ISA eSymposium for Sociology

Varieties of Modernity, Varieties of Self:

Towards an Indigenisation of the Sociology of Self

Fadlan Khaerul Anam University of Indonesia

The main thesis of this paper is that while the holy trinity of Western sociologists –Durkheim, Marx and Weber – advocate the assumption of the inevitability of industrialisation and secularisation in the wake of the transition to Western modernity, this makes them see that the secularised self is represented with pessimism. In opposition to it, Eastern modernity – intended modernity in non-European societies – shows a different phenomenon and this has the consequence of differences in self-representation. Three examples of Asian social thinkers – Khaldun, Syed Hussein Alatas and Kuntowijoyo – are important to be studied with regard to this. To this end, two different self-images which will be discussed toward an indigenisation of social science discourses (indigenisation of sociology of self). Two different self-images will create a global perspective about self in varieties of modernity.

Keywords: Western modernity, Eastern modernity, self-representation, the indigenisation of the sociology of self

Introduction

One contemporary discourse in the social sciences is the indigenisation of social science. Alatas S. F. (2006) stated that this discourse refers to a commitment to reconstruct social and original history discourse as a reflection of a critique of Eurocentrism and Orientalism that negatively impact on social science. The indigenisation of social science discourse with a wide range of their mention as in Alatas S. F. (2003; 2006) – Asian social science, endogenous intellectual creativity, decolonisation of social science, globalisation of social science, sacralisation of social science, subaltern studies, postcolonial theory, nationalization of social science, theory of delinking, Deschooling, 'penyemestaan ilmu', 'pengaslian ilmu-ilmu sosial', autonomous social science, autonomous sociology (Alatas S. F., 2010), prophetical social science (Kuntowijoyo, 1993; 2001) – has become one of the issues, problems, and challenges in the social sciences today (Patel, 2014).

The emergence of this discourse of anxiety begins via the 'captive mind' (Alatas S. H., 1974); 'intellectual imperialism' (Alatas S. H., 2000); and 'academic dependency' (Alatas S. F., 2006). Furthermore, there are eight issues of social science that leads to this discourse (Alatas S. F., 2006): 1) Eurocentric bias, 2) the existence of a general neglect of the local literary and tradition, 3) the lack of creativity or the inability of social scientists outside the Euro-American culture to give birth to the alternative theory and methods, 4) mimesis seen in the adoption or imitation that is not critical of the model of Western social science, 5) European discourse on non-Western societies tend to lead to essentialist constructions, 6) no minority viewpoint, 7) alliance with the state, and 8) dominance of the world's first social science powers in the third world.

As a consequence of the discourse of indigenisation of social sciences, there should be a critical and reflexive examination about the sociology of self. First, the concept of self in sociological perspective rooted

© 2015 The Author(s)
© 2015 ISA (Editorial Arrangement of isa.e-Forum)

in Durkheim, Marx, and Weber that is always associated with Western modernity; it makes the concept of self in sociological perspectives trapped in Eurocentrism. Therefore it is necessary to study the concept of self related with modernity that is experienced in non-European societies. Second, the history of sociological theory that Connell (2012) writes as a 'mythologised version' give the picture of Asia indicated in Alatas S. F. (2010) which suggests the absence of non-European societies in the intellectual regions and implications for systemic exclusion of local thinkers whose thinking reflects the reality of what happened. Third, the indigenisation of social sciences discourse becomes a challenge for other discourses – global sociology – which globalising sociology should be as Connell (2012) notes, about 'learning from each other on a world scale'. To work toward a fully globalising sociology, social scientists need to show their seriousness in building alternative theoretical frameworks as what Alatas, S. F. (2006) refer to as reflections on 'constructive criticism over the Western knowledge'.

