

CHAPTER 2

Pembangunan

2.1 KEYWORD

It would be an understatement to say that the Indonesian word for 'Development', *Pembangunan*, is important and widely disseminated. In a so-called 'Developing Nation', it is to be expected that 'Development' would be highly visible, but in the case of contemporary Indonesia, the word *Pembangunan* is more than just unavoidable in the general population's everyday life. It has become one of the two most salient keywords, the other being *Pancasila*, the term for the official state ideology. The extent to which this word binds and legitimises certain modes of thought, as well as negating other forms of consciousness, is probably unique among the various Developing Nations.

Several foreign observers have correctly noted that New Order Indonesia is characterised by its *Pembangunan* consciousness, rhetoric, and programs (see McDonald 1980:68; van Langenberg 1987:20; van Ufford 1987:147,152; Emmerson 1988:109). However, the significance of this label, its past history and implications for the present, are still greatly understudied. Many of the previously cited references make only passing comments, rather than explore the issues. It is also wise to note a distinction between an outsider's view of the issue (no matter how accurate) and the view as presented by the actors in the New Order drama. Though both views can be equally legitimate and instructive, they often give us significantly different kinds of information.

It is interesting to note how the speakers of Indonesian deal with and internalise the word in question, as well as how various members of that community express their perceptions of the significance of the word. The regime has claimed to be not only the *Orde Baru*, 'New Order', but also the *Orde Pembangunan*, 'Development Order'. Retired General Soeharto, who has been the President for six consecutive terms, holds the honorary title *Bapak Pembangunan* 'Father of Development'. All cabinets under the New Order government have been called *Kabinet Pembangunan* 'Development Cabinet', each distinguished from the other by a number from one to six.⁹

The same word has been commonly incorporated into the names of various institutions, activities, or concepts, including those over whom the government has no direct or full control. One of the three official political organisations in the country is named *Partai Persatuan Pembangunan* 'Development Unity Party'. Likewise, the *Golongan Karya* 'Functional Group', or *GOLKAR* within the legislative body, is called *Fraksi Karya Pembangunan* 'Development Functional Group'. The word *Pembangunan* can be attached also to entertainment activities. A 1987 carnival jointly celebrating the national Independence Day and anniversary of the

⁹ Philip Quarles van Ufford (1987:147) made a passing comment on this point, but failed to recognise the recurrent use of the name for all successive cabinets: "the first [sic] cabinet under the New Order was called kabinet pembangunan".

founding of the capital city, Jakarta, was called *Pawai Pembangunan*, 'Development Parade'. A recreational centre, constructed by the local government in Central Java's capital city, Semarang, is named *Pusat Rekreasi dan Promosi Pembangunan* 'Centre for Recreation and Development Promotion'.¹⁰

To complete the picture, I would like to mention examples of cases where the same word has been used adjectivally to modify concepts. The most popular ones under this category are those idioms that refer to the New Order's period of ascendancy: *era pembangunan* 'Development era' (see Almatier 1987; Alwi 1985; Sudewa 1984), *periode pembangunan* 'Development period' (see *Kompas* 1987b; 1987d), and *zaman pembangunan* 'the age/time of Development' (see Atmowiloto 1983; *Kompas* 1986d). Other examples of importance include *nasionalisme pembangunan* 'Development nationalism' (see Mursito 1983/4); *komunikasi pembangunan* 'Development communication' (see Muis 1987); *pers pembangunan* 'Development press' (see Sutrisno 1987). With one exception, *zaman pembangunan*, all the names of these concepts are clearly borrowed words from modern English or Dutch.

In light of this practice, we are readily reminded of the rhetorical aphorism 'What's in a name?' that has a popular translation in contemporary Indonesian (*Apalah artinya sebuah nama?*). We may be led to believe the implied message of the aphorism and dismiss the above issue of naming as trivial. Since the New Order has been so serious about the practice of naming things with '*Pembangunan*', in studying the New Order's *Pembangunan* we cannot simply ignore the process. We might be more inclined to examine the significance of this seemingly ritual naming, once we consider the immense and vigorous exploitation and transformation of the nation's natural resources and of the population's wealth and labour, as well as the accompanying social changes that have all been legitimised by *Pembangunan*. The whole undertaking is too great for us simply to ascribe the practice of such naming to a series of insignificant rites, or believe that it would not matter if the word were substituted by other words, or not used at all.

On the contrary, there is something of great importance to be recognised here. Earlier I suggested that 'Development' or *Pembangunan* does not exist beyond language. It is the very word that defines the perceived and projected reality, though it must be understood that the definition is never static, as language never is, and never isolated from the whole range of social dynamics. The keyword *Pembangunan* can be seen simultaneously as a constitutive force for the so-called *Pembangunan* process and an essential product of that process. It is 'constitutive',¹¹ because it gives *Pembangunan* its actual existence, as well as its recognisable and workable nature. The metaphor, *Pembangunan*, provides a set of boundaries within which the general population is urged to concentrate their views of reality, from which and within which to explore the vast changes in which they are engulfed. It is also a 'product', since *Pembangunan* as a keyword is a construct of a particular historical process.

¹⁰ The construction of this centre brought about a nation-wide controversy over two issues. Firstly, it was preceded by a mass protest from local inhabitants whose land was reportedly appropriated for the site of the construction. Secondly, an illegal practice of gambling was found to have been institutionally accommodated as part of the centre's activities. Apparently, the modifying name "*Pembangunan*" does not necessarily preclude any possibilities of public objections. Nevertheless, such naming has enhanced the confidence of many in launching important projects.

¹¹ The notion of language as 'constitutive' is from Raymond Williams. For a further elaborated discussion, see Williams (1977:21-44).

The all-pervasive tendency to qualify individuals, institutions, concepts, or activities as *Pembangunan*-based or *Pembangunan*-oriented does not immediately signify certain qualities embodied in the entities named as such. In actual practice, however, the use of the term indicates the espousal of controlled or approved processes of social interaction, in thought and behaviour, which are conducive to maintaining or reproducing the state-desired economic, political, and cultural status quo. This proposition will be an area of major interest in the discussion that follows. For the moment I wish only to draw attention to a series of conspicuous phenomena in contemporary Indonesia to illustrate the point. Given the unquestionable and strictly formulated decision from the highest echelons in the social hierarchy that the primary aim of the nation-state is to undertake *Pembangunan*, all existing activities, institutions, and consciousness of the population are now expected to focus on, to conform to and support *Pembangunan*. Thus, pre-existing institutions, institutionalised activities, and mentalities of the population need to be restructured, redefined, reoriented, or at least renamed to be in tune with the legitimate *Pembangunan* framework.

Nationalism has been reinterpreted in a search for its direct relevance to the officially defined notion of *Pembangunan* (see *Kompas* 1987d; Rasmala 1986; *Sinar Harapan* 1985b). Many Indonesian intellectuals designate their current discussions of the humanities as part of the same pursuit (see Hardjosoemantri 1983/4; Kartodirdjo 1987; Sudewa 1984). In a similar vein, we find the service of *Pembangunan* defined as a goal in current discussion of Indonesian literature (see Basuki 1986; Hutasuhut 1986; Hutomo 1980), of the Indonesian arts (see *Kompas* 1986d), of local indigenous traditions (see Sinolungan 1986), and of the role of the intelligentsia (see Soedjatmoko 1985). For our present study, writings on the role of the national language in *Pembangunan* (see Anggoro 1981; Halim 1981) will demand our special attention in a later chapter. All these approaches attempt to find contemporary legitimation by appropriating past historical constructs. Indeed, this process is parallel to Alton L. Becker's (1984:135,142) depiction of the essential activity of languaging:

In using language one shapes old words into new contexts...pushing old language into the present...The meaning of a word is...a combination of...the past and present contexts it evokes.

