

# INSANIYAT

## Journal of Islam and Humanities

### Critique and Development of Modernity: From Romantic Criticism to Post-modernism

Sukron Kamil

Arabic Language and Literature Department, Faculty of Adab and Humanities, Syarif Hidayatullah  
State Islamic University Jakarta  
email: [sukronkamil@uinjkt.ac.id](mailto:sukronkamil@uinjkt.ac.id)

#### Abstract

*In the East, even in the most parts of the West, modernity has been an omnipresent phenomenon. It becomes the ultimate goal of modernization. However, modernity appears in the Western history, shortly after birth, which emphasizes the rationality of modernity has been criticized among the romantic and irrational which rely more on feelings, spontaneity, and intuition, rather than sense. The next Critics regard modernity not only as a solution, but also a problem. For example, nationalism gives birth to anti-Jewish attitudes and industrialization gives birth to imperialism. The same patten goes with science and technology. It is problematic in axiology, ontology and epistemology. The universality of science in the latter period is rejected trough relativity theory and quantum theory. in the view of the post-structuralist, science is considered as a product of power. Modernity is also considered to have made a person has lost the soul and spirituality. Regarding the development of modernity, it is called postmodernity, for some experts, it is a new social configuration which is different, even disconnected with early modernity. As for the opposite, modernity today is a continuation of the previous modernity as a reflexive project to make life goes forward.*

**Keywords:** *Modernity; Critique; development; postmodernity.*

#### A. Introduction

Modernity derived from the word “modern”. It comes from the Latin word *modus* (modernus) which means new, latest, or recent. In the Western history, the modern was first used in 490-500 which shows the displacement of the old Roman period to the new Roman period. However, in this study the modern is the opposite of the ancient times and the mid-west running the earliest since the 16<sup>th</sup> century or rather the 18<sup>th</sup> century until the 20<sup>th</sup> century and today. It is synonymous with contemporary words, although some experts distinguish the contemporary word as the present, about 50 years later. Modernity, in this context, means novelty, progress, dynamism, innovation,

cut the old-fashioned past, progress in the form of ideas, behaviors, as well as an autonomous progress or freedom of man as the foundation and awareness of the present as a requirement.

In Arkoun term, modernity is progress, dynamism, and innovation, both in the form of material (outer frame) or in the form of intellectual (cultural) as the base (inner frame). According to Arkoun, modernity is the principal changes in thinking and other areas of life. According to Agnes Heller (1999, pp. 1-12), as the emphasis on novelty and modernity of a better future, everything in modernity open to be questioned and to be tested; everything is a target to be investigated in order to obtain advancement. Everything assessed,

if accompanied by rational arguments and empirical (D. King, 1995, pp. 108-109; Gillen and Devleena, 2007, pp. 52-53; Ritzer [et.al.], 2007, p. 3068; Jones, 2010, p. 23; and Putro, 1998, pp. 47-48).

Based on some literature, dimension or size of modernity is the idea of the nation state; rationalism and empirical science; capitalism, at least not in the sense of a multiplication of production and profit based on the principle of the rights to own, competition, and rationalism, including efficient and effective bureaucracy; secularism is at least not in the sense concerned with the life of the world (the present and here-ness) with desecrated against everything other than the things that are truly divine/transcendent; and birth control through Family Planning or *Keluarga Berencana* (Jones, 2010, pp. 23-24; Cox, 1984, 181-183; Pye, 1965, p. 8; Madjid, 2008, p. 229-231; and Nasution, et. al, 2003, p. 169).

In the sense and size as above, especially in the Third World, certainly, also in the majority of the West today, modernity is something noble, even sacred. Modernity has become a sort of estuary destination of the efforts made, either by the state or civil society organization (CSO) called modernization. Through modernization, modernity is into a destination that should become a reality in society. Modernization, as argued by Danial Lerner, is a process of social change in which traditional underdeveloped societies acquire common characteristics of people who are more developed (modernized). In the formulation of Light and Keller, modernization is an attempt to create a traditional society that is not developed into a society having values, institutions, and views characterize as advanced and industrialized and urban society (Karim, 1994, pp. 23-24; Apter, 1985, 457-461). In other words, modernization means the movement, either by the State or not, either in the form of action or discourse, whereby the various dimensions or sizes of modernity sought to be part of the reality in society.

In Indonesia, presumably it can be seen from the policy of the New Order government which was in power since March 11, 1966 to 1998, even to this day. Modernization or, in Indonesia, often referred to as development --as a popular term to embody modernity in various fields-- the main policies. The meaning of various fields is good economic, political, social, and cultural aspects including family planning to reduce the number of population, education, and religion, including religious pluralism. Modernization or construction of a key issue campaigned always in every policy of the New Order government. All means all, such as education and religion should be part of it.

The New Order with its modernization is the antithesis of the Old Order regime under President Sukarno (in power since 1945, although the effective power since Presidential Decreed 1959). The Old Order through guided democracy perceives the problems of the nation from a political perspective. The orientation of social thought and political leaders are too ideological and political. Politics then becomes the commander. As a result, all non-political aspects, such as economic development, industrialization, etc., should be subordinated to politics and ideology (Ali and Effendy, 1986, p. 94).

The choice of the modernization to achieve modernity that seems to be considered by the elite of the New Order as the only alternative for the promotion of Indonesia after the government failing to meet the demands and expectations of the people. Through political modernization, the New Order government expects to gain political legitimacy from the people, because its socio-economic welfare will be realized previously that was dormant during the Old Order (Anwar, 1995, pp. 4-5). Options in the politics of modernization is also expected to attract the support of the Western countries, both as a country and as a private foreign investor. The New Order government at that time viewed no alternative to invite financial support for the construction, except from

the Western countries that are currently economically advanced.

In the history of Indonesia, through the modernization, the New Order had succeed in the issue of population control through family planning (KB). The UN (United Nations) awarded President Soeharto in the achievement. The New Order was also quite successful in the development of education, from basic education to higher education either under Ministry of National Education and Culture or Ministry of Religious Affairs; the development of highways and overpasses; building skyscrapers; development of Miniature of Indonesian Culture and Diversity Landscape (Taman Mini Indonesia Indah) and other infrastructure; the development of technologies such as shipbuilding technology through PT PAL (Company Limited of Penataran Navy) Indonesia, the aircraft industry through IPTN (Nusantara Aircraft Industry), and Weaponry Technology through Industry of Army or PT. PINDAD (Oktorino, 2009, pp. 262-267).

Even so, according to Chaniago (2001, pp. 234-248) through modernization to achieve modernity, The New Order and failed to equalize economic modernization policy as it chose the emphasis of uniformity under the military. Herbert Feith (1980) regards the New Order developmentalism as a repressive regime, or so-called by Mochtar Mas' oed (as quoted by Yudi Latif, 2005, pp. 451-456) as an authoritarian bureaucracy, which emphasizes political stability as the basis of modernization. At that time, the New Order Government was very easy to use hard side of the power to silence modernity critics and modernity itself. Therefore, the New Order government failed to build democracy, humanism, and also a clean government, where corruption was widespread due to the political culture of patrimonialism implementation (Effendy, 1998; Kamil, 2016). In fact, three of the latter is one of the dimensions or sizes of modernity as well.

