

# **Collective Violence and Social Disintegration: A Study of Mass Violence as a Trigger off Crime and The Loss of Social Values in Society**

Indah Sri Utari

*Faculty of Law, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia*

---

## **Abstract**

This study delves into the intricate interplay between collective violence and social disintegration, examining the repercussions of mass violence as a trigger for heightened criminal activities and the erosion of societal values. Through a comprehensive analysis of historical and contemporary instances of collective violence, the research aims to unravel the complex mechanisms that link such events to an increase in criminal behavior and the gradual breakdown of fundamental social norms. The investigation explores psychological, sociological, and economic dimensions to illuminate the multifaceted impact of collective violence on the fabric of society. The study endeavors to uncover how these violent events contribute to a loss of trust, exacerbate socio-economic disparities, and foster an environment conducive to criminality. By understanding these dynamics, the research seeks to provide valuable insights for policymakers, law enforcement, and community leaders. These insights can inform the development of

effective strategies to mitigate the impact of mass violence on crime rates and work towards the preservation of foundational values that underpin social cohesion.

## Keywords

*Collective violence, social disintegration, role of the game, Legal institutions*

## I. Introduction

The various societies that are the object of analysis in this CLE study are a form of collective violence that marks the state formation. Indonesia towards the end of the New Order government. Since the signs of the New Order regime will end, collective violence seems to be a tool of articulation of the interests of various groups. Institutions and the rule of law, even other official institutions seem unable to control the violence that occurs, both against members of the public and the state.

As is known, the period leading up to the collapse of the new order government, law and order (law and order) almost did not play a role in managing the process of state-nation-community management. Conditions that up to a certain degree still carried up to now in the reform era. Here and there still looks lawless-state environment.

The violence that takes place, takes on a variety of forms-that can be classified into two main models. The first form - horizontal conflict, violence directed against fellow members of the community. Whereas the second form of vertical conflict, specifically between society and state-is characterized by mass anger towards State apparatus and institutions. In the May 14 riot,

for example, in particular in the Surakarta Region, two models of violence occurred together. This is one of the main considerations why the mass violence that took place in the community was raised to be the object of CLE study

Many theoretical perspectives are put forward to explain collective violence. Some studies that preceded it have drawn different conclusions about the root causes of the collective violence. There is a link with historical factors of radicalism in the past (Mulyadi 1999: 54)

There is also a suspect that the factor of tribe, religion, race, and among groups that became the root cause of the phenomenon of concern. Then, not a few also assume that social disparity among the population is an element that accelerates the escalation of social division (social segregation). (Sritua Arief & Adi Sasono, 1997: 8). There is also a highlight as a result of development during the New Order that is wrong in implementing economic, political, social and cultural policies, resulting in various development problems such as poverty, economic and income gaps, marginalization and so forth. (Sritua Arief & Adi Sasono, 2001: 32)

The source of the riots in the New Order period is often regarded as the impact of social and economic jealousy problems between indigenous and immigrant people. (Research Team of Faculty of Law University, "Social Conflict in West Kalimantan: 2012)

## **II. Pattern of Conflict and Violence**

It must be admitted that in the past social and political relations which were accommodated by the concept of tribe, religion, race and intergroup, actually have a negative impact on the harmonization of social relations in society. (Kleden, "1998). But sometimes there is a reduction as social problems are merely constricted to the indigenous and non-indigenous stigma.

When we look closely at the social behavior of societies there has been a more complex symptom of changing social problems from indigenous non-native vis-a-vis patterns, to the migrants' vis-a-vis migration pattern as happened in Sambas, West Kalimantan, As well as at the beginning of the conflict in Ambon. Another growing pattern is the occurrence of religious dimension, Christian vis-a-vis Christianity. This pattern develops especially in areas with religious balances, as occurred in Ambon and Mataram.