This paper examines three major themes: 1) self and Western modernity, 2) self and Eastern modernity, 3) the reconciliation of sociology of self that show sociological perspectives about themselves based on different modernity. In the section self and Western modernity I elaborate the sociological thought of the Holy Trinity - Durkheim, Marx, and Weber. In the next section on self and Eastern modernity, I present some typical examples of thinking about themselves and Eastern modernity derived from local thinkers, by examining the works of three figures: Khaldun, Syed Husein Alatas, and Kuntowijoyo. In concluding, the two great traditions of this will be met and reconstructed into a large theoretical building (this paper also talks about nativism and autonomous social science perspectives as the way of reconstruction on theoretical building): global perspective on different self from different modernity.

Self and 'Holy Trinity': The Reflection of Western Modernity

The Holy Trinity of Western Sociologist – Marx, Durkheim and Weber – all thought that the type of self which emerged in Western modernity is inextricably bound-up with industrial capitalism (Burkitt, 2008).

Self and Western Modernity in Marx's Social Thought

Marx (in Antonio (2003)) held that self are social beings and that modernity's 'economic transformation and problems have a "social character"' (i.e., however distorted, even liberal individualism and private property arise from capitalism's social matrix). Furthermore Antonio (2003) stated that Marx argued that overcoming capitalism's limitations and injustices calls for social transformation.

Marx's social thought about self can be seen in his early writings. As mentioned in Giddens (1971), Marx wrote when school final exams showed some signs in the young Marx: review of moral duties and scope of freedom available to a person are foundational in choosing a profession that will be explored in life. Furthermore Giddens (1971) quoted Easton & Guddat (1967) where the glorious self in Marx's view are self that works for the people of the universe and human well-being and improvement of our own are two guidelines for choosing a profession.

This thought leads Marx to wrestle with the writings of Hegel and Feuerbach. Burkitt (2008) shows how Marx deliberates upon Hegel's thought:

> Like Hegel, Marx believed that the social world is not something external to the self, but is the totality of relations in which the self is located and constituted. That is to say, we are all born into a social group: a social class, culture, religion, gender, ethnicity or any other social position by which we can classify ourselves. We may want to get out of that position or transcend its limitations, but we still have to work within the social framework that sets these conditions in the first place. Social relations are therefore the very essence of what it is to be a self: an individual with an identity amongst others. Again, like Hegel, Marx believed that these social conditions or relations only appear to be external to us – that is, to oppose

> and limit us rather than to be something living and vital to which we belong – when we are alienated from them.

Regarding how Marx addresses Feuerbach's thought, Giddens (1971) stated that when Marx was very passionate with Feuerbach, he tried hard to align Feuerbach and Hegel's thought. The essence of Feuerbach's thought (1957) as mentioned in Giddens (1971) is the true self-existence is existence in the material world that is real. Furthermore, Giddens (1971) stated how Marx saw that Feuerbach's arguments have been successfully demonstrated in a variety of social institutions (especially religion), self-participate as if being in a fantasy world that is not real in terms of harmony, beauty and self-satisfaction, and he lives in the everyday world that is practical, where misery and suffering are still present.

Marx saw that the capitalist mode of production align labour with material object into what is termed 'devaluation of the human world increases are directly in relation to the increasing value of the world of objects'. (Easton and Guddat [1967] as quoted in Giddens (1971)). This is what Marx referred to as the objectification (Vergegenrtandlichung) [Giddens, 1971]. Furthermore, Marx (in Easton and Guddat (1967)) noted that objectification makes labour into slaves of the object. Marx intended this as alienation (Entrfremdung).

The dimensions of self-alienation are as follows (Giddens, 1971; Ritzer, 2003; 2005; 2011): 1) labour does not have the power to market the product, 2) labour alienated from his own work, 3) labour alienation has social ramifications and the capitalist mode of production, the relationship between ourselves as human beings tend to be simplified in market activity, 4) self-alienation makes the decline of human productive activity to the level of adaptation in nature rather than mastery over nature actively. This resulted in a disconnection in terms of what Feuerbach (1957) notes as 'Gattungswesen'. It is important to emphasise that, for Marx, the self in the human sense is a universal producer, which is just the opposite of the animals which became a producer that is partial and trapped in natural determinism.