At all level of the society, exaltation or even modernity sacralization is also visible on the notion of culture, of the views is from

Sutan Alisjahbana, a modern Indonesian culture figures in 1936's. For him, the ideal format for the modern Indonesian culture should adhere the West completely, even as literal as possible, if you want to progress as a modern western, especially if you want to keep up with it, modernization shall embody modernity with nothing but westernization. Guidelines that have been taken up to be like the West should now be selected. It is different from other cultural circles whose believe must remain as the East (adhering traditionalism) like Ki Hajar Dewantara, or be moderate (a mixture of Western and Eastern) like Sanusi Pane. In his article entitled "Towards a New Culture" published in the daily *Pujangga Baru* Sutan Alisjahbana believed that the definition of "Indonesia" is closely related to the spirit of "Indonesian-ness", and the spirit is "the creation of the twentieth century" by modernity. Pre-Indonesia period before the 20th century, for him, is "the age of ignorance". He concludes: "now it's time we turn our eyes to the West". Because, according to Sutan Alisjahbana, Indonesian-ness was formed by the West because of the Dutch colonialism. Only by reaping the science and the spirit of the West in very comprehensive way (literal modernity), Indonesia can compensate the West as he suggests further (Mihardja, 1998; Rosidi, 2000, pp. 34-35; and Teeuw, 1980, pp. 59-63).

## B. Method

This study aims to find facts about the development of modernism and post-modernism. In addition, it also seeks to find a link or a critical relation in the dynamics of post modernism. This study or study also aims to discover the development of romance criticism in the context of post modernism.

Therefore, this study also aims to find facts about romantic criticism of the current social scientists in view of modernity with various dimensions and sizes over the exalted among its supporters, both the ruling regime and the elite, as shown above. This criticism

is important, considering what is displayed is the latest social studies experts (among post-modernism) who exceeded bearers of modernity above in terms of era.

### **C. Result and Discussion**

In terms of comprehension and size above, modernity is not an entity that is free of criticism and refusal. In contrast to the reality of history in the Third World such as Indonesia in which modernity is glorified, in The Western history, from the time of its development (the 19th century), modernity had been criticized. Among the romanticists. The biggest criticism was born in the period of contemporary Western history of the post-structuralist and post-modernity. Clearly, as the exposure as follow.

Shortly after rising, especially during the 18th century Enlightenment, modernity in the sense of rationality as the most basic measure, getting criticism, even the rejection of the romantic in the West in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, to mention some here, English poet Percy Shelley and William Wordsworth, French novelist Victor Hugo, and the philosopher Schelling in Germany. For the romantic, the enlightenment thinkers who emphasize rationalism and empiricism have changed blood and human flesh into thinking soulless machine. In order to be whole again, according to the romantic, people must be freed from the excessive tyranny of intellectualization (rationalism and empiricism). Feelings should be cultivated and expressed. The romantic in the West suggest people to discover and reveal his true self; plays music in his own way; writing poetry and prose in his own way; depict nature, life, love, and suffer in his own way without having to master the theories and humanities. Victor Hugo wanted to give freedom to the human in art. The romantic, therefore, focus on the inherent creativity on intuitive emotion, instinct, passion, will, empathy, and compassion. They influenced the development of modern art that emphasizes the human feelings and the exploration of the world of dreams and

fantasies hidden.

#### **C.1. Critique of Modernity: From the 19<sup>th</sup> Century Until Now**

Although for the thinkers of the Enlightenment in modernity, feeling hinder clear thinking, for the romantic, the feeling is the essence of man. For Rousseau, even for humans in general, one that exists means a person feels. Is something indisputable, the ability to sense the first human beings rather than reason (ratio). Poet and artist William Blake also said that the power of human reasoning is only one layer of the immortality of the soul alone. Quoting Blake, The 19<sup>th</sup> century romantic would like people to feel and experience the “bathing in natural water of life.” The Romanesque even insisted that the imaginative writer has greater insight on life than the analytical philosophers. They were then, calling the empiricist and rationalist modernity has tried to shrink the religion into a series of scientific argument. They blame the Enlightenment thinkers in the West to weaken Christianity by subjecting dogma on testing ratio. For the romantic, science and religion is not a syllogism, but the expression of a vibrant and authenticity of human nature (Perry, 2013, pp. 73-79).

The same criticism on modernity conveyed irrational thinkers who deny the Enlightenment conception on human rationality as the main characteristic of modernity. They do not believe that reason has prevailed in human affairs and showed naivety of liberals who exalts rationality. Instead, they emphasized the irrationality of human nature. For them, reason has a very limited effect on human behavior. Lust, impulse, instinct (all potentials in sub-consciousness) more determines human behavior rather than logical consciousness. Like the romantic above, the proponent of the thinker of irrationality is to rely more on feeling, spontaneity, and intuition, rather than reason.

These irrationality thinkers, one of them are Friedrich Nietzsche (1844 to 1900). His view rejects the truth of rationality

and religion. For him, there is no absolute standards regarding good and evil that truth can be shown by a reflective mind. It is ridiculous that there is only the naked man who lived in a world without God. Rationality, he said, to sacrifice the will and instinct. Rationality also destroys the spontaneity that sparked cultural creativity and ignite a passion for life. For him, Christian morality should be abolished, because it is only suitable for people who are weak and slaves. Christian morality burden people with guilt and blocking the free implementation of the spontaneity of human instinct. He also proclaimed "God is dead". God is a human creation itself. There is no higher world, there is no transcendental or metaphysical truth, no morality comes from God or nature. Human creates new values, achieving self-control, and eliminates uniformity and regular nature of modernity. Nietzsche was idealizing Superman (*Übermensch*), a new type of man who broke the accepted morality and determines its own standards. He had wasted "thou shall not" of his Christian and sensitized the "I want". According to Nietzsche (as cited in Perry, 2013, pp. 213-219), the most daunting and fundamental desires of human beings is the desire for power. Love to power is a vicious man that will not disappear when other needs are met though.

Philosophy of irrationality delivered also by Henri Bergson (1859-1941) and Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), although with different sides. For Bergson, the emphasis on intellect sacrificing spiritual encouragement, imagination, intuition, and shrink the soul into the mechanism. Western civilization, he said, must recognize the limits of scientific rationality. Intuition methods, how to immerse themselves in the mind objects to unite with it, may reveal more about reality than a rational method of scientific analysis. Intuitive is the highway to proofing.

It almost comparable delivered by Freud. According to him, the instinctive impulses he called id stronger regulate human behavior rather than reason. He even

called the id as a kettle full of boiling stimuli. When stimuli instinctive id denied, people will get frustrated, angry, and unhappy. Id gratification is the highest pleasure. Human get the highest pleasure of sexual gratification. Freud also mentions that man is a wolf to the other man. Aggression is a character that is always present in human. Unalterable core of human nature is always at odds with civilized life. Everyone is potentially an enemy of civilization. At least, there were times when instinctive elementary human nature rebelled against the restrictions.

However, unlike Nietzsche, Freud said that the fulfillment of unbridled sexuality will drain psychic energy required for the life of the intellectual and artistic creativity. Civilization imposes great sacrifices not only in sexuality, but also on human aggressiveness. Even so, he advised (as cited in Perry, 2013, pp. 213-226) people to soften the sexual standards that limit, because it hurts mental health.

Modernity by some experts assessed a crisis or dark side as stated by Jeffrey C. Alexander, Paul Gillen, and Devleena Ghosh. Through science and technology, modernity becomes a kind of Frankenstein, to borrow the title of Mary Shelley novel (1831) which undermine and threaten humanism and morality. Modernity is not only a solution, but also a problem. Modernity has indeed been promising progress. For example, the effective state power through the concept of nation state supported weaponry, welfare for many people, freedom, and security through advanced weaponry to the state monopoly. But modernity also has a dark side that is destructive. For example, the emergence of Nazi holocaust, a slaughter of Jews in Europe. It is said that the number of Jews who were killed in this incident is 6 million, although to some experts, this figure is an exaggerated number.