On the other hand, the pattern of conflict can also be linked to elite conflicts both at the central and local levels. Another approach explains that conflicts in the form of social unrest in Indonesia are not merely the product (reproduction) of local communities, but are also encouraged by external groups such as provocateurs, elite conflicts, the influence of global information, as well as outside parties concerned Disrupt the socio-political, economic conditions at the national and local levels

The above patterns, in general, occur in Java, especially in the riots in Surakarta. In that event, for example, the pattern of conflict with native and non indigenous stigma occurs. There are also issues of socioeconomic inequalities, religious issues, attacks on public facilities, destruction of property of power elites, and coordinated acts of violence. This condition is also another consideration of the author to lift as the theme of study in CLE

The various results of the above study with each approach used, has succeeded in raising various aspects of the underlying riots that occurred during this time. Nevertheless, these studies have not been successful in demonstrating criminogenic traits in the various areas of life present in Surakarta society. Yet from the side of criminology, every form of violence always breeds from criminogenic conditions that surround the event. This study takes such a position, ie, attempts to disclose and explain the potential of criminals present within the Surakarta community (systemic crises), whether involving cultural dimensions or legal, political and resource allocation dimensions together (Tanya 2001: 3). The

assumption is that the social, economic, cultural and political crisis of a region has great potential for social tensions and conflicts in both soft and violent categories such as riots. (Michael C. Hudson and Charles Lewis Taylor 2004:) Collective violence will not occur if it is not preceded by accelerator factors, or triggers, even in an area where there are sources of problems. Here it is assumed that the relationships of the three factors (source of problem, accelerator factor, and trigger) are interrelated between each other and not mutually independent.

In sharpening the analysis, the authors used a criminal sociology approach to examine the social conditions of crime. Since criminology is a science that examines crime as a social problem, and its interdisciplinary nature, the use of theories in analysis is inevitable. In the perspective of criminal sociology, the crisis in law is one of the drivers of violence in addition to other factors, such as cultural, social, political, and economic factors.

In the context of Nisbet's theory sees collective violence as a social problem. According to Nisbet, all social problems, possessing general elements. The elements are the existence of a number of structural factors that hook and complex hooks. (Nisbet, R.A, 1961). As a social issue, collective violence is not sufficiently studied with psychological approaches. In addition to its limited and partial scope, an approach that seeks to root errors in individuals, it will also encourage limited problem handling

According to Tannenbaum, by simply looking for problems in individuals, it is likely to excessively look for the factors that are considered to be negatively suspected to exist in a person, regardless of the possibility of the influence of external structural conditions. Such a tendency, according to Tannenbaum, will see the "dramatization of evil" which can reinforce the tendency of deviance. Kingsley Davis calls this trend a blurring of evil cause-evil fallacy-which he claims is not objective and ought to be avoided.

To avoid such apostasy, Ian Taylor presented a more comprehensive approach. According to Taylor, a new approach in

research effort and a scientific understanding of crime, it is necessary to disclose the following: (1). The root of wider evil, in the form of structural conditions in society. (2). Causes of crime. (3). The social dynamic behind the evil. (4). Social reactions to crime. (5). The actors' response to social control. According to Taylor, the direction and persistence of evil must be consistently examined within the scope of theoretical analysis, while being dialectically explained to each other.

In line with Taylor, Smelser mentioned the six deciding factors. Every factor, if it does not involve the next factor will not give birth to collective violence. The six factors are: (1). Structural conducting (structural conducting), namely the structural condition of society which has potential for the emergence of collective violence. (2). Structural strains, which are conditions of tension caused by the reality of community structures such as uncertainty, oppression, conflict, potential disparities for the growth of collective violence. (3). Growth and dissemination of common beliefs, ie processes where structural strain is meaningful to potential perpetrators. Structural tensions are already perceived as reality, then disseminated into common beliefs, and then identified sources of tension as well as ways to overcome those tensions. (4). Precipitating factors are situational factors that emphasize structural drivers, structural tensions, and general beliefs about sources of tension that trigger collective behavior. The trigger factor if not motivated by the existence of structural drivers, structural tension and the dissemination of common beliefs, will not result in collective violence. (5). Mobilization of the participant to act, that is, an advanced condition when steps one through 4 occur in order for the collective violence to take place. Here the leadership role of mobilizing people and mobilizing collectivities is important. (6). Weak social figures are respected