What is important to note about Marx's social thought of the self is that it is related to his discussion on historical materialism. Marx (1976) considers that history as a process of re-creation of human needs to be continuous. Here Marx consciously emphasises the differences in self in the sense of man and animals: for Marx, self in the sense that animals have needs that are definite, fixed and unchanging, while man is the opposite. In addition, Marx (1976) is noted in Giddens (1986), where the differentiation of human and animals is reflected through work as a creative human work between himself and his environment, and this became the foundation of human society.

Marx's contemplation led him to find that the 'universal nature' which Hegel sought is within the proletariat (labourers). Marx, as cited in Giddens (1986) stated that the proletariat (labourers) is a class that has a chain radical: universal suffering, irrationality recipient on society concentrated in the emancipation due at the same time is the emancipation of society. In the end, Marx advocated a radical revolution. Radical revolution is supposed to lead to the reorganisation of society which would be integral to the main agenda of abolishing the relationship between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. It is important to understand the changes which Marx aspired to - elimination of private property, self-alienation, thereby realising true human potential (D. Guddat Easton, 1967). Further D. Easton and Guddat (1967) states that Marx intended this revolution to bring back human beings to truly become human beings, returned fully and consciously, and assimilate all the wealth of subsequent developments.

Self and Western Modernity in Durkheim's Social Thought

For Durkheim, the division of labour is the basis for the creation of a different identity. This view is similar to Marx's social thought (Burkitt, 2008). The key of Durkheim's social thought about self and modernity is raised in Burkitt's (2008) analysis where modern Western capitalism creates and binds individuals in 'organic solidarity'; in which individuals are dependent on one another because each one fulfils a different function in the division of labour. Furthermore Burkitt (2008) stated that:

> Here, individuals specialise in specific tasks and functions, creating a range of differences between people, reflected in the creation of a variety of self-identities. Indeed, it was in such a society that Mauss (Durkheim's nephew) claimed that the self becomes a basic category of thought, in the sense that it becomes one of the organising principles of our thinking and, more broadly, of society. It forms part of what Durkheim called the 'collective consciousness': the ideas, beliefs and values formed within society, which become the basis of all individual thinking and feeling.

Durkheim saw that organic solidarity is premised upon the relationship between special functions that are diverse and make up a system. Durkheim saw that in this solidarity, a contractual relationship is formed and becomes a presumption for what is called in Giddens' (1971) work as the development of norms governing the contract, that Durkheim's intent as cooperation has its own intrinsic virtue. Furthermore, Durkheim's the division of labour lowered the entry capability of collective consciousness, and here individualism gain momentum. Durkheim (1984) stated that differentiating way of thinking and feeling open up opportunities for the emergence of individual differentiation.

For Durkheim (1984), organic solidarity makes the growth of the cult of the individual. Secularisation becomes the main source for the emergence of the cult. Durkheim (1984) stated that in this solidarity, the cult of the individual is not based on the collectivism to be based on individual prestige. The emergence of the cult of the individual is in line with one of the characteristics of organic solidarity: the division of labour. The division of labour for Durkheim (1984) does not provide the sole basis for solidarity. Here are interesting in Durkheim's social thought, in contrast to Marx's social thought that the view that the division of labour was actually a reflection of the class struggle - Durkheim (1984) states that the division of labour is in an anomic condition (the relations of the organs are not regulated). Giddens (1986) attempted to give a suitable definition of anomie: the pattern of relationship capital owners and workers who do not have the settings in the formation of contracts.

In contrast with Marx that suggests that class conflict is a direct consequence of the division of labour, Durkheim (1984) states that the condition of anomie could eventually lead to a new class conflict. Anomic conditions are necessary to make other arrangements for the division of labour in general tend to be imposed. Durkheim (1984) refers to this as 'la division du travail contrainte'. The diversity of rules governing the contract becomes a necessity for the proper functioning of organic solidarity. Durkheim (1984) explains that if one class of society be required to accept any price for his services, other classes can be freed from such acts because of available sources that actually do not need to be owned because of their social superiority. Then, the class has unfair advantages when compared to the previous class.