One reason holocaust associated with modernity is due to its association with nationalism or nation state and also the relative rationalism, two things become one marker of modernity. This event begins

with the birth of racial nationalist German focusing anti-Semite Jews as a race of the most evil and deadly enemy of the German nation. Anti-Semite Organizations and parties sought repeal of civil rights of Jews and publications anti-Semite is growing. In a speech that inspired Hitler, Nazi leader, Paul de Bellegarde said: "People should not be dealing with pests and parasites, one should not raise and cherish them, and people should destroy them thoroughly and as quickly as possible." Moreover, Hitler called Jews as parasites, plague, and cancer, also accused Germany's defeat in World War I as a result of an international Jewish conspiracy. The Jews in Europe at that time considered to dominate the economy and are able to manipulate the media. Anti-Jewish in Germany peaked on April 1, 1933 with a national boycott on Jewish-owned shops and Jewish professionals. Marriage and sexual relations between Germans and Jews even later banned.

Anti-Jewish evolve further to other European countries. Edouard Drumont, a French journalist argued that Jews were racially lower than the adherents of a primitive religion, and they have gained control of France. As the anti-Semitic Christian Middle Ages, Drumont accused the Jews decide and using the blood of Christians for ritual purposes. He called for the expulsion of Jews from France and forecasted that they would be slaughtered. As Germany and France, Romania hinders the majority of Jews to hold office and have the right to vote, to impose economic restrictions, and the right of entry to secondary school and university. Romanian government finance even anti-Semitic international congress that met in Bucharest in 1886.

Threats of top European Jews are of course absurd. How could the European nation of 50 million people is threatened by one and a half million citizens of Jewish. How might also 11 million Jews in the world in the 1900s to organize dominate the planet. This is the relative rationality as purely rational justification used the anti-Semitic in

the West at that time the real ethnocentrism (nationalist blind).

Other evidence referred to appoint the crisis of modernity is also a World War I and World War (World War II), who in World War II, countries such as the Soviet Union lost 27 million soldiers and citizens as well as the imposition of the atomic bombs in Japan at the end World War II (Alexander, 2013; Gillen and Devleena, nd., pp. 86-87; Madjid, 2007, pp. 3-5; and Perry, 2013, pp. 184-189). Of course colonialism or imperialism towards eastern countries (Asia, Africa, South America, and Australia) at the expense of millions of people worldwide also is other additional evidence.

Those called crisis of modernity, as the relationship these events with particularly colonialism. In modern history, colonialism or imperialism among others influenced by two things: nationalism and social Darwinism. At the very least, it is associated with nationalism built the Jacobins and Napoleon Bonaparte who made himself emperor of France in 1804. In the year 1793-1794, when the invasion of foreign threats, the Jacobins creates a national army that demands fidelity and sacrifice for the nation. However, the problem is his exclamation for expansion from the French border. It is similar to Germany. The Romanesque Germany are the apostles of nationalism, where they stuck consciousness with memories of past nationalism Germany and emphasizing special qualities of the German people and the German people have a special destiny (Perry, 2013, pp. 83-85). Nazi Germany under Hitler in World War II as an actor was referring to himself as Nietzsche's superman, which they regard Germany as the ruling race (Perry, 2013, pp. 213-219).

While the relationship of colonialism or imperialism with Darwinism social (evolution) seen from the view of social Darwinists that the last is a race that is stronger physically and mentally. Darwinism emphasized the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest. Social Darwinism such as Albert J. Beveridge emphasized the

necessity adhere to the blood and control of new markets. They separate human races the superior and lower. Anglo-Saxon race (Britain and North America) and the Teutonic race was considered a superior race that is evidenced by the growth of the British Empire, American expansion into Pacific and German expansion to Europe. In fact, people such as the Prussian General von Bernhardt called the war are a number one biological necessity (Perry, 2013, p. 144).

Colonialism or imperialism rather new (to differentiate with colonialism understood as a residential and commercial 16-18 century) to the Eastern world ensued. Europe, through the theory of evolution (social Darwinism) justifies their exploitation through new imperialism as the races less on the lower race without law. Superior and inferior nations that are widely used in Germany, Britain and the United States. Some people even believe that the expansion of the European rule of law, order, and civilization of Western modernity would lift underdeveloped nations to the ladder of evolution and civilization.

Colonialism or imperialism is also seen as a direct result of industrialization, even the main measure of modernity. Industrialization, activity and economic competition (capitalism) to make Europe struggled to get raw materials, the market for commodities, and where to invest their capital. When Imperialism time is coming, some of politicians and industrialists in Europe believe that the only way for Europeans to ensure their economic requirements is to acquire overseas territory. They estimate the consequences are frightening, if they fail to get a share of the world market, despite the recent reality show that Europe and America is indeed the main areas of trade and investment, instead of Asia and Africa.

Of course, for the record, the economic motivation (industrialization needs) is not the only factor for the birth of the West colonialism/imperialism. The desire to achieve glory (political) also influential, showing the crisis factors that come into

modernity. Following the UK, Germany, Italy and France also wants people "have a place in the sun". They turn their attention to the East, hoping to gain prestige, increase human power, and wealth. In fact, imperialism is also influenced by the spread of religious motivation, which in the discourse in Indonesia known as the motif of three g: gold (gold/economic motive), glory (triumph/political motive) and gospel (evangelism). In fact, imperialism is also backed by an interest to visit and control of exotic places and also pleasure motivation. According to Edward Said, imperialism for most of the West aims to dominate women in the colonies that provide large numbers of slaves were full of lust as described by Richard Haggard's King Solomon's Mine's work, and also appeared in character Cleopatra, seductive and alluring East noble women (Perry, 2013, pp. 190-192; Walia, 2003, pp. 26-28, 35-46).

In the history of modernity, colonialism made east becomes integrated with Western modernity, a mutual giving relationship. On the one hand, Western societies, especially the working class and Western farmers can get the goods from distant places, which can only be obtained once the economic upper class. In contrast, the East gets the market for the products or commodities such as cotton, coffee, tea, and indigo in the West that gave profit-making relative to the East. Imperialism has spread even to the East of Western modernity, as explained in advance. Ideas, institutions, techniques, and Western languages such as English and French are spread to the East. The East (Asia, Africa, and Latin America) have adopted democracy with limited success, socialism, industrialism, and science and modern Western science. Similarly, agricultural techniques, business practices, medicine, law, school curriculum, architecture, music, and modern Western clothing. In the East, through colonialism, the rules no longer apply untouchable; Turkish women are no longer required to wear hijab; Chinese women are no longer restricted; and India is no longer practiced slavery (Perry,

2013, pp. 208-210).

However, for the peoples of the East as a former Western colony, imperialism is a source of great bitterness. Not only because the practice of economic exploitation of imperialism, but also boost the imperialist racism and callous neglect on other cultures. In fact, in the United States for example, Indian tribes as natives are victims of imperialism that is almost extinct. Through military force, destruction, exclusion and regional development reservations, the natives Indians removed. Likewise, the Aborigines in Australia. The millions of other victims who were killed as a result of imperialize in the World. Until now there has been no research that accurately how many millions the number of victims who were killed as a result of West colonialism/imperialism over Asia, Africa, Australia, and the America. In the Islamic world, western dominance through colonialism or imperialism creating trauma, which Mernissi called it as a crisis (*Azmah*). Therefore, the Muslim world reaction against modernity that known through colonialism was not entirely positive, as will be described (Bennet, 2005, p. 17; Perry, 2013, p. 86).