It is neither necessary nor possible to list all the examples available to illustrate the use of *Pembangunan* in contemporary discourse. I have deliberately excluded examples from certain areas of discourse that have been the core area of Development studies, such as economics and industrialisation studies. It is obvious that in these areas *Pembangunan* occupies a central position. I have a special interest in examples from the humanities, since this area has the reputation of being least concerned with, if not hostile to, pragmatic, utilitarian or materialistic concerns of social life. And yet, as is mentioned above, discussions of the humanities in Indonesia today give a great deal of attention to the supposedly economic-oriented concerns of *Pembangunan*. It is equally interesting to notice that a considerable number of contemporary writings on the social roles of women in Indonesia have been unashamedly reduced to and directed towards inquiries of women's contribution to the state-sponsored *Pembangunan* (see Abunaim 1985; *Kompas* 1986c; 1986e; Soetomo 1986; Sumobroto 1986).

It must be noted here that the above examples do not represent the overall picture of contemporary Indonesian discourse and intellectual preoccupation. Neither do all the existing *Pembangunan*-oriented discussions in the country share the same arguments or values, or make complimentary and enthusiastic remarks about the ongoing *Pembangunan* programs. We should not assume that the dominant ideology of *Pembangunan* has exhausted the population's consciousness and language. Nevertheless, the above examples do provide

some evidence that *Pembangunan* has succeeded in drawing remarkable attention to itself beyond official and directly state-controlled activities. It has not only created a new object of attention, but also reset the previously existing order of the people's attention. In many cases it appears that the presence of *Pembangunan* is so insistent that even critics of the Indonesian status quo can hardly avoid addressing the issues it raises.

We find individuals, like Arswendo Atmowiloto (1983) or Herman Darmo (1986), who can be critical of the excessive propaganda of *Pembangunan* programs and its penetration into many areas of contemporary discourse. Scholars from both the humanities and social sciences occasionally express critical views, in varying degrees and styles, of the government's policy, or the underlying assumptions, technical operation, or current outcome of *Pembangunan*. While these critical arguments deserve some attention and appreciation, they are bound to share some minimal common ground for speaking to each other: a language of Development. There is no doubt that there is some room for disagreement about 'what has happened, should have happened, or will happen' in Indonesia's Development. However, it is clear that criticism or disagreement can only be articulated within the shared framework of Development metaphors, unless the individuals concerned are critically aware of this framework. Therefore, it is not so much the discussion of Development itself that needs to be challenged, as the general tendency to take for granted the shared language of the discourse. "To speak a language", Alton L. Becker (pers.comm. 1986) once noted, "you have to believe it – you have to believe the reality you see through it".

As we follow the expanding discussion of 'what is happening or has happened' in Indonesia's Development, it is imperative to reflect, from time to time, on what the language involved does to us as well as what we can do to it. It is instructive to keep in mind the wisdom that Wittgenstein (quoted in Becker 1984:142) shared with us:

[o]ne thinks that one is tracing the outline of the thing's nature over and over again, and one is merely tracing round the frame through which we look at it.

We will now try to trace the frame of *Pembangunan* as a dynamic historical metaphor in Indonesian society, and pay attention to the changes, continuities, and implications which have characterised its use at various times and in various contexts. By tracing the frame through which Indonesians look at *Pembangunan*, we will, hopefully, understand better the central and the various peripheral meanings of the word.

2.2 BIOGRAPHY

Despite its prevalence and outstanding status in contemporary Indonesia, the word *Pembangunan* is remarkably young. We know little today about some of its earliest usages. There is reason enough to believe, however, that its initial debut took place only during the early decades of this century amongst the emerging Western-educated Indonesian intelligentsia. During the middle decades of this century the word was not discarded, but only during the past two decades has it developed its fully-fledged force and prominence.

While the construction of the word is relatively recent, its major ingredients are drawn from old materials. *Pembangunan* is a derivative word from the root word *bangun*. The affixes *pe(m)-* and *-an* function to 'nominalise' the transitive verb *membangun*. The verbs *bangun* (intransitive) and *membangun(kan)* (transitive) are principally associated with two sets of meanings: (a) to wake up, to get up, to awaken, to be awake; and (b) to build, to construct, to erect, to found. In isolation, the verbs *membangun(kan)*, as well as the nominalising

affixes *pe(m)-* and *-an*, had existed for years before *Pembangunan* itself came into being. Why at a certain historical moment the verb *membangun* was nominalised to create the term *Pembangunan* suggests some significant historical events.

Old dictionaries of the Malay language, from which the Indonesian language evolved, deal with *bangun* as an entry with its various derivatives. None of them, however, mentions the noun form *pembangunan* (see Shellabear 1902; Mayer 1906; Wilkinson 1908 and 1926; Ronkel 1930). Likewise, for cross-checking we can notice that in his English-Malay dictionary, Shellabear (1916:143-144) did not consider *pembangunan* as a possible option to render his English entry "development". Instead, he suggested several Malay words which seemed to be the best options available then, and to which we will return in later discussion: "*kkmbangan, ktumbohan, kmajuan*".

Even the authors of later Malay dictionaries, published after *pembangunan* was already in use in some Indonesian intellectual circles, did not seem to be aware of the existence of such a word (see Wilkinson 1937; Wilkinson and Coope 1948). The earliest dictionaries I have been able to find that acknowledge the existence of the word are dictionaries of Indonesian published during and after the late 1940s (see Kramer 1948:17; 1952:215; Poerwadarminta 1952:69; 1961:88). These dictionaries give meanings of the word that are fairly close to the contemporary. Based on the limited sources given above, it seems likely that *pembangunan* probably entered the language of the Malay-speaking communities of the archipelago a little earlier than their peninsular counterparts. Whether or not this is the case, in both areas (now called Indonesia and Malaysia respectively) the same word with the same dominant meanings has become a keyword (see Iskandar 1970:71; DBP 1984:35).

One of the earliest usages of the term *pembangunan* available to us today comes from the famous *Polemik Kebudayaan* ('Polemics on culture') from the second half of the 1930s. Essays involved in these polemics are compiled in Mihardja (1977). It is conceivable that the word made its initial debut at this time, and in this context. The polemics have been generally celebrated as an early peak or a notable beginning of Indonesian discourse on modernisation. The language required for such a discussion is unequivocally a modern, or better modernising, one. It heralded the beginnings of Indonesian nationalism. A projection of something extremely new, a hitherto imagined social order called 'nation', filled the indigenous thinkers with great enthusiasm. Words like *pembangunan* and *membangunkan* were vital and extremely empowering concepts. These words were derived from formal elements of the language of the oppressed indigenous people, and yet they were able to express new, liberating concepts that the nationalists learned from the language of their oppressor. The source of the words needed to be indigenous so as to evoke a genuine spirit of struggle against the alien forces. The concept was inevitably derived from the language of the colonisers, however, for only in their terms could the oppression be effectively confronted.