In another work, Durkheim examined the self in the power of rationalisation, ethic, and the cult of the individual. Durkheim (1995) stated that although the basis of individualism is already to be found in Christian ethics, the new individualism that gains momentum occurs when there is a sign towards modernity. Furthermore, Durkheim stated that individualism increasingly cannot be blocked because it is a nonstop movement throughout history, so for Durkheim (cited in Giddens [1986]) stated that moral consolidation on the division of labour is diverse to be one way to face the dilemma of self (the rise of individualism) in modern society.

Self and Western Modernity in Weber's Social Thought

One key feature of Weber's social thought about self and modernity located in his analysis about how the Protestant ethic contributes to the growth of capitalism. Weber (1930) as quoted in Burkitt (2008) argues that Protestant sects such as Calvinism created an ascetic ethic by which individuals ordered themselves and their behaviour; activities that were to be influential in the formation of capitalism.

In his work, Weber (1930) sees that Protestant believers' emphasis on discipline is different from the conditions of their colleagues who embrace Catholicism. Furthermore, Weber (1930) identifies some of the teachings of Protestant (Calvinism): 1) the universe was created for the sake of the glory of God,

human beings exist for the sake of God, 2) God's truth can be known only partially, 3) believe the fate that predestined by God. The doctrine makes a Calvinist asked about his electability subsequently. In the end, a Calvinist would find an answer: work in the world and wealth will be a sign of election by God. With this answer, the Calvinist worked hard because gaining wealth is a sign from God.

Weber (1930) as cited in Burkitt (2008) stated the significant influence of the Protestant ethic: the emergence of the Protestant spirit became secular as general ethics. It spread to capitalist firms in which rational methods of bookkeeping account for money spent and the profits made were employed, as well as disciplined work (Burkitt, 2008). For Weber (1930), it led to rationalisation as the fundamental mode of social organisation and government, and the bureaucratic style of administration.

With regard to Weber's contemplation on Western modernity, Burkitt (2008) notes that individuals who are crushed and depleted by modern civilisation, can only become true selves when they take back the power and responsibility to freely choose their own values and actions. Selfhood is therefore an ideal to be attained, rather than a fact of modern life in Western bureaucratic capitalism.

Eastern Modernity: Reflections

In contrast to Western societies, modernity taking place in Eastern societies showed different dynamics. This dynamics is usually associated with the presence of anomalies in the picture of Eastern modernity pertaining to the acceptance of religion; even religion can actually adapt to modernity (unlike in the West). Alatas S. H. (1975) provides a systematic overview of the characteristics possessed by the process towards Eastern modernity, one that is considered an anomaly in Western sociology:

> (a) The mere introduction of science and technology without the necessary related elements such as scientific reasoning, research, and the proper concept of relevance. (b) The gearing of science and technology towards aims which violated the values of modernisation such as increased standard of living, social-justice, human wellbeing and the respect for the individual personality. (c) Negative imitation in the planning of development projects. (d) Acceptance of perpetual dependence on foreign knowledge and skill beyond that dictated by the need of the moment. (e) The isolation of the modernisation process from a philosophy collectively and consciously upheld by the elites constructed with reference to modern scientific knowledge. (f) The prevalence of a fragmented outlook on the function of science. (g) The acceptance of disintegrative practices such as corruption and maladministration. (h) Indifference towards the rule of law. (i) The presence, side by side with science and technology, of archaic modes of thought and beliefs to a degree which stifles the growth of a scientific outlook.

Based on the above characteristics, it has different consequences of self-representation that is shown in the East. Self and Eastern modernity need to be seen in the eyes of non-western thinkers. This paper raised three thinkers of non-Western social science - namely Khaldun, Syed Hussein Alatas, and Kuntowijoyo - to be able to give an alternative picture of the self and Eastern modernity as certainly different from Western modernity.