The dark side of modernity, according to Bauman (as cited in Garrent, 2012, p.17), referred to as solid modernity (modernity solid) is the dominant (repressive) which establish the elements of modernity through totalitarianism (imperialism). Therefore, he suggested changing the model of solid modernity to liquid modernity.

Critique of modernity continues to resonate in the 20th century until now. In addition to the critique of modernity solid side of Bauman, a critique of modernity is directed against the truth claims of science as a major element of modernity. The truth of doubt and criticism science through Einstein's theory of relativity (1905 and 1922) and and the quantum theory developed in the 1920s until the 1930s (Gillen and Devleena, 2007, p. 87). Two theories have rejected natural law as claimed certainty of Newton's classical physics. Preceded by the

refusal of quantum theory of atoms as solid particles and undivided, Max Planck (1858-1947), one of the experts in this latter theory, basic properties of atoms is elusive and unpredictable. Quantum mechanics teaches that in the sub-atomic realm, we cannot predict with certainty what happened. For Einstein through relativity theory, both space and time have no independent existence. Time and space disappeared with objects. There is no frame fixed reference that does not move absolutely anywhere in the universe. Nature cannot be completely known. Uncertainty, probability, and even magic inherent in the universe. In fact, Jacob Bronowski (as cited in Perry, 2013, pp. 235-239) calls no absolute knowledge. All knowledge is limited.

In addition to the theory of relativity, Einstein also criticized modernity empirical science with a statement of the importance of religion in axiology science, something which was marginalized in Western modernity. He once stated: "Science without religion is blind, and religion without science is lame". Einstein statement is expressed not long after the imposition of the atomic bombs on Japan by the United States, where he played a role in the making, even the most influential. In this case, Einstein argued that the empirical method can indeed be used as the base/source of reliable science, though also relatively. However, relying solely on empirical methods of living alone is to simplify life. Life is too complicated, if only approached by one way of thinking such as the empirical method alone. Science should not divide and marginalize religion. The goodness of both should be complementary and integrated. Empiricism in Einstein's viewpoint has many shortcomings, as it is said by Satnley M. Honner and Thomas C. Hunt, a contemporary philosopher of science. According to Honner and Hunt (as cited in Suriasumantri, 2006, pp. 3-4) as a result of sensory, empirical results of scientific studies that could be deceptive; only on the surface (see through what looks alone), who therefore devoid of philosophical thought as presented by experts school of critical theory;



even, for the social sciences, empirical results of scientific studies that could be partial and erroneous because it cannot be a correct theoretical conception; and empirical findings often material for any reason.

Critique of Western empirical science as marker of modernity was also stated by Huston Smith, a spokesman for contemporary religions, citing the opinion of Apleyard. According to him, science or scientism are psychologically biting humans and, after throwing religion, burn the whole authority and a long tradition (Christian). He meant by scientism is a Freud's view that science is a material fact, not an illusion, and the view that the methods of empirical science which is the most reliable method. Scientism has shown itself unable to live with others (religion), and science has engulfed the world, or at least bigger than it should be. Science has been given a blank check by modern Western society, because obsession is too big for the material needs to claims about what constitutes knowledge and belief (Smith, 2003, p. xxvii; Bertens, 1991, pp. 89-90; and Pals, 1996, pp. 54-88).

In the United States, criticism of empiricism and scientism as a main characteristic of modern Western culture is also conveyed by Seyyed Hossein Nasr. According to him, the perspective of materialist empiricism and rationalism that has played a role in the birth of sorrow for the modern society, especially in the West. Through the dominance of empirical facts and logic, modern man has lost the soul and spirituality, because underestimate intuition, spirituality, values of divinity and religion. They referred to Weber, as concerned with the efficiency of modern economics emphasized that empirical loss of life, loss of its spirituality, and a side of humanity become pessimistic. In the language of Habermas, they let life "colonized" by rationalism and empiricism. They no longer be the center for himself, but experienced problems of alienation (alienation from self and environment), because his soul has been ripped away by rationalism and empiricism

outside him as efficiency and effectiveness as an instrument emphasized rationalism of modern economics. Also said Erich Formm (as cited in Yayasan Paramadina, 1993, pp. 1-9), this is a kind of mental illness in which a person no longer feels himself as his own, but was taken away by forces outside himself that could not be controlled. They lose the sense of meaning of life. Therefore, the phenomenon of suicide even in today's modern society is something that is commonplace.

Critique of modernity most recently emerged from post-structuralist and postmodernist. Michel Foucault (from 1926 to 1984) refused the West universalism and absolutism of science and technology as the most basic elements of modernity. In his criticism, first he said that what we think, what we know and what we say, is produced by various discourses that we face and we use. Discourse that is meant is the way we think, the way we know and say. Foucault connects modern Western science with language and power. The relationship between thought, language and action (discursive practices) promoted by the discourse and it is associated with language and power. For Foucault, if we want to know human behavior in a particular place and time finding dominant discourse there. For Foucault, knowing the meaning of language (words) is the only way that we can use to find out and discover the world. Language not only tells the world, but also created the world. Foucault therefore, believes that power is exercised so that a discourse materialized (the power to carry a particular discourse [power generating knowledge]). Power is also implemented and controlled by a discourse. Certain discourse becomes the cornerstone of power, for which the discourse is always rooted in power. Power and knowledge directly affect each other and this applies to western science and power. According to him, the truth, including the truth of Western science and technology as the principal marker of modernity, is determined by a ruling minority: he forced and arranged systematic subject in order to

conform to the goals and doing that through discourse. Knowledge which in turn gave birth to power may not be applied without knowledge. He asserted: "There is no relationship of power without the creation of correlative on the field of knowledge, and there is also the knowledge that at the same time create relationships with power". For Foucault, power determines what is thought and known. Power determines how humans act. "Subject" creative --agent free to choose and interpretations do not exist. Foucault in this regard not only belongs to the power of the ruling class. Power, for him, is a strategic region, the scene of the unequal relationship between the us and the weak. In the eyes of Foucault, power is something that is productive in the sense of creating, producing, and gave birth to reality, objects and rituals of truth territory. In archaeological science, Foucault emphasizes that the task of the historian is to express the basics of a discourse and also express what is contained in the emergence of discourse. Based on the theory of discourse, Foucault concluded, there is no knowledge that is valid for eternity and valid at all times, as contained in the claims of modernity (Jones, Pip; Bradbury, Liz; and Le Boutillier, Shaun; 2010, pp. 124-125; 139-140, 144-148).

Foucault's view was followed by Edward W. Said who stating discourse depends on its context. Articulate the knowledge and approval power over knowledge by mass conducted agents of power, not just through military force, but also especially through means of persuasion and collaboration. Therefore, modern Western science is actually the articulation of the West, and it is different from Foucault's view, is done by conscious agents. The truth of a discourse depends on what is stated, particularly who declared, when and where it is stated. For example, for Said, the so-called East is the findings of the Europeans. Orientalism was, therefore, not objective, as European power and identity positioning at odds with the East. Orientalism is a Western style in dominating, organizing, and controlling of the East.

West, through Orientalism, especially the literary text and its historical description, according to Said, created the myth of power and mastery. He even hooked modernity that emphasizes rationality and progress of the Enlightenment with the practice of colonization. Through an advanced conception of Western modernity, Western have been had legitimacy of Africa and Asia that are considered Barbarian to colonize, as described above. On behalf of "civilizing mission" (the spread of modernity), West was valid for doing colonialism. In Rudyard Kipling's rhetoric is even more apparent, namely as 'liabilities white man' (Story, John, 1993, pp. 91-95; Lash, Scott, 1990, pp. 128-134; Said, Edward W, 2010).