To a large extent, I think, the source of the newly introduced and explored concept was 'building' in the catchphrase 'nation-building'. The double major metaphors of (*mem-*)*bangun(-kan)* we discussed earlier found revolutionary expression here. While one major set of meanings of *bangun* could perfectly translate the notion of 'building' a new nation, the other could readily supply extraordinarily reinforcing notions of 'awakening' the people's consciousness. The most controversial figure in the course of the polemics was Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana, who has remained a leading proponent of Indonesia's modernisation in the subsequent five decades. Significantly, of all the participants in the 1930s debate, it was he who used the word *pembangunan* most frequently and enthusiastically. He spoke

alternatively of *pembangunan* and *membangunkan* with occasional reference to a Dutch phrase: "...pekerjaan Indonesia muda ialah cultuurscheppen, *membangunkan kebudayaan baru...*" (Mihardja 1977:17).¹² We may confidently understand *cultuur* as 'culture', in the broadest sense: way of life. The word *scheppen* can be rendered as "to create" (Renier 1982:251).

Alisjahbana's rhetoric gives us some indication of the decisive developments in metaphor that took place at that time. While the old two sets of metaphors remained recognisable at this (and even to the present) time, new visions and linguistic constructions were under way. In his assertion "...hanya mereka yang dapat melepaskan dirinya dari yang lama, akan mungkin membangun yang baru"¹³ (Mihardja 1977:65) the metaphors commonly used for house or building restoration/renovation are striking. Even more striking is his use of *rubuh* in arguing that the work of "*membangun yang baru*" necessitates "*rubuhnya traditie yang lama*"¹⁴ (Mihardja 1977:65). The other sense of *bangun* (to be awakened from sleep) was well preserved, for example in Alisjahbana's argument that the awakening of the people's consciousness was imperative so as to counter the ongoing practice of "*meninabobokan rakyat banyak*"¹⁵ (Mihardja 1977:19).

The novelty of Alisjahbana's language is more than the new term *pembangunan*, but also its link with the idea of 'to create'. In a separate essay he made a clear statement: "*Pekerdjaan pembangoenan itoe ialah pekerdjaan pentjipta*"¹⁶ (Alisjahbana 1946a). While the act of abstracting the notion of *membangun* in the form of nominalisation is linguistically creative, the conceptual substance of *membangun* as an act of 'creating' is indeed revolutionary.

We may recall the three Malay terms, "*kkmbangan, ktumbohan, kmajuan*" that Shellabear (1916:143-144) chose to render his English entry "development". Each of these Malay terms, as well as their modern manifestations *perkembangan* 'unfolding', *pertumbuhan* 'growth', and *kemajuan* 'progress' bears no resemblance to the central notion of 'bringing about the existence of what was formerly non-existent' historically embedded in the word 'create'. Each of those old indigenous metaphors refers to the process of change from some pre-existing organic entity. The fact that Alisjahbana decided to introduce the new word *pembangunan* in preference to the existing available Malay terms suggests his awareness of the need for a neologism (to convey a new idea) as an integral part of the struggle to materialise that idea into social relations (a liberation from colonial oppression, a newly created society, a nation). From its incipience, the prospective nation was viewed as something created ex nihilo.

¹² I wish to provide nothing but a rough translation of quotations from Indonesian sources for readers who are unfamiliar with Indonesian. It should be clear from previous discussions that the significance of the quotations from Indonesian sources in the context of Indonesian social history is invisible once these quotations are transformed into what seems to be their translations in English, or any other foreign language for that matter. For practical purposes, the above quotation can be crudely translated as "...the work of young Indonesia is *cultuurscheppen*, to develop/construct/build a new culture..."

¹³ "...only those who are able to disassociate/detach themselves from the past/old, can possibly develop/construct/build the new".

¹⁴ "the fall/collapse of the old tradition".

¹⁵ "to lullaby the people at large".

¹⁶ "The work of *pembangoenan* is the work of a creator".

'Creating' a new nation is fundamentally distinct from liberating the separate colonised communities of Java, Sunda, Madura, Bali, Aceh, and so on from the colonial power. While the latter had been the ambition of many people in the colony in the past years, the former had been, until then, unthinkable for most of the population. Creating the nation called Indonesia involved creating new thinking, new imagination,¹⁷ and new language. In his early essay that triggered off the *Polemik Kebudayaan*, Alisjahbana took the first several pages to emphasise that distinction. With great passion, he wrote (Mihardja 1977:16):

*Indonesia yang dicita-citakan oleh generasi baru bukan sambungan Mataram, bukan sambungan kerajaan Banten, bukan kerajaan Minangkabau atau Banjarmasin. Menurut susunan pikiran ini, maka kebudayaan Indonesia pun tiadalah mungkin sambungan kebudayaan Jawa, sambungan kebudayaan Melayu, sambungan kebudayaan Sunda atau kebudayaan yang lain.*¹⁸

Putting it in a positive statement, the work of 'young Indonesia', in Alisjahbana's scenario was "*menciptakan sesuatu yang mempunyai cap sendiri Indonesia*" (Mihardja 1977:17).¹⁹

In this light, it is significant that Alisjahbana was extremely hostile towards anything from the 'old', as exemplified by the previously cited quotations from his argument during the Polemics: "...*hanya mereka yang dapat melepaskan dirinya dari yang lama, akan mungkin...membangun yang baru*" and therefore he insisted on the "...*rubuhnya traditie yang lama*". A few years before the *Polemik Kebudayaan* Alisjahbana led a rebellious group of young intellectuals to found the journal *Poejangga Baroe*, 'New Writer(s)'. *Poejangga Baroe* posed a direct confrontation with the then dominant linguistic and literary activities of the 'old' *Balai Poestaka*, the colonial government's publishing house, from which Alisjahbana's own literary career originally grew. The idea of 'creating' the previously unsayable and unimagined society, the Indonesian nation, evolved hand-in-hand with the ideas of 'creative' writings and 'creative' literary authors which the *Poejangga Baroe* learned from the Dutch Romantic writers, and to which it subscribed.²⁰ In 1938 he published his piece *Kesusasteraan dizaman Pembangunan Bangsa*, ('Literature in a time of nation-building') (see Teeuw 1979:39). In 1945 he led the publication of the biweekly magazine *Pembangoenan*.

Alisjahbana's nearly total rejection of the old or the past in an attempt to create the new became one of the major targets of the attacks by his opponents in the Polemics. The latter expressed the belief that one cannot and should not "*melepaskan dirinya dari yang lama*" in making the attempt to "*membangun yang baru*" (Mihardja 1977:22,29,74). Despite these reservations, and Alisjahbana's later admission that the past was inseparable from the present and future, enthusiasm for the new, the metaphor of creativity, and undermining the given past have persistently and vigorously characterised much of the elites' subsequent thinking

¹⁷ Benedict Anderson's (1983a) thesis that a nation is essentially an "imagined community" deserves a serious consideration.

¹⁸ "Indonesia, being the ideal of the young generation, is not a continuation of [the] Mataram [kingdom], not a continuation of the Banten kingdom, not the kingdoms of Minangkabau or Banjarmasin. Likewise, in the perspective of this [young Indonesia], Indonesian culture cannot possibly be a continuation of the Javanese culture, the continuation of the Malay culture, the continuation of the Sundanese culture, or any other cultures."

¹⁹ "to create something with its own Indonesian trademark".