Self and Eastern Modernity in Khaldun's Social Thought

The key of Khaldun's social thought on modernity can be seen in his analysis in Khaldun (1967), elaborated in Adem (2004) and specified systematically in Alatas, S. F. (2010) 1) social organisation ('umran') in general and its divisions, 2) Bedouin society ('al-umran al-badawi'), 3) the state ('al-dawlah'), royal ('mulk') and caliphate ('khilafah') authority, 4) sedentary society ('al-umran al-hadari'), 5) the crafts, ways of making a living ('al-maash'), 6) the sciences ('al-ulum') and their acquisition.

In contrast to Western modernity, the self found its momentum with secularisation as argued by Salama (2011). For Khaldun (1967) as mentioned in Alatas, S.F. (2010), the existence of Eastern modernity relates to religious reform as the key of enlightenment. Religious reform imposed upon the power of the top agents of social change can be seen in Khaldun's social thought. Khaldun (1967) as quoted in Alatas, S.F. (2010) indicate:

When there is a prophet or saint among them,

who calls upon them to fulfil the commands of God and rids them of blameworthy qualities and causes them to adopt praiseworthy ones, and who has them concentrate all their strength in order to make the truth prevail, they become fully united (as a social organisation) and obtain superiority and royal authority.

Therefore, Alatas, S.F. (2010) has this to say about Khaldun's social thought: the solidarity implied by the concept of 'asabiya' – a form of inter-subjectivity that pertains to the founding of a state (Adem, 2004) – is not wholly dependent on kinship ties. Religion can also aid in forging such solidarity, the prime example of that being the rise of Islam itself.

Self and modernity in Khaldun's social thought in which the self is represented in revolutionary praxis has to do with reforming religion in the context of state. Khaldun (1967) as cited in Alatas, S.F. (2010) points toward how the conflict between the pre-urban Bedouin and the sedentarised urban tribes is not just one over the city and the luxuries and prestige that it brings. The Bedouins are driven by a will to reform. The logic is one of periodical waves of revolutionary movements bent on abolishing what is objectionable ('taghyır al-munkar').

Khaldun stated that by tying people together, religion could counteract a larger group's divisions, lending it the strength and unity that it needs to triumph (Spickard, 2013). Khaldun as mentioned in Spickard (2013) stated that at first the beginnings of the Arabs is the most savage society, because their lives as camel herders make them the most nomadic so that they have a strong group-feeling, courage, and fortitude, but the most remote from civilisation and how they are torn apart by war. Furthermore Spickard (2013) stated that Islam, with its emphasis on good conduct and discipline, helped overcome this savagery and it expanded the Arab group-feeling to encompass more than kin, allowing the growth of royal authority, which Khaldun saw as the natural result of group-feeling.

For Khaldun (1967), (as raised in Arnason and Statuth [2004]), religion becomes a source of truly transformative social change in a state because it is close to universal humanity. Khaldun (1967) as quoted by Arnason and Statuth (2004) mentioned how the self must possess inbuilt adaptive potentials and patterns of reform. Furthermore, Arnason and Statuth (2004) stated that self in Khaldun's social thought uphold egalitarianism and scripturalism made it responsive to modern conditions and at the same time modernising imperatives capable of translating into its own language. Khaldun (1967) as raised in Tarmiji (2008) is in support of his thinking about the 'sacred self' (self that balances physical and spiritual life). He saw that the self has intelligence which is divided into five types: cognitive ('fikriyyah marifiyyah'), affective ('khuluqiyah'), psychomotor ('jihadiyyah'), spiritual ('ruuhiyyah'), and social ('ijtimaiyyah').

Self and Eastern Modernity in Syed Hussein Alatas's Social Thought

One of Syed Hussein Alatas's main notions is the 'captive mind', emphasised in relation to the sociology of knowledge. 'Captive Mind' is defined as imitating the uncritical mind, dominating external sources, which deviates from an independent perspective. The 'captive mind' has these characteristics (Alatas S. F., 2006): can't be creative and can't show the original problem, can't find analytical method with original thought, and deviating away from main issues in indigenous society. This thought of Syed Hussein Alatas showed that the self in different regions have different selves. In this position, Syed Hussein Alatas disagree with essentialism – in this context, essentialism showed that self-represention is the same in different regions – with an appreciation of indigenising the self theoretically.