Foucault's view above justified by Thomas Kuhn (1922) with a more literal language again. For him, modern scientific West is not in power because really, but really because of the ruling. So, the question is not "what is right?", but "how it became the dominant version of the truth/dominate the social sphere and history. For Kuhn, despite the appeal relating to the facts, the production of scientific truth is always influenced by the style and trends, politics and the use of power, and by the choice of what should be known and not. Scientists not only have to choose which one should be examined, but also have to choose a theoretical approach to research. And the choices it has always done in social contexts. Therefore, he believes that scientific knowledge produced by a certain-traditions, which he called paradigm and generally based on the dominant paradigm. The dominant paradigm is the result of social influences through persuasive political practice. Therefore, Kuhn firms it is fair that homeopathy, hypnotherapy, and acupuncture was used as a medical system in the outskirts of thirty years ago. Nowadays, the forms of treatment are called alternative medicine. Doctors in the UK, in fact, often also offer homeopathy or acupuncture or psychotherapy as part of a medical doctor (Jones, Pip, et. al., 2010, 148-154).

## **C.2. The Development of Modernity: Postmodernity or New Faces of Modernity?**

Because of criticism and also other problems of modernity as will be discussed, is now rated in some quarters modernity postmodernity has ended, although not part calls. In the social science literature, postmodernity understood on two levels: the first refers to the view that the institutions and ways of life of modernity has been replaced by the new institutions and ways of life, so to a certain extent, the life of the 21st century is not the continuity of modernity. Modernity has ended. As suggested by Zygmunt Bauman (as cited in Smart, Berry, 2005, pp. 256-257): postmodernity is not a modification of modernity, but has its own treasuries. Postmodernity is a new age and a world that has been transformed. Postmodernity is a new social configuration of different social conditions. Modernity has been actually replaced by postmodernity. Modernity has ended. Second, postmodernity is simply the new era in mind, a new way of understanding the ideas, beliefs and knowledge, rather than new ways to live and organize social problems (Vattimo, Giani, 2002, pp. 113-181). Therefore, for the latter one modernity has not over yet.

For the first one, applying the theory of Durkheim, Weber and Marx modernity did not address issues that are very important for human life in 21<sup>st</sup> century. For example, the threat of preservation of life, the dangers posed by nuclear weapons, and the risks and uncertainties posed by the progress of science and technology are much honored modernity (Jones, Pip, ed., 2010, pp. 155-156).

As poststructuralist like Michel Foucault and Thomas Kuhn, the postmodernist who sees modernity has ended also rejected the absolutist empirical science as one measure of modernity. Francois Lyotard stated that there is no method which guarantees the final truth, though experimental empiricism. Truth theoretical

empiricism is only tentative and not absolute and universal. For Lyotard, there is no so-called grand narrative or metanarratives. He rejected the idea totalize such as Marxism, Liberalism and Christianity. As science, education was not responding to the question of whether it is true. However, what good is and whether it can be sold? Science and education, therefore, has been trapped in crisis. As Lyotard, Jean Baudrillard, the other postmodernists reject God, nature, and science as a metanarrative. Everything has been lost as the central authority of authenticity and truth. They proclaimed scientific pluralism.

Richard Rorty, in fact, asserted that the task of a scientist is now no longer determined “who is right” and “it is wrong”. They only served as moderator, directing traffic science and thought. Therefore, among the scientists, he said, must perform scientific logged. Comparable to Rorty, Paul Karl Feyerabend also embraces scientific pluralism. He argues in the area of science today, the principle: “whatever method may be”. According to him, the progress of science cannot be achieved by following a single theory, empirical theory. He refused hegemony method over other methods. He was, in this case, one of the scientists who adopted the slogan belongs to the Church which has now been abandoned: *Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus* (there is no salvation outside the Church). In contexts of science, Paul Feyerabend has no longer adhere to the principle: *extra scientism nulla salus* or no truth outside of empirical science (Rosenau, Pauline Marie, 1992, pp. 114-115; Last Scott and Friedman Jonathan, 2007, pp. 73-86; Holub, Robert C, 1991, pp. 139-161; Noble, Trevor, 2000, pp. 226-234).

Herbert Marcuse, scientists from the critical schools, had almost the same idea as the above two postmodernism scientists. Marcuse rejects the cult of empirical science and technology. This cult begins to understand empiricism and scientism which considers that the methods of the natural sciences are a universal method that can

be applied in all of science. In this case, Marcuse reject excessive confidence in the ability of empirical science and technology in meeting human needs, thus are becoming the sole truth. Rationalism, especially the instrumental rationalism (reasoning based utility), showed hostility to metaphysics, because the statements are considered metaphysics could not be verified. For Marcuse also (as cited in Santoso, Listiyono, 2007, pp. 116-118) the myth and the ratio are two things that are mutually dialectic. Myth produce rationality and rationality freed him from myth, which eventually became the new myth.

Both the postmodernism as well as the critical schools, looked epistemology of science is not based on viewpoint of binary opposition principle: modern versus primitive and progressive versus decadent that favor one over the other. They build up his mind about science above the paradigm of pluralism, where the epistemology of science likes identity and commodities. Everything is viewed as the sand in the desert. No one over the other considered more superior. Epistemology of science in theory postmodernism is the search for identity and products in consumerism and capitalism. Both are an endless odyssey, in which no one dominant identity representation. The presence of different of differences too, as Barthes says, is not a lasting anchored in position or to be destroyed, but to be multiplied. Now, even as commodity empirical epistemology modern with the traditional, both sold by global capitalism by side without having seen the latter is lower (Piliang, Yasraf, A, 1999, pp. 225-235; Storey, John, 2009, pp. 85-95, 159-179).

According to the postmodernity, capitalism is different from capitalism of modernity. Capitalism is no longer confined to the West. Efforts to make a profit from the capital have now penetrated into the most distant corners of the world. Capitalism has become a global phenomenon, far beyond the reach of national regulations. The players in today's global capitalism are multinational

corporations (transnational corporation). They operate in countries, but do not work for those national interests. Their ideology is only advantages. They will relocate capital and production in countries that creating benefit, without considering the possibility of unemployment in the previous country. They will put the capital and production in countries that can depress wages and do not have a labor union (Jones, Pip, et.al., 2010, 156).

In contrast to capitalism in the previous modernity, in order to obtain the multiplication of capital and profits, contemporary global capitalism is now following the growth model is not on the basis of the root, despite the many relay. Global capitalism advanced in the days following the postmodernity rhizome growth model, growth model tubers or vines, which does not rely on taproot. However, it is able to grow through double roots and combinations, as well as through the process of deterritorialization and reterritorialization to get new multiplication tremendous advantages.

All aspects and territory are also capitalized. Ranging from politics, sex, sports, education, fitness, body, safety, and even death. All sides of life commercialized. Of course, the main thing is known three f: food, fantasy, and fashion. Through paradigm consumptives above, malls/shopping centers are now already exceeded the initial concept. Malls have been transformed into consumerism and push into the center of the formation of a lifestyle, the center of social activity and acculturation, where the establishment and existence of its images of themselves, even a source of information, knowledge, values, and morals (Piliang, Yasraf A, 1999, pp. 128-132, 225-235; Storey, John, 2011, pp. 85-95, 159-179).