²⁰ For more information about the *Pujangga Baru*, originally spelled *PoedjanggaBaroe*, and its connection with the Dutch writers, see Foulcher (1980), Teeuw (1979:28-31,41-45), Jassin (1963) and Sutherland (1968). On the Romantic notion of artist as a creator, see Wolff's critical assessing survey (1981:10-12,17,25,118,137).

on *Pembangunan*. The dichotomies between the *lama* 'old' and the *baru* 'new', and between *tradisional* 'traditional' and *moderen* 'modern' have found repeated and renewed expression right up to the present day, albeit not without resistance from some quarters.

One of the most prominent slogans of Sukarno's government was 'New Emerging Forces' vis-a-vis 'Old Established Forces'. Another case that immediately comes to mind is the self-proclaimed *Orde Baru* 'New Order', that distinguishes itself from and denies any form of historical connection with what it calls the *Orde Lama* 'Old Order' (see Mangunwijaya 1986).²¹ It is as a part of the insistence on such a dissociation that some leading figures in contemporary Indonesia claim that Indonesia's *Pembangunan* did not begin until the New Order came to power (see Alwi 1985) or until it launched its first Five-Year-Development program in 1969 (see Gafur 1982:4). The whole previously discussed issue of 'creativity' is only one of a series of important elements in the recent development of socialised thought in Indonesia that found expression in Alisjahbana's rhetoric during the Polemics. Two other issues are worthy of mention here.

Firstly, we may notice from the Polemics of the 1930s that the word *pembangunan* was widely used to discuss the idea of *pembangunan kebudayaan*, 'development of culture', as contrasted with the predominantly economic growth-oriented sense of *Pembangunan* in contemporary Indonesia. There was a strongly held view that *kebudayaan* – as of 'culture' in many English-speaking communities at that time – was the primary determining variable in social change. Before the New Order emerged, when *Pembangunan* had already been used by the late President Sukarno and members of the Cabinet in special reference to economic undertakings, the residual use of *Pembangunan* in reference to cultural affairs and to the notion of 'nation-building' was still apparent. Ajip Rosidi's (1967) *Peranan Sastra dan Pembangunan Bangsa* ('The role of literature and [in?] nation-building'), (which was originally dated 18 January 1959), does not subordinate culture to an economic growth-oriented *Pembangunan*. Thus, it is distinguishable from the previously discussed obsession in refocusing and subordinating discussions of culture in terms of its relevance and contribution to the New Order's economic-oriented *Pembangunan*.

Secondly, the initial socialisation of the word *pembangunan* in the 1930s Polemics also marks an important embryonic tendency that becomes prominent in the New Order's language of Development. It is the practice of perceiving and confronting social reality in abstraction, manifested by the act of nominalisation of verbs. Although the noun *pembangunan* already occupied an important status in the Polemics of the 1930s, particularly in Alisjahbana's writings, it was still used less frequently than other *bangun*-derived verb forms. Contrary to the general practice today, verbs like *membangun*, *membangunkan*, *dibangun*, *dibangunkan* were used a great deal more than *pembangunan*. Very often, Alisjahbana preceded his use of the noun *pembangunan* with the semantically verbal noun word *pekerjaan* 'the work of'. Indicative is the title of his classic paper that provoked the Polemics: *Pekerjaan Pembangunan Bangsa sebagai Pekerjaan Pendidikan* ('The work of developing the nation as an educational work'). What does this signify?

²¹ Herbert Feith helped me realise how unclear the term 'Old Order' is in reference to its date of birth. The birth of the 'New Order' made clear only the end of the 'Old Order' (ca 1966). It is curious and significant that no attempt has been made to date the beginning of the 'Old Order'. Perhaps it is considered to be of little relevance or value to the present interests of the 'New Order' in propagating the contrast between the two 'Orders'.

It is tempting to explore historically the relationships between the practice of abstraction and the profound transformation of the concepts of time and space that were shaped by, among other factors, the print industry (see McLuhan 1964; Anderson 1987). The limitations of both space and my knowledge of such a broad subject allow me to restrict myself to making merely a brief note with regard to one specific area of interest. A growing practice of abstraction in language seems to have a direct correlation with a growing phenomenon of social alienation, or 'decommunalisation', in the community speaking the language. Geoffrey Benjamin (1984/5:12) makes a powerful, succinct comment on recent developments in the Malay and Indonesian languages, to the effect that the ongoing tendency

to focus attention towards such abstract notions as NOMINALISATION....entails that anyone speaking in the formal mode will be making reference to concerns lying beyond the immediate context of utterance, thereby shifting the situation to a more 'outsider' interactional frame.

We never know the past, and what 'really' happened when the Malay-speaking communities spoke of *membangun* or *membangunkan*. However, we can speculate that when they did that they were referring to some specific action(s) and actor(s) in the context of specific events. Unlike the formerly familiar usage of *bangun*-derived words in verb forms, *Pembangunan* is an impersonal topic or theme for thinking and engaging in conceptual discussion. While there is no mention of *pembangunan* in the national anthem *Indonesia Raya*, the repeated action-commanding verbal phrase *bangunlah* is given melodic emphasis.²² The contemporary Indonesian abstract noun *Pembangunan* is a generic metaphor that encompasses broad images.

An abstract mode of consciousness is obviously compatible with the abstract mode of social relations and mass production in most industrial societies. As mentioned earlier, Benedict Anderson's (1983a) assertion that a nation is essentially an imagined community is a relevant point. So is his analysis of the relationship between the rise of nationalism and the print industry, particularly newspapers (i.e. the making of an abstract 'public readership'). Creating a nation, implementing the so-called *Pembangunan*, and expounding the new word *Pembangunan* require the same enterprise: the socialisation of abstraction.

Some major events took place between the early emergence of *Pembangunan* and its present fully-fledged development. Indonesia gained Independence, and as the work of 'building' the new nation began to show its formal outcome the word 'nation-building' encountered a newly emerging English keyword 'Development', as an independent noun. As previously mentioned, 'development' had formerly found its most appropriate equivalent in the Malay/Indonesian word *perkembangan*. The emergence of the independent noun 'Development' and its rising popularity in the years that followed made it difficult for the old word *perkembangan* to remain a faithful equivalent of 'Development'. *Pembangunan* quickly responded to this change, and revitalised itself by shifting its major position from being the equivalent of the idea of '(nation-)building' to the new extension of 'Development'. This process was not accelerated, however, until the New Order assumed power. The old word *perkembangan* has been surviving quite well, despite the overwhelming vitality of its young rivalling word *Pembangunan*. Their coexistence and their contrast deserve our special attention in the next section, 2.3 'Significant others'.

²² *Indonesia Raya* ('Great Indonesia') was composed by Wage Rudolf Supratman, and it was sung in a formal gathering for the first time at the Indonesian Youth Congress on 28 October, 1928 in Jakarta.