One of Syed Hussein Alatas's arguments is the rejection of Western sociological thought about secularisation towards modernity as a global process. For Alatas (as discussed in Matthes [2005]), this rejection is brought about by: 1) 'secular' is used in the social sciences is based on the radical division of the 'World into this world and the other world', 2) historically, the controversy between the Pope and the Emperor as the origin of the distinction and separation of the 'secular' and the 'sacred' in European art history, 3) historically, 'secularisation' denotes the confiscation of church property by the state. In time, the term became

more and more generalised, and finally came to designate any kind of emancipation of inner-worldly actions, motives and institutions from the dominance or influence of the church, 4) the term 'religion' gained its modern meaning precisely in Western society context. Therefore for Syed Hussein Alatas, self in the East modernity does not necessarily vanish in the process of secularisation as compared to the self in Western modernity.

Syed Hussein Alatas's social thought about self and modernity rejects the myth of the lazy native. Alatas S. H. (1997) as discussed in Ibrahim (2005) argued at great length to dispel the image of the lazy native, a negative perception of Malay labour propagated by Western orientalists. Furthermore Ibrahim (2005) stated that Syed Hussein Alatas asserted that the image of the lazy native emerged in the context of nineteenth century colonial expansion where capitalist exploration reached a stage 'when the capitalist conception of labour gained supremacy'. Syed Hussein Alatas consistently showed that Eastern modernity does not necessarily make the self to be always in accordance with the ideal in Western society. This is proven according to Alatas S. H. (1997) (as mentioned in Ibrahim [2005]), that the indigenous Malay peasantry had their own rationale: they preferred to have their autonomy as 'independent cultivators' rather than to subject themselves to the controlled work-situation of the colonial plantations whose working conditions then were regarded as 'sub-human'.

Self and Eastern Modernity in Kuntowijoyo's Social Thought

For Kuntowijoyo (1993), modernity in the third world is often depicted in European discourse as an overview of the history that is always hampered by religious revival. However Kuntowijoyo (1993) underlines that religious revival should be understood as a response to the loss felt by many religious communities over the social, economic, political and cultural in modernity offered by them. It is worth exploring, as done by Kuntowijoyo (1993) the history of resistance of religious communities to colonial penetration. This idea became one of the typical signs of Kuntowijoyo's deliberations on the self and modernity: self who is in need of revolutionary praxis is seen as a response to modernity, not just seen as a pessimistic 'inhibitor' – Kuntowijoyo rarely discussed explicitly – as found in Western sociology.

In opposition to Durkheim who saw the emergence of the secularised self as contingent upon modernity (organic solidarity), Kuntowijoyo (2001) saw that the sacred self and modernity can still be maintained, andnot necessarily turn out to be a secularised self. Through historical analyses, Kuntowijoyo attempts to offer proof about this: sacred self for Kuntowijoyo (2001) can transform into three types - 'kiai', 'guru' and 'mitra'. First, 'kiai' is a sacred self that has a personal relationship with other self – it is the same with the self in mechanic solidarity –and concerned with genealogy. Second, 'guru' is a sacred self that start to try to build a relationship intensively with the other self, not as in 'kiai'. Third, 'mitra' is a sacred self that tries to build a relationship with secondary interaction.

In opposition to Marx who argued how modernity led to the emergence of class conflict and need to be resolved by a radical revolution to bring down one of the main classes and all the old social institutions (religion, country, etc.), Kuntowijoyo contended that it was different in the context of Eastern modernity. Kuntowijoyo (1993) stated that industrialisation indeed led to a class-based conflict, but there is also a 'strategic group'. 'Strategic group' generally manifest in religious groups. For Kuntowijoyo (1993), shedding light on the issue of class struggle means making increasingly sharp conflict demands of a stagnant condition that can still be represented as a class conflict, where the 'strategic group' tries to block the existence of an increasingly sharp class conflict. 'Strategic groups' attempt to understand the various interests of each class and do not suggest the presence of one of the main cessation class. In the end, 'strategic groups' are able to perform functional integration between classes.