Character of capitalism that makes people postmodernism as a consumer society, where consumption becomes central to their existence. Consumption has become a sort of identity, replacing the work and class as the identity of the first modernity. Postmodernity society is a society that is infatuated with

consumption, as referred to Bauman and Jean Baudrillard. In contrast to classical consumptivism, post-consumptivism now no longer just a point of view or the desire to enjoy or consume objects for pleasure in taking appropriate demands endless lust. However, more than that, which owns and activities consume as existence. Consumptivism also higher than the materialism which saw the presence of a person in terms of how much material (material and money) owned. However, more than that, namely whether the objects owned follows the novelty/trend or not. Consumerism, therefore, not as mere objects of culture, but put consumption as a social platform in which social contested meanings.

Consumer products have become a medium of formation of personality, style; image, lifestyle, and social status differentiation are different. Now the object/commodity purchased is no longer solely due to the object alone, but the meanings behind the objects. The value of an object is no longer on the function (a utility objects), but rather on the value or the image as a new image and trendy. Gold watches, pens, ties, coats, belts, shoes, luxury cars, and a spacious house with the latest styles, are words that tell about the lifestyle and social class position of the owners/users, although the results borrow. Commodities become an arena game semiotics, status, prestige, and sensuality marketing communications. If you continue to follow him, then obtained the contemporary consumerist pseudo-reality was in fact, not true happiness, despite the artificiality may be seen as more pleasant than reality for most of the audience.

Postmodern consumerism above built following the fashion cycle. Everyone feels the need to renew themselves every year, every season, or every month through clothes, and stuff that's new to them. If not, they are not a true member of the consumer society, and it is judged disrupt their Ahmadiyah. In fact, what they would actually not be merely a new recycling only, since the nature of any product sold cutting-edge global capitalism

just repeat signs and ideom without end. Here, in fact, nothing really new. There is only nihilism, not substantivalism (Piliang, Yasraf A, 1999, pp. 128-132, 225-235, Jones, Pip, et.al., 2010, pp. 155-164, Storey, John, 2009, pp. 85-95, 159-179).

So what paradigm/ideology that became the foundation of consumerism and capitalism postmodernist above? The answer is the paradigm pluralism and progress. In modernism, culture before postmodernism, identity or perspective built on the principle of Binary opposition: modern versus primitive and progressive versus decadent. In short, it is to favor one over other. While in postmodernism (consumerism and advanced capitalism), the identity built on the discourse of pluralism. Identity and commodities like deserts, as explained in advance. No one over the other considered more superior. In consumptivism and postmodernist capitalism, the search for identity and the product is an endless odyssey.

To support the commodity pluralism, ideology is developed/advanced paradigm, ie rejuvenation/speed. Advanced capitalism on which awakened a new consumptivism be presenting its range of products and services as well as the atmosphere of the environment that has always rejuvenated. In the discourse of capitalism to develop the need to shorten product life cycles and styles by the producer as an ideology of consumer society. Everyone feels the need to buy a watch or mobile phone has, for example, despite the fact it does not need. The images presented mass media and commodities in supermarkets alternated appear and disappear at high speed. Styles and products flowing at high speed in the supermarket (Piliang, Yasraf A, 1999, pp. 128-132, 225-235, Jones, Pip, et.al., 2010, pp. 155-164, Storey, John, 2009, pp. 85-95, 159-179).

Advanced capitalism now nothing more than a stage on which the drama displayed speed. In essence, there is no difference between the riders on the circuit the car, the experts at the center of a military strategy, the producers and workers in the factory, and

the consumer at the center of consumption. Everything in the speed race. Human jungle invitation increasingly fused images flowing devastating, like lightning, and a mirage. They are entangled in the rhythm of speed and acceleration. Born later than this speed-based production process is, in the language of Jean Baudrillard, simulacrum, a clone without any real identity. Postmodernist culture is playing with the pieces, a kind of patchwork (*sulam*). The difference between the original with the clone was now being crushed. Even among the real with the imaginary is increasingly disappearing. Desneyland and Rambo are not clear, whether real or not. Posmo society is a society hyper-reality and perspective developed not only pluralism, but eclecticism, and hybridity.

In postmodernity, human and even now no longer control the object, but the system is controlled by the objects. Humans now live in a consumer excitement. By doing so, people now want a contemporary objects is not due to the inadequacy of the existing natural in him, but the inadequacy of inner built, produced and reproduced solely by himself. In plain language, the contemporary human culture through consumerism where life cycles are lasting change (unbroken), controlled by the logic of lust. In fact, what happens is certain fetishism of the commodity (an attitude which considers the charm spiritual strength or power that resides in it) (Piliang, Yasraf A, 1999, pp. 128-132, 225-235, Jones, Pip, et.al., pp. 2010, 155-164, Storey, John, 2009, pp. 85-95, 159-179).

In addition, the public post-modernism is also different from the classical modernization of society. Today's society is a society with a world that is folded, the world that is no more than a glass screen, a floppy disk or memory bank. Knowledge society is not limited space and time. Communication through information technology revolution that did not occur previously has been transforming into the current financial management, where financial activities are conducted by electrical technology worldwide. The world community is also

united by the media as a medium of global communication. Therefore, in the language of Manuel Castells (born 1942), contemporary global society connected with one another is the network society (Jones, Pip, et.al., 2010, pp. 156-159; Piliang, Yasraf A, 1999, p. 227).

As a result of the growing dominance of global capitalism, especially the strength of Western capitalism also military dominance the United States in various countries, consumerism symptoms in various places, and factor the information easily available via mobile phones and information technology, then postmodernity is also marked by the rise of religious fundamentalism in various places. This movement is a reaction to the emergence of insecurity and risks created by global society. This movement was also born, among others, influenced by economic and political solidarity for the absence of equality caused by global domination by the West. Here is the paradox of freedom in postmodernity (Heller, 1999, p. 15), or according to Lyon (1999, pp. 28-29) ambivalence, as postmodernity/modernity gave birth to a full life favors on the one hand, but also death, cohesion and fragmentation.

For the postmodernity, modernity, which built on the legacy of enlightenment, has been a source of oppression through his own creation: technology, bureaucracy, the nation state, ideology, and a number of institutions, procedures, and modern norms, besides materialism and consumerism above. In addition to rejecting objectivity and give great weight to the subjectivity, as described above, where the science is not deemed to have any greater claim to truth than religion/belief, postmodernism also argued that the reason to develop the government that oppresses, the complexity of the military, and the bureaucracy suffocating.

Humanism in modernity as well, for them, has failed. Vision humanism, socialism has ended communism in the Soviet Union in the mid-1980s and liberal humanism proved no more effective than Christianity. They ask whether modernity (rational-humanist tradition) are able to solve the problem

of overpopulation in the world, hunger, and poverty? Is modernity also managed to overcome the damage, homelessness, violence, racial tension, or addicted to drugs?

In fact, the poles of modernity which is considered as a great achievement and creative mankind, for them, full of gender bias, class bias, and racial. Western modernity is full of male interpretation, interpretation of the white man, an interpretation Eurocentric. Modernity is the veil of hypocrisy is intended to conceal, rationalize and legitimize power, privilege, and the choices of the elite of Europe, as it is called among others by Edward Said in *Orientalism*. They show a violation of Western modernity. For example, slavery, imperialism, racism, ethnocentrism, sexism, class exploitation and environmental destruction, as was partially described. They marginalize color, the poor, and women who they view as "Other" (Perry, 2013, pp. 450-452).

In contrast to the above postmodernity, intellectual circles that the opposite is not seen modernity has ended. They regard postmodernity as a continuation of modernity. For example, Antony Giddens (1938) and Ulrich Beck (born 1944). The term used was not postmodernity, but the new modernity, such as Ulrich Beck called, or called late modernity or second modernity.