Earlier we noted some claims, denying historical continuities, to the effect that the Soeharto Government was the initiator of Indonesia's *Pembangunan*. The then Chief Commander of the Armed Forces, General Benny Moerdani, reportedly perceived the history of the nation in two periods, leaving out the years of the 'Old Order' period: the past *periode perang kemerdekaan* 'the period of war of independence', and the present *periode pembangunan* 'Development period' (*Kompas*, 1987b). Though it is undeniable that it is the New Order which has been primarily responsible for both the ascendancy of *Pembangunan* as a keyword in Indonesia's history and the impressive successes of economic-growth *Pembangunan* in modern Indonesia, the Sukarno government employed the same term and launched its own Eight-Year Over-All Development Plan (1961-1968) (see Feith 1964:257 and Ndraha 1987:60). But *Pembangunan* was only one of several keywords during that period, another of which was even more central in importance was *Revolusi* 'Revolution'.²³

As I have previously suggested, the past two decades witnessed not only the rise to prominence of the metaphor *Pembangunan*, but also new dynamics of complementary and conflicting values as well as competing emphases embedded in the word. There are at least two ways of seeing these dynamics. Firstly, in the current meanings of *Pembangunan* we can identify some kind of amalgam of the residual metaphors and the newly imposed ones. In this perspective we can talk about historical continuities and changes. Secondly, overlapping with the first, we can also recognise some tensions in the dynamic meanings of the word. The tensions come from two major sources: there is the official, normative, formulation of *Pembangunan* on the one hand, and there are generally understood meanings of the same word in everyday activities. The official, normative version of *Pembangunan* retains many of the older ideas of *Pembangunan* as an all-encompassing undertaking. The more practical embodiment of the meaning of *Pembangunan* is more specific and limited, and is a response to current politico-economic constraints.

Historical continuities in the current meanings of *Pembangunan* are found in the old analogy between 'building a building/bridge/road' and 'building a new nation', as well as in a comprehensive view of the multi-faceted society to be developed. The old phrase was *membangun kebudayaan*, 'cultural development'. The Sukarno regime had its *pembangunan semesta* 'all-embracing development', and its current counterpart is *pembangunan manusia seutuhnya*,²⁴ as formulated in the official definition of *Pembangunan*. Thinking of 'building' a new nation and speaking within the Malay frame of *membangun*-centred metaphors, Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana could do nothing better than explore to his best advantage ways of elaborating his ideas within the given framework. In his 'introductory note' to the first issue of his magazine *Pembangoenan*, he expressed his hope that "*gedoeng Indonesia Merdeka jang sedang didirikan itoe dahsjat dan permai dan koekoeh...*" (Alisjahbana 1945).²⁵

²³ The period of the Sukarno government is my major blind spot, as it is to most Indonesians born after 1950. A large portion of writings from that period have not been discussed widely and openly, or made easily accessible to the general public, since the ascendancy of the New Order. I am grateful to Herbert Feith, whose major expertise includes this particular area, for his information to the effect that "1959-1965 was a period of sharp competition between *Pembangunan* and *Revolusi*. It was not till 1963 that one could say *Revolusi* was clearly getting the upper hand" (pers.comm.). For a further glimpse of the "languages of Indonesian politics" during the Sukarno government, see Benedict Anderson (1966).

²⁴ This is very difficult to translate: 'Man (*manusia*) – in Wholeness (*seutuhnya*) – Development (*pembangunan*)'.

²⁵ "[may] the mansion of Independent Indonesia, now being built, be great, beautiful, and strong".

Reflecting on the newly 'built' Indonesian nation on its first birthday, Alisjahbana (1946b) noted some concerns:

*Boekan sadja masih banyak bahaya jang mengantjam dari loear, tetapi tiang-tiang dan sendi-sendi jang dalam tergesa-gesa itoe didirikan, masih djaoeh dari tegoe dan mantap berdiri ditanah.*²⁶

In his memorable address to the United Nations Assembly in 1960 Sukarno used the term 'To build the world anew'²⁷, rather than 'Developing' or 'Development'. He was thinking of '*Membangun dunia*', a more explicit statement of a commitment to radical changes than what the term 'to develop' suggests. The root metaphor of 'building' remains intact despite the fact that *membangun* has been increasingly intimately associated with 'to develop' in the past two decades. In the first year of the New Order's Five-Year Development implementation President Soeharto explained to his people his projection of *Pembangunan Bangsa* 'National Development' by making an explicit analogy to the effect that the work of those undertaking *Pembangunan* was "*ibarat orang mendirikan gedung besar*" (Soeharto 1971:45).²⁸

One of the best sources of the official and brief formulation of New Order's concept of *Pembangunan* is, I think, that provided by the recently published *Ensiklopedi Indonesia* (Shadily 1984:2612):

*Pertumbuhan, perluasan ekspansi yang bertalian dengan keadaan yang harus digali dan yang harus dibangun agar dicapai kemajuan di masa yang akan datang. Pembangunan tidak hanya bersifat kuantitatif tetapi juga kualitatif, manusia seutuhnya. Pembangunan di Indonesia berlandaskan Pancasila dan UUD 1945, dan melalui kebijaksanaan Trilogi Pembangunan.*²⁹

The curious amalgam should be noted between the old metaphors '*pertumbuhan*' and '*perluasan*' that acknowledge the pre-existing conditions which impose some given constraints to the construction of anything new on the one hand, and the metaphors of '*creatively*' building houses/bridges in the phrases '*yang harus digali*' and '*yang harus dibangun*' on the other. The metaphor of building houses/buildings is a clear expression of the notion of bringing about the existence of what was formerly non-existent, as opposed to a process of unfolding.

Despite the familiar widespread formulation of *Pembangunan* as previously discussed, in daily experience Indonesians cannot fail to notice that in practice *Pembangunan* has a much narrower meaning. It is primarily used to refer to the state-sponsored economic development programs and large-scale construction of economic infrastructure. As a result, there has been a great deal of criticism from those who consider that *Pembangunan* has caused various undesirable effects in non-economic realms of the society (in cultural values, human dignity, social harmony and so on). These have often been interpreted and explained away as *dampak Pembangunan* 'negative impacts of the *Pembangunan*'. Though many of these critics have made strong arguments against the reduction of *Pembangunan* solely to matters of economic growth, they often subscribe to the generally accepted idea that economy, politics, and

²⁶ "Not only are there threatening dangers from the outside, but its hastily constructed pillars and foundations are still far from being firm and steady on the ground."

²⁷ This was the English title of the address.

²⁸ "like people building a great mansion".

²⁹ "Growth, extension, expansion in reference to a situation to be exploited and to be developed so as to yield progress in the future. Development is not only quantitative but also qualitative, man in wholeness. Development in Indonesia is based on *Pancasila* [state ideology] and UUD 1945 [the 1945 Constitution], and implemented through the Development-Trilogi Policies."

culture are separable entities.³⁰ Nevertheless, the Soeharto government has not been able to ignore these persistent grievances. As a response, it has both justified the current economic orientation in *Pembangunan* as a necessary prerequisite for attaining the ultimate aims of *Pembangunan*, and promised a more comprehensive approach to subsequent *Pembangunan* programs. How far this promise has materialised, or has the potential to materialise, is a separate question.

Even from the early years of the New Order's *Pembangunan*, President Soeharto was already aware of the grave incongruity between the official pronouncement of what *Pembangunan* should mean, and what the government was prepared to implement. Very consciously, he stated on 11 April 1970 that "*Pembangunan Bangsa djelas tidak hanya pembangunan ekonomi sadja*" (Soeharto 1971:44).³¹ Furthermore, on the last day of the same year (1971:45), he explained:

*ibarat orang mendirikan gedung besar, Pembangunan Lima Tahun ini adalah dasarnja, 'pondamen'nja. Kita tidak akan memiliki gedung jang besar dan indah, djika kita tidak dapat memasang 'pondamen' itu.*³²

Understandably, therefore, in a book of quotations from Soeharto's speeches, published by the Cabinet Secretariat, from which the previous citations were drawn, *Ekonomi* and *Pembangunan* make one topic heading: '*Ekonomi/Pembangunan*'.