In opposition to Weber who saw the secularised self as a consequence of the rationalisation process towards modernity, and where the self cannot reject the secularising self, Kuntowijoyo (1993) saw that the self can preserve on sacred self-position in modernity.

Before showing it, Kuntowijoyo (1993) assert that religion is not merely acting as an endorsement of social order and cooperation without showing the behaviour of the system. The self must make religion in order to cope with 'objective secularisation', i.e. structural isolation and 'subjective secularisation' credibility which is a discharge of religion in human experience levels. Structural isolation can be addressed by presenting an alternative discourse in order to see the relevance of religion in today's structural level. Religious credibility can be addressed by making adjustments to the rational, ethical, and emotional.

Afterword: Towards an Indigenisation of the Sociology of Self

In the discourse of indigenising the sociology of self, it is important to show two opposing perspectives: nativism and autonomous sociology. These two discourses equally stress the need for seriousness in establishing 'alternative theoretical building' and both are disappointed by the absence of a captive mind, intellectual imperialism, academic dependency that is perceived by social scientists outside the West.

Nativism as discussed by Alatas, S. F. (2006) refers to a view as a reflection of a high intolerance towards Western social science in terms of theory, methodology, and formulation of the problem. Nativism in general is seen as an attempt to deconstruct the images in Western social theory that gives a picture of reality which is exotic. In addition, emphases will also make nativism genealogical: the existence of a priority for local thinkers than the thinkers 'outside' that seeks to understand a reality. At its extreme, nativism makes local viewpoint dogmatically as the assessment criteria of description and analysis.

Autonomous sociology or more generally intended as an autonomous social science as argued by Alatas, S. F. (2006) is a view which seeks to formulate problems independently, developing the concept of right and not absolutely reject the various theories that reflect the experience of Western societies. Furthermore, Alatas, S. F. (2006) tried to give a practical overview of autonomous sociology namely: 1) to encourage assimilation selectively and independent from knowledge of the West, 2) determine a higher intellectual standard by comparing the local social sciences to the social sciences in developed countries, 3) social scientist studies directed at comparative studies, 4) creating awareness among the government and the elite on autonomous sociology, 5) search for Western social scientists who sympathise with autonomous sociology, 6) criticise the Eurocentric development plan, 7) raise awareness to escape academic dependence.

On the indigenisation of the sociology of self, two perspectives can be used for building alternative theoretical frameworks. Nativism with positively egocentric demands seriousness in establishing alternative theoretical building and have a negative impact is also what Alatas, S. F. (2006) calls the 'essentialisation of difference by reducing the difference'. Autonomous sociology shows high flexibility: in building alternative theoretical building, this approach tends to try to show the seriousness of the above non-western thinkers in assessing the self and modernity. In addition, the diversity of non-western thinkers sought to build alternative theoretical building which later can complement Western social sciences. In the end it is actually referred to as a global perspective of the self and modernity.

References

Adem, S. (2004). Decolonising Modernity Ibn-Khaldun and Modern Historiography. In A. S. Long, J. Awang, & K. Salleh (Ed.), *International Seminar on Islamic Thoughts* (pp. 570-587). Selangor: Department of Theology and Philosophy, Faculty of Islamic Studies, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Alatas, S. F. (2003). Pengkajian Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial: Menuju ke Pembentukan Konsep Tepat. *Antropologi Indonesia*, 1-23.

Alatas, S. F. (2006). *Alternative Discourses in Asian Social Science: Responses to Eurocentrism.* New Delhi: Sage.

Alatas, S. F. (2010). Religion and Reform: Two Exemplars for Autonomous Sociology in the Non-Western Context. In S. Patel (Ed.), *The ISA Handbook of Diverse Sociological Traditions* (pp. 29-39). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc.

Alatas, S. H. (1974). Continuing Debate, The Captive Mind and Creative Development. *Interna-*

tional Social Sciences Journal, 691-700.

Alatas, S. H. (1975). Erring Modernisation: The Dilemma of Developing Societies. *Symposium on The Developmental Aims and Socio-cultural Values in Asian Society* (pp. 1-46). Bangkok: Asian Institute For Economic Development and Planning.