Giddens rejected claims that human poststructuralist battered around by the discourse. For him, the subject is not being dead. Besides the structure in the sense of a set of rules and resources that stir the liquid and are used subject has the nature of duality. Structure and unify not only impede certain forms of behavior, but also provide the ability for behavior. Structure provides opportunities and restrictions as well. Structures can be regenerated and transformed. His view is this is known as the theory of structuration. Giddens also led to the theory of reflexivity of modernity. For him, human beings are able to create and recreate the life of a lifetime. Today's modern society must shape and reshape itself in order to be able to face changes in their environment, or

the environment is not stable. They can form a self, an identity to suit the new conditions. According to Giddens (as cited in Loyal, 2003, pp. 115-146), the new modernity is reflexive project, the project of a lifetime to make life make sense and fit the demands of the condition, so it continues to advance.

Unlike the poststructuralist, Ernest Gellner also rejected relativity science. Moral relativity here is possible. For him, truth is not beauty, nor goodness, not disability, and not progress due to political causes. Cognitive relativity, for him, is something unreasonable. Moral may be quite relative, but the facts reveal that science would almost certainly not relative (Jones, 2010, pp.165-167).

Almost the same thing delivered Jurgen Habermas (born 1929). He was criticized modernity overemphasized instrumental rationality, where modernity is too dominated by the calculations of efficiency. As a result, modernity ignores the spiritual aspect and the supernatural became disappeared. Modernity is not only a victory of rationality, but also the victory of instrumental rationality. Modern humans have made a mistake letting life colonized world of instrumental rationality. He called modernity as a modernity that is distorted, especially capitalism, modernity in crisis or pathology. However, that struck a devastating crisis of modernity is not modernity itself, but the crisis in the paradigm. Humans today, therefore, do not have to leave modernity. What should be done is to live in modern humans with a continuous insight into the paradigm of communicative action or intersubjectivity. Modernity in the view of Habermas is an unfinished project, and now should be continued by performing continuous criticism in communicative action. And that, he said, was possible because the human language (speaking), could overcome the crisis of modernity paradigm, can find common ground and build consensus for the sake of coexistence. In contrast to the post-structuralist Kuhn, cultural differences do not mean that all patterns of thinking and

different flavors, which therefore everything is relative. Language can bridge cultural differences (Delanty, 2005, pp. 279-283; Jones, 2010, pp. 167-172; and Hardiman, 2003, pp. 162-163).

In other writings, Habermas reviews the issue of marginalization of religion apparently seen as a crisis of modernity. In contrast to the absolute secular circles in the early modernity that put absolute faith in the private sphere, Habermas proposes a pluralistic public space model that accepts religious aspirations without having blocked like that carried absolute secularists. He did not reject religion in the public space, because then it becomes more legitimate public policy, because it involves all parties, without silencing the parties voicing religious aspirations. However, he proposed several rules as a basis of religions are in the public sphere. One of them the aspirations of religious, especially if it wants to become a public policy, must be explained rationally and treated as the territory of the rational, so it has the status of epistemic that can be accepted by the citizens of a secular or who believes differently. Aspirations of religion, therefore, should be debated rationally by various parties (religious aspiration should be eliminated the sacred side beforehand), contains the principle of social justice for all parties (inclusive/satisfies the principle of plurality/Human Rights). (Hardiman, 2009).

Of course, in the social science literature on modernity, there are also other groups that defend modernity against postmodernity and others, in addition to the experts above. According to Jacques Ellul (as cited in Perry, 2013, p. 454) him, if in the East was born a movement to liberate women, from where the impetus for this movement? The answer is of Western modernity, not from others. Western modernity, he further was the first civilization in history to focus on the individual and freedom. Western Modernity which defends the rights of the human person can't be revoked and sought to enforce the conscious and methodical manner.

## **D. Conclusion**

Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that in the Western history, shortly after its birth, modernity has been criticized among the romanticist and irrational. In contrast with the modernity relying on rationality, these two circles have to rely more on feelings, spontaneity, and intuition, rather than sense. For the romanticist, rather than thinking, humans first lived with feeling. Therefore, the feeling is essential, even more pivotal. To create creativity, the irrational favors mind is not possible and for the others, sexuality is the most decisive human aspect than others, such as rationality or economics. In summary, relying only on the rationality of life and also empirical merely which is emphasized by modernity is to simplify life, even impossibility.

In addition, critics of modernity view modernity not only as a solution, but also a problem. Modernity has indeed been promising progresses. For example, the effective state power through the concept of nation state based on the state of art weaponry, wellbeing for many people, freedom, and security from sophisticated weaponry to the state monopoly. However, modernity also has a dark side that is destructive. Nationalism, for example in the hands of the Nazis became an ideology and anti-Jewish movement spawning the Holocaust, a slaughter of Jews in Europe. Despite the low intensity, narrow nationalistic tendencies that is no side in common with anti-Jewish nationalism also is anti-immigration and Islamophobia phenomenon which is now widespread in the West.

Nationalism and industrialization are supported also by orientalism as activities that are considered scientifically well regarded by the critics of modernity has given birth and perpetuate imperialism against countries that are now called the developing countries. Worse yet, imperialism in modernity even considers the perpetrators as a legitimate act legitimized by a civilization mission



(deployment of modernity) to the East as a liability of the whites (West). Although imperialism makes the East modernized, for the colonized people, imperialism is not only as economic exploitation practices, but also as boost to the racism and callous neglect of culture and other nations.

Similarly, with science and technology. It is problematic in axiology, i.e. the use of science in practice sometimes is transformed into Frankenstein, giant creatures that eat everything greedily that undermines and threatens humanism and morality. In fact, ontologically and epistemologically, recent scientific truth is doubtful and criticized through the theory of relativity and quantum theory refuting the certainty of natural law as claimed by the classic Newtonian physics. The subsequent post-structuralists also reject universalism and absolutism of science and technology of the West as the most fundamental element of modernity. For the post-structuralists, science is a product of power, at least within certain extents. In fact, some critics of modernity more recently perceive it through the dominance of empirical facts and logic, making modern mankind has lost the soul and spirituality. They are also experiencing sorrow.

Regarding the development of modernity called postmodernity, for some experts, it is not a modification of modernity, but it has its own treasury. Postmodernity is a new age and a world that has been transformed. Also, it is a new social configuration with different social conditions. Modernity is replaced by postmodernity. Modernity has ended. For this expert group, the classical modernity (early) does not address issues that are very important for human life of the 21st century. For instance, the threat of environmental sustainability, the danger posed by nuclear weapons, and the risks and uncertainties posed by advances in science and technology that is favored highly by modernity.

As the post-structuralists, the postmodernity of this type also reject the

absolutism of empirical science. The truth of theoretical empiricism is only tentative as well as not absolute and universal. These circles are no longer adhere to the principle: *extra scientiam nulla salus* (outside of empirical science is no truth). For them too, capitalism is now different from capitalism (pre-20th/21st century). Capitalism has become a global phenomenon that does not discount the spirit of nationalism ideology which is their only advantage. The practitioners will relocate the capital and production in countries that provide more benefit. Therefore, they embrace the plurality of the product and its acceleration to encourage consumerism as essential in the later capitalism.