As late as 1987, the emphasis of *Pembangunan* on economic areas still constituted a cause for concern for many, including those responsible for implementing *Pembangunan*. In an interview with the leading newspaper *Kompas* (1987f), various prominent figures in intellectual, political, and bureaucratic circles invariably stressed the need for directing future *Pembangunan* orientations towards 'basic non-material needs'. The former Chief Commander of the Armed Forces, Retired General Benny Moerdani, reportedly said that the speedy achievements in economic development have not been accompanied by progress in other fields of the nation's social life (*Kompas* 1987g). President Soeharto himself conceded that uplifting 'human qualities' must be emphasised in the next Broad Guidelines of the State (*Kompas* 1987c).

2.3 SIGNIFICANT OTHERS

The significance of *Pembangunan* is discernible not only in terms of its diachronic development, but also in terms of its synchronic connection with other Indonesian key words. The boundaries of their connections are ambiguous, and their connections are never static. Bearing that in mind, I have no intention of exploring or suggesting where such boundaries might lie or to propose a neat diagram depicting the structural relations of these

³⁰ Arief Budiman (1979:212-214) presents an elaborate discussion on this point. Surprisingly, however, many of his recent writings are still coloured by the dominant view that separates those abstract categories and subordinates 'culture' to 'politico-economics' (see Budiman 1987). Similarly, Richard Robison (1981) denounces his contemporaries' tendency to separate "Culture, Politics, and Economy" in studying New Order's Indonesia, but without making the supposedly inseparable much clearer.

³¹ "National Development clearly does not constitute only economic development".

³² "like people building a great mansion, this Five-Year Development is the basis, the 'foundation'. We will not have a great and beautiful mansion, if we are not able to construct that 'foundation'". It is interesting to note the parallel between this simile proposed by someone who is extremely anti-Marxist and the metaphors of 'base' and 'superstructure' among the orthodox Marxists.

words.³³ I simply want to consider two selected words that have special connections with the keyword *Pembangunan*. They are *Pancasila* and *perkembangan*.

Of course, the list of words that we might include in this section is an open-ended one. I have selected only two here, primarily on the basis of their importance in relation to *Pembangunan*. Consequently, we will consider the significance of each of these selected words not in isolation, but rather insofar as its interconnection with *Pembangunan* provides us with further illumination of the significance of *Pembangunan* itself.

2.3.1 *Pancasila*

The official state ideology, *Pancasila* 'Five Principles',³⁴ has remained a salient keyword throughout the history of independent Indonesia. The succession of power from The 'Old Order' to the presently ruling 'New Order' rests its legitimacy on the successor's claim that it assumed power in order to 'save' *Pancasila*, and thus the whole Indonesian nation-state. The date (1 October 1965) on which the New Order's core group made the initial overt military move leading to its ascendancy has been annually celebrated as *Hari Kesaktian Pancasila* 'Pancasila's Victory Day'.

Furthermore, the New Order has managed to mould that sanctified ideology to fit its interests, and to utilise it most extensively to secure and exercise its power. *Pancasila*, like *Pembangunan*, has become a fundamental term in the everyday vocabulary of the population at large. Like the former term, the latter has been pervasively used to modify various names of public importance. Indeed, these two words have been the most salient keywords in New Order Indonesia. Nevertheless, since these two keywords come from different origins, they are bound to occupy different domains and contain different values. Thus, to a considerable extent, they may be seen as mutually independent. *Pancasila* should be considered here partly because it is the only other New Order keyword of equal importance to 'Pembangunan', and partly because the two words have managed to coexist in spite of their substantial differences.

Indeed, it would be fair to argue that *Pancasila* slightly outweighs *Pembangunan* in contemporary Indonesian discourse, though the two clearly outweigh all other existing keywords. *Pancasila* is far more politically sensitive in contemporary Indonesia than *Pembangunan*. Major political disputes have arisen concerning the New Order's interpretation of *Pancasila* and its all-pervasive application of that interpretation in governance. Nation-wide *Pancasila* indoctrination programs have been established since 1973. All civil servants, urban citizens, and students from primary up through tertiary school systems are required to attend these centrally organised indoctrination sessions. Since 1985, all social organisations have been compelled by national law to adopt *Pancasila* as their common 'sole principle'.³⁵ The government has succeeded in taking all these measures despite a series of conflicts during the past few years.

³³ Michael van Langenberg (1987) attempted to make a diagram of the New Order's keywords.

³⁴ The 'Five Principles' are: (i) Belief in One God; (ii) Humanism; (iii) Nationalism; (iv) Democracy; and (v) Social Justice. There have been some discussions on whether *Pancasila* in the New Order Indonesia should be understood as an 'ideology' or 'quasi-religion' or 'civil religion'.

³⁵ See Michael van Langenberg (1987:20-21) for a brief account of *Pancasila* as a keyword in New Order Indonesia. For an analysis of the political significance of *Pancasila* in the 1990s, see Ramage (1993).

In one crucial respect, however, *Pembangunan* serves the interest of the New Order better than *Pancasila*. The New Order may successfully claim to be the initiator of Indonesia's *Pembangunan* (see Alwi 1985; Gafur 1982:4). The same government deserves the honorary title *Orde Pembangunan*. It is proud to grant the title *Bapak Pembangunan* to its President. It can hardly do anything similar with *Pancasila*, however, primarily because established history irrefutably presents Sukarno, the 'Old Order' President, as the one and only forefather of *Pancasila*. Attempts to refute or gloss over this history, as well as Sukarno's merit, have been made, but to no avail.³⁶

In sum, the importance of considering *Pancasila* in this section does not lie so much in what meanings that keyword adds to *Pembangunan* as in what limitation the former sets for the latter. *Pembangunan* is more of an operational program than a competing ideology to *Pancasila*. In fact, the implementation of *Pembangunan* needs the legitimacy that *Pancasila* provides. *Pembangunan* programs have the character of being 'international' or 'cosmopolitan' in the sense that they are comparable to various 'Development' programs in different 'Developing nations' worldwide and that they are substantially inseparable from the dynamics of global industrialisation. In contrast, *Pancasila* is relatively nationalistic and ostensibly 'authentic'. In the official state formulation, *Pancasila* is acknowledged to be the 'basis' or 'foundation' of *Pembangunan*.

2.3.2 *Perkembangan*

Earlier I noted that during its formative years the word *pembangunan* was primarily meant to be the equivalent of '(nation-)building' rather than 'development'. This is not because 'development' was unheard of or incomprehensible, but because 'development' was then understood as a noun-of-process, as *perkembangan*. The shift of the Indonesian equivalent for the powerful word 'Development' from *perkembangan* to *pembangunan* is a radical one. We will examine it here, before proceeding to study its relationship to the shift of prominence in the English word 'Development' from a noun-of-process to an independent noun.