Alatas, S. H. (1997). *The Myth of The Lazy Native: A study of the image of the Malays, Filipinos and Javanese from the 16th to the 20th century and its function in the ideology of colonial capitalism* . London: Frank Cass.

Alatas, S. H. (2000). Intellectual Imperialism: Definition, Traits, and Problems. *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, 23-45.

Antonio, R. J. (2003). Introduction: Marx and Modernity. In R. J. Antonio (Ed.), *Marx and modernity : key readings and commentary* (pp. 1-50). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Arnason, J. P., & Stauth, G. (2004). Civilisation and State Formation in The Islamic Context: Rereading Ibn Khaldun. *Thesis Eleven*, 29-47.

Burkitt, I. (2008). *Social Selves, Theories of Self and Society.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc.

Connell, R. (2012). Learning from Each Other: Sociology on a World Scale. In S. Patel (Ed.), *The ISA Handbook of Diverse Sociological Tradition* (pp. 40-51). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc.

D. Easton, L., & Guddat, K. H. (1967). *Writings of The Young Marx on Philosophy and Society.* New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Durkheim, E. (1984). *The Division of Labour in Society.* New York: The Free Press.

Durkheim, E. (1995). *The Elementary Form of Religious Life.* New York: The Free Press.

Feuerbach, L. (1957). *The Essence of Christianity.* New York.

Giddens, A. (1971). *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory, An Analysis of The Writing of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ibrahmi, Z. (2005). Return of the Lazy Native: Explaining Malay/Immigrant Labour Transition in Terengganu Plantation Society. In R. Hasan (Ed.), *Local and Global: Social Transformation in Southeast Asia, Essays in Honour of Professor Syed Hussein Alatas* (pp. 45-70). Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.

Khaldun, I. (1967). *Ibn Khaldun: The Muqadimmah – An Introduction to History.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Kuntowijoyo. (1993). *Paradigma Islam: Interpretasi Untuk Aksi.* Bandung: Mizan.

Kuntowijoyo. (2001). *Muslim Tanpa Masjid: Esai-esai Agama, Budaya, dan Politik Dalam Bingkai Strukturalisme Transendental.* Bandung: Mizan.

Lamb, P. (2010). Marx, Karl (1818–1883). In M. Bevir (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Political Theory* (pp. 856-863). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Marx, K. (1976). *German Ideology: Including Theses on Feuerbach and Introduction to The Critique of Political Economy.* New York: Prometheus Books.

Matthes, J. (2005). Is Secularisation A Global Process? An Exercise in Conceptual History. In R. Hassan (Ed.), *Local and Global: Social Transformation in Southeast Asia, Essays in Honour of Professor Syed Hussein Alatas* (pp. 19-30). Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.

Patel, S. (2014). Afterword: Doing global sociology: Issues, problems and challenges. *Current Sociology Monograph*, 1-11.

Ritzer, G. (2003). *The Blackwell Companion to Major Classical Social Theorists.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Ritzer, G. (Ed.). (2005). *Encyclopedia of Social Theory.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Ritzer, G. (2011). *Sociological Theory.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Salama, M. R. (2011). *Islam, Orientalism and Intellectual History, Modernity and The Politics of Exclusion Since Ibn Khaldun.* London: I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd.

Spickard, J. V. (2013). Accepting the post-colonial challenge: Theorising a Khaldûnian approach to the Marian apparition at Medjugorje. *Critical Research on Religion*, 158-176.

Tarmiji, A. (2008). Meretas Jalan Sosiologi Ibn Khaldun: Antara Pendidikan Karakter dan Pendidikan Nasionalisme. *Komunitas*, 59-46.

Weber, M. (1930). *The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism.* New York: Routledge.

Fadlan Khaerul Anam is a student in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social and Political Science, University of Indonesia. He actively writes various papers for conferences. He has written ten conference papers related to the sociology of religion, theory of modernity and alternative social science discourse.
fadlan.khaerul.anam@gmail.com