However, for the opposing experts, the notion of postmodernity is not as over the top. It is a continuation of modernity, although the records. Postmodernity is simply a new era in mind, a new way of understanding the ideas, beliefs and knowledge, rather than new ways to live and organize social problems. For some people this second postmodernity, new modernity is a reflexive project, the project of a lifetime to make life reasonable and appropriate demands and conditions, so continue forward and evolving. Therefore, modernity for the second expert is not over. A person must do is to live in modernity with continuous enlightenment in the paradigm of communicative action or inter-subjectivity.

#### References:

- Alexander, Jeffrey C. (2013). *The Dark Side of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ali, Fachry & Effendy, Bahtiar. (1986). *Merambah Jalan Baru Islam*. Bandung: Mizan.
- Anwar, M. Syafi'i. (1995). *Pemikiran dan Aksi Islam Indonesia*. Jakarta: Paramadina.
- Apter, David E. (1985). *Pengantar Analisa*

- Politik* (Setiawan Abadi, Trans). New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.
- Bennet, Clinton. (2005). *Muslim and Modernity; An Introduction to the Issues and Debates*. London: Continuum.
- Bertens, K. (1991). *Ringkasan Sejarah Filsafat*, Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Burger, Christa. (2007). "Modernity as Postmodernity: Jean-Francois Lyotard". In Scott Lash and Jonathan Friedman (Ed.). *Modernity and Identity* (pp. 73-86). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
- Chaniago, Andinof A. (2001). *Gagalnya Pembangunan, Kajian Ekonomi Politik terhadap Akar Krisis Indonesia*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Cox, Harvey. (1984). *Religion in Secular City*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- D. King, Anthony. (1995). "The Time and Space of Modernity (or Who Needs Postmodernism?)". In Mike Featherstone (et. al.). *Global Modernity*. London: Sage Publications.
- Delanty, Gerard. (2005). "Modernity and Postmodernity: Part 2". In in Austin Harrington (Ed.), *Modern Social Theory: An Introduction* (pp. 286-289). English: Oxford University Press.
- Edward W. Said, *Orientalisme, Menggugat Hegomoni Barat dan Mendudukan Timur sebagai Subjek*, translation of *Orientalism*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2010 and look also Gauri Vizwanathan (Ed.), *Kekuasaan, Politik dan Kebudayaan: Wawancara dengan Edward W. Said*, translation of *Power and Culture: Interview with Edward W. Said*, Pustaka Prometheus, 2003
- Effendy, Bahtiar. (1998). *Islam dan Negara: Transformasi Pemikiran dan Praktek Politik Islam di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Paramadina.
- Garrent, Paul Michael, "From 'Solid Modernity' to Liquid Modernity'? Zygmunt Bauman and Social Work", in *British Journal of Social Work*, 2012, pp. 634-651
- Gillen, Paul & Ghosh, Devleena. (2007). *Colonialism and Modernity*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Hardiman, F. Budi. (2003). *Melampau Positivisme dan Modernitas*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Heller, Agnes. (1999). *A Theory of Modernity*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publisher.
- Holub, Robert C. (1991). *Jurgen Habermas: Critic in Public Sphere*. London: Routledge.
- Honner, Stanley M. & and Hunt, Thomas C. (2006). "Metode dalam Mencari Pengetahuan: Rasionalisme, Empirisme, dan Metode Keilmuan", in Suriasumantri (Ed.). *Ilmu dalam Perspektif: Sebuah Kumpulan Karangan tentang Hakikat Ilmu*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor.
- <https://soedoetpandang.wordpress.com/2013/10/15/psi-dan-polemik-kebudayaan/> (Accessed in 27 November 2016).
- Jones, Pip., Bradbury, Liz., & Le Boutillier. (2010). *Introducing Social Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kamil, Sukron. (2016). *Ekonomi Islam, Kelembagaan, dan Konteks Keindonesiaan*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Karim, M. Rusli. (1994). *Agama, Modernisasi, dan Sekularisasi*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
- Latif, Yudi. (2005). *Intelegensia Muslim dan Kekuasaan: Geneologi Intelegensia Muslim Indonesia Abad ke-20*. Bandung: Mizan.
- Lyon, David. (1999). *Postmodernity (Concepts in the Social Sciences)*. UK: Open University Press.

- Madjid, Nurcholish. (2007). *Berhala Holocaust: Pertarungan Sengit Zionis dan Revisionis*. Jakarta: Mediakita.
- Madjid, Nurcholish. (2008). *Islam Kemodernan dan Keindonesiaan*. Bandung: Mizan.
- Mahzar, Armahedi. (1991). "Menuju Islamisasi Paradigma Sains Modern", dalam pengantar Mulyadhi Kartanegara, *Menyibak Tirai Kejahilan*, pp. xvii-xviii, 126-128.
- Marvin Perry. (2013). *Peradaban Barat: Dari Revolusi Prancis sampai Zaman Global* (Saut Pasaribu, Trans). Bantul, Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana.
- Mihardja, Achdiat Karta. (1998). *Polemik Kebudayaan*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Nasution, Harun. et.al. (2003). *Ensiklopedi Islam Suplemen 2* (11<sup>th</sup>. Ed.). Jakarta: Ikhtiar Baru Van Hoeve.
- Noble, Trevor. (2000). *Social Theory and Social Change*. London: Macmillan.
- Okotorino, Nino et. al. (2009). *Ensiklopedia Sejarah dan Budaya Indonesia Raya* (vol. 8). Jakarta: Lentera.
- Pals, Daniel L. (1996). *Pals, Seven Theories of Religion*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Piliang, Yasraf Amir. (1999). *Sebuah Dunia yang Dilipat, Realitas Kebudayaan Menjelang Milenium Ketiga dan Matinya Posmodernisme*. Bandung: Mizan.
- Putro, Suadi. (1998). *Mohammed Arkoun tentang Islam dan Modernitas*. Jakarta: Paramadina.
- Pye, Lucian W. (1965). *Aspects of Political Development*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Ritzer, Geoge. et.al. (2007). *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Rosenau, Pauline Marie. (1992). *Post-modernism and the Social Sciences, Insights, Inroads, and Intrusions*. Princeton: Princeton University press.
- Rosidi, Ajip. (2000). *Ikhtisar Sejarah Sastra Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.
- Santoso, Heri. (2007). "Kritik Herbert Marcuse atas Selubung Ideologis di Balik Rasionalitas Manusia". In Listiyono Santoso, et.al. *Epistemologi Kiri* (pp. 116-118). Yogyakarta: Arruz Media.
- Sarjuni. (2007). "Anarkisme Epistemologis Paul Karl Feyerabend". In Listiyono Santoso. et.al. *Epistemologi Kiri* (pp. 156-157). Yogyakarta: Arruz Media.
- Smart, Barry. (2005). "Modernity and Postmodernity: Part 1". In Austin Harrington (Ed.). *Modern Social Theory: An Introduction* (pp. 256-257). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Huston. (2003). *Ajal Agama di Tengah Kedigdayaan Sains* (Ary Budiyanto, Trans.). San Francisco: Harper One.
- Steven, Loyal (2003). *The Sociology of Anthony Giddens*. London: Pluto Press.
- Storey, John. (1993). *An Introductory Guide to Cultural Theory dan Popular Culture*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Suhelmi, Ahmad. (1999). *Pemikiran Politik Barat*. Jakarta: Darul Falah. 1999
- Teeuw, A. (1980). *Sastra Baru Indonesia*. Flores: Nusa Indah.
- Vattimo, Giani. (2002). *The End of Modernity: Nihilism and Hermeneutics in Post-modern Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Yayasan Paramadina. (1993). "Bahan Semnar Sehari 'Spiritualitas, Krisi Dunia Modern, dan Agama Masa Depan'". Jakarta: Yayasan Paramadina.