Perkembangan is the nominalised form of the intransitive verb *berkembang*. Its root word is *kembang* 'flower'. Thus, *berkembang* denotes the notion of 'blooming' or 'flowering'. By extension, both *berkembang* and *perkembangan* have been used to refer to a process of similar kind. Most popular reference is made to the 'developing' process of human beings (from childhood to adulthood) and to incidents or events (from conflict/crisis to resolution). In essence, *perkembangan* and *berkembang* refer to a presumably natural process of change, which is motivated primarily by some internal necessity, enforced primarily, if not exclusively, by its own internal energy, its pace and extent being proportional to its own 'nature'.³⁷

³⁶ Controversies on this matter are voluminous and still in progress. For an introspection following the 'reviving' idolatry of Sukarno during the latest general election (April 1987), see the cover story in *Tempo* (1987:56-67) and David Bourchier (1989).

³⁷ The idea of 'proportional' development in natural organisms came to me after reading an illustration of a similar point, though in a different context, by Ivan Illich (1982:82): "A snail, after adding a number of widening rings to the delicate structure of its shell, suddenly brings its accustomed building activities to a stop. A single additional ring would increase the size of the shell sixteen times. Instead of contributing to the welfare of the snail, it would burden the creature with such an excess of weight that any increase in its productivity would henceforth be literally outweighed by the task of coping with the difficulties created by enlarging the shell beyond the limits set by its purpose".

I wish to propose a construct of two models of world view, each being signified by the values embedded in the two metaphors, *perkembangan* and *pembangunan*. For the purpose of clarity, I will present the two models in a rather exaggerated or simplistic fashion. They should stand as extended metaphors, rather than as an 'objective' depiction of immediately observable realities. The construction of these models is informed by an insider's observation of implied meanings in the language practices of the society concerned.

The extension of the previously-mentioned metaphor *berkembang* 'blooming, flowering' seems to suggest something fundamental. It reveals that the so-called nature of human beings and of events in the cosmos are viewed as parallel or comparable, at least to some degree, with that of natural organisms. To believe that human beings and social events *berkembang* is to believe that they undergo changes and continuities under a certain pattern of order, similar to the governing laws of nature and natural equilibrium, ideas very familiar to many of the communities in Indonesia. Flowers grow out of seeds, turn to fruits, which then yield seeds. To ask about how a social crisis *berkembang* at a certain point of time seems to express new anxieties or residual hopes about the effectiveness of the traditionally believed metaphysical powers at work; will it develop or resolve the way things usually did in the remembered past? *Berkembang* is, in fact, just a temporary phase of the cyclical passage of life: *bertunas* 'to sprout' → *bertumbuh* 'to grow and to have a stem' → *berkembang* 'to flower' → *berbuah* 'to fruit' → *berbiji* 'to seed' → and back to *bertunas*. To the present time, in Indonesian there are no words derived from the root words *tumbuh* or *kembang* that are equivalent to the English words 'grown up' and 'developed' (referring to a final achieved state).

In contrast, *Pembangunan* does not only denote different meanings, but it belongs to a radically different type of world view. There is no way, at least to the present time, to say *pembangunan* from childhood to adulthood, or from a crisis to resolution. *Pembangunan* is a nominal form of the transitive verb *membangun*, in the sense of 'to build, construct, or erect'.³⁸

In short, *pembangunan* does not even pretend to refer to things presumably in 'nature' or 'natural' processes. On the contrary, it refers to an exploitation of nature, as of human beings. In essence, it denotes craftsmanship as well as engineering, with the chief emphasis on yielding maximal product, in the most efficient pace and manner possible, by bringing external forces to bear upon the object, *bangunan*. Unlike the naturalist *perkembangan*, the characteristically human-centred *pembangunan* raises the questions of ethical values, as well as social legitimation.

It is necessary to appreciate the difference between two kinds of *membangun*, each of which is distinguished from the other by the emergence and hegemony of the nominal form *pembangunan*. Etymologically, *pembangunan* was primarily an extended metaphor for building houses, temples, roads, or bridges. Already then we have the sense that *membangun* requires human consciousness, willingness, labour, tools, as well as exploitation of natural resources. But before developing its nominalised form *pembangunan*, *membangun* was conceivably less in opposition to the whole image of *berkembang* than it was thereafter. During the pre-*pembangunan* period, the communities seemed to be self-restrained, with or without

³⁸ The other set of meanings of the reflexive verb *bangun* (to wake up, to get up, to be awake) has a different nominal form, *kebangunan*. Occasionally Indonesians speak of '*membangunkan*' in a transitive sense (someone woke up someone else). If nominalised, which would be an extremely rare and strange case, this noun would more likely be '*membangunkannya*' rather than '*pembangunan*'.

deference, in dealing with nature than their counterparts today. Nature was considered sacred and the work of *membangun* was a religious communal activity. Early this century some of the Western-educated Indonesian intelligentsia saw and denounced this tradition as irrational or superstitious. With the best of intentions they declared war against the old tradition and propounded modernising *Pembangunan*.

This kind of attitude towards 'nature' ran through much of Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana's arguments from the 1930s Polemics. For several months subsequent to the issue published on 10 January 1946 (vol.1, No.3), Alisjahbana's magazine *Pembangoenan* presented the same sketch on its cover: a panorama of paddy fields, mountains, clear sky, and coconut trees at the bottom left; at the centre of the page a pair of muscular hands pushing a log from left to right in an attempt to set it erect; and a silhouette of factories with smoking chimneys at the top right corner. Today *membangun* is primarily used in reference to the nation, its politics, economy, culture, and so on rather than to simple houses. It has become more and more bureaucratic, based on exclusive privilege, and it is capital- as well as high technology-intensive, and hazardous to the social as well as natural environment.

The two models constructed above only serve to explore the semantic area and embedded values that the metaphor *pembangunan* can imply, in contrast to those of *perkembangan*. In reality, the contrast may not be as sharp, simple, or overt as the above discussion suggests. Nor should the above contrast be understood to take place in isolation from the processes of social change occurring in other realms and in a broader context. The transition from one particular world view to the other as signalled by the increasing prominence of the word *pembangunan* is certainly much more complex and gradual than the above discussion might indicate. As newer values and world views have gained prominence, their older counterparts have not entirely vanished, but have made room to coexist and compete with the newer. Hopefully the subsequent discussion on the word 'Development' will throw some light on some of the complexities involved here and moderate what in the preceding pages may have sounded an overromanticised account of the old past world view of *berkembang* vis-a-vis the presently prominent 'engineered' *pembangunan*.

The sharp contrast between *perkembangan* and *pembangunan* outlined above is invisible in the English word 'development' that has been commonly used to translate both Indonesian words. This is not to say that 'development' does not contain those contradictions, but only that the embedded contradictions are not as visibly marked in English as they are in Indonesian.

2.4 EXOGENOUS CHALLENGE, ENDOGENOUS RESPONSE

The discussion above explores some important connections between *Pembangunan* and two other Indonesian words. We discussed what is lost and gained from the propagation of *pembangunan*, at the cost of the old familiar *perkembangan*. What remains to be examined is why *pembangunan* has outweighed *perkembangan* in contemporary Indonesian discourse. The reason I wish to consider here is partly derived from what has happened outside Indonesia, from the changes in the word 'development', and partly from the relationship between Indonesian and modern English. Earlier I noted that the formation of the noun *pembangunan* was to a considerable degree indebted to the term '(nation-)building', while the prevalence of the independent noun 'Development' has been responsible in large measure for the ascendancy of *Pembangunan*. Like *perkembangan* and *pembangunan*, 'development' has never been static in its history.

H. W. Arndt (1981) identifies two major streams in the development of the word 'Development', namely the colonial, and the Marxist. Each of these streams takes one of the pair of meanings that the word has in English: transitive and intransitive. The first (colonial) stream expounds the idea of social development in a transitive sense: society to be developed. The agent of the action is most frequently understood to be the government (Arndt 1981:462). Among the Marxists, social development is primarily viewed in an intransitive sense: society that develops of its own accord. While Arndt's identification and particularly his labelling ('colonial' and 'Marxist') for each of the two categories of 'Development' is debatable, his distinction between the transitive and the intransitive senses of the word is valuable to us. It helps us in two ways.

First, it explains how *perkembangan* and *pembangunan* translate equally well into 'd/Development', despite the contrast of meanings between those two Indonesian words. Second, it also helps us understand the prevalence of *pembangunan*, outweighing *perkembangan*. It is related to the fact that the transitive 'Development' has outweighed its intransitive counterpart. Indeed, this is another way of saying that the independent noun 'Development' has been more dominant than its twin as a noun-of-process.

It hardly needs to be explicated that in their unequal relationship the international communities (including an Indonesian elite minority) of 'Development language' speakers have done a great deal more to influence, impose upon, fascinate, promise, or intimidate the speakers of 'Pembangunan language' than the reverse. However, this assertion should not be confused with an allegation that Indonesian is essentially dependent upon or merely echoing the dynamics of English. Despite the heavy pressure from English, Indonesian has never lost its own identity entirely. A couple of related illustrations must suffice here, one indicating the imitating tendency of Indonesian, the other showing its capacity to generate some form of authenticity.

It is obvious that new Indonesian words like *Rencana Pembangunan Lima Tahun*, *program pembangunan*, *pembangunan daerah*, *studi pembangunan*, and *teori pembangunan* are originated from their English equivalents ('Five-Year Development Plan', 'Development Program', 'Community/Rural Development', 'Development Studies', and 'theory of Development'). It is also clear that in all these terms the word 'Development' is used in its transitive sense. From this perspective, it is rather striking that English has the term 'developing nations' which is no less prominent than all previously mentioned usages of the term 'Develop(ment)'. In 'developing nations', the word 'developing' is not a gerund, but a present participle. It is derived from the intransitive verb 'to develop'. Following English, Indonesian has currently adopted the idea and coined an equivalent in the term *bangsa berkembang*. The variation from the all-pervasive *pembangunan* neologism to the propagation of *negara berkembang* is more glaring than its counterpart in English. Logically, no *negara berkembang* needs *pembangunan*. Because *negara berkembang* has the capacity to 'develop' (intransitively) there is no need to invite and authorise any 'Development Agencies' to (transitively) 'develop' it.

While the above illustrates how faithfully contemporary Indonesian reproduces English key terms, we also have ample cases where *pembangunan* is used in more authentic ways. Examples are already provided in the opening section of this chapter. One example that deserves further examination is the term *Bapak Pembangunan*. Although the word *Pembangunan* in that honorary title is the same word that originates from 'Development', *Bapak Pembangunan* is not a copy of any known English title. The relative authenticity in

that Indonesian title lies at a more profound level. One of the reasons³⁹ why speakers of English, particularly those who hold power, prefer the intransitive term 'developing nation' is, I think, because the term effaces the questions of responsibility and of legitimacy assumed by external (be they domestic or alien) 'developer(s)' that the transitive 'development' implies.

In contemporary Indonesia, the paternalistic government is fully confident of taking on the highest responsibility for the nation's *Pembangunan*. It is significant that the conferring of both 'honorary' titles *Orde Pembangunan* and *Bapak Pembangunan* took place in Indonesia at a time when in many other places 'Development' was under fierce attack from many quarters (see Illich 1969; 1979). In specific reference to Indonesian politics in the context of world politics, Herbert Feith (1979:7) even discussed what he observed to be "the decline of developmentalism as an ideology" only three years before the conferment of the titles was prepared, or four years before the actual conferment of those titles.

The title *Bapak Pembangunan* signifies an aspect of contemporary Indonesian society that is closely related to our previous discussion of the complex transition from one view of nature to the other. I would like to consider the implications of that title by identifying major features of what being a father 'ideally' means, particularly, but not exclusively, in Javanese communities, which outnumber those of other ethnic groups in the nation and from which the President, as well as the largest portion of the state officials, originates.⁴⁰

The formation of any *Bapak-Anak* 'Father-Child' relationship is commonly perceived to be a 'natural' phenomenon, in the sense that it is beyond the will and control of any human being. A particular person is 'given' as a father to another individual or a group of siblings by some powerful forces that seem also to create, regulate, and destroy things in the cosmos. The making of a father does not involve a process of nomination and election by consensus or votes from members of a family, as that of a 'leader' or 'chairperson' in a modern formal organisation. The making of a *Bapak* in *Pembangunan* seems to re-emphasise the already familiar slogan in Indonesia that *Pembangunan* is to be implemented based on *asas kekeluargaan* 'familial principles'. *Pembangunan* is not supposed to be viewed as a purely modern and professional project.

Holding the highest status and authority in *Pembangunan*, as if in a 'family', *Bapak Pembangunan* is not occupying a temporary position, between terms of service as commonly practised in most offices. While the father is responsible for what happens in the family to some higher authorities (e.g. more senior members of the family, of the community, or deities), not to his children or his wife, the children and wife have a great deal of responsibility to the father. By tradition, they are supposed not only to respect him but also to love and obey him. There is only one father to a family, and he will be the father of the family throughout his life and after his death. The formal text proposing the conferment of the title *Bapak Pembangunan* to President Soeharto includes a statement that reads:

³⁹ Another, and more commonly acknowledged, reason is that 'developing' has been chosen, as a 'euphemism' or a 'gentler' and 'more flattering' word, to replace the already familiar terms, such as 'backward', 'underdeveloped', 'less developed', or 'poor'. See Raymond Williams (1983:102-104) for the semantic history of the term 'developing'.

⁴⁰ For a further discussion of idealised models of Javanese families, see Hildred Geertz (1961), Magnis-Suseno (1985:46-49, 168-176), and Keeler (1987).

Dengan demikian maka gelar Bapak Pembangunan Indonesia hanya menjadi milik seorang dan tidak untuk hal yang sama kepada orang lain. Artinya Bapak Pembangunan Indonesia manunggal dalam pribadi pemimpin nasional kita sekarang ini yakni Pak Harto (Gafur 1982:4).⁴¹

What the above statement and the preceding discussion indicate is the complexity in the world views of those engaging in the process of *Pembangunan*. The 'naturalist' outlook as embedded in *berkembang* persists in finding contemporary expression, and to serve the interest of the ruling government, despite the predominantly 'human-centred' outlook embedded in the 'engineered' *pembangunan*. In the next chapter we shall return to the history of the communities in question and make attempts to trace some of the fundamental changes that these communities experienced, and that paved the way for the evolution of words like *pembangunan*.

⁴¹ "Therefore, the title *Bapak Pembangunan Indonesia* should belong only to a single person and will not be conferred to other persons for similar merits. That means *Bapak Pembangunan Indonesia* and the personality of our current national leader, namely Pak Harto, are one."

It is worthy of mention that the so-called "our national leader" in this quotation is earlier referred to in the same text as "a central figure in the process of national Development", rather than as "a leader" in that process. This seems to underlie the distinction between the man-made status of "leader" and the nature-given role of "father" here.