### III. Social Conflict and the End of the Values Society

In fact, the May 14 riot of 1998 was a form of social conflict, because of the antagonism or differences in various aspects of the common life. According to conflict theorists, social differences cannot be avoided, there can be no upper layer groups if there is no lower and middle layer. Even in Karl Marx's view, societies are configured in two conflicting classes, the upper society (capital owners) and the lower layers (workers).

Why a conflict of interest? Because of the different classes of interests, namely the upper and lower classes. According to Marx, the way of production in society is always configured in the form of 'ruling' (capital owners) and 'controlled' (non-capital owners / laborers).

So according to Marx, economics is a 'bottom structure' that gives form and style to all that exists in the 'upper structure'. Therefore, the law, the political system, the cultural style, even the structure of society, is nothing but a mere reflection of the economic system behind it. There is no historical event in the world, which cannot be explained by categories of economic interest. War, revolution, rebellion, violence, and even colonialism always have economic motives.

Here it is seen that the economic conditions determine the social classes. Membership in social class, determines the interests of people. While interests, determine what is aspired, what is considered good and bad. According to Marx, one will always regard both what guarantees existence and interests, and takes badly what threatens it. In other words, what is considered good is what is perceived as an improvement in the quality of life, while those who disparage it are considered bad.

But the quality of life, so Marx, is determined by the position in society, especially by whether we belong to a lucky class or a

disadvantaged class. Owner / possessed class is a lucky class, while no worker or worker is a disadvantaged class. The relationship between the classes according to Marx is the relationship of power and exploitation. A strong class dominates and exploits a weak class.

Because the interests of the upper and lower classes are objectively contradictory, they will also adopt a different basic attitude toward social change. The class of owners and upper classes in general tend to be conservative and anti-change, while the less fortunate class will be progressive and revolutionary. Upper class is already in power. He lives from a lower class job. Therefore, the upper classes are intrinsically interested in maintaining the continuity (status quo) to oppose any change in the power structure. Since they are well established in their class conditions, any change is perceived to threaten their position.

Conversely, the lower classes have an interest in change. Because they are oppressed, every change is always dreamed of bringing progress, because for them, every change must be liberation. The final objective interest of the lower classes, according to Marx is, the dismantling of upper class power. Once the interests of the oppressed lower class get wind, the power of the oppressor class must be resisted. But the upper classes-because he was the upper class-had an interest in maintaining his power. Then the upper classes may never give up the change of the system they enjoy, because it necessarily ends the enjoyment and role of the upper class. Exactly at this point the occurrence of collisions, both latent and real (manifest)

In the social production of human life, everyone enters certain relationships that are absolute and independent of their will. These relationships correspond to a certain level of development of the material productive forces. The sum of all these relations of production is the economic structure of society - the real basis upon which a 'juridical and political' top structure exists, and with which certain forms of social consciousness



coincide. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political, legal, and ideological processes of life in general. According to Marx, whoever controls the economy, it will rule people.

In this context, Marx introduces the theory of 'class state'. According to him, the state is essentially a class state, meaning that the state is controlled directly or indirectly by the classes that control the economic field. Therefore for Marx, the state is not a neutral institution that governs society unconditionally, but a tool in the hands of the upper classes. That is why, the state is not a 'neutral referee' who breaks up disputes arising in society fairly. The state also does not always seek public welfare. In many ways, always sided with the strong (upper class)

So most of the state policies will benefit the upper classes. The state may act in the interest of the whole community, for example by building transportation facilities, conducting public schools, and taking criminal action. But Marx said, the action was in the interest of the upper classes, because the upper classes can not defend themselves, if people's lives are generally chaotic. If the state occasionally makes social improvements, it is to pacify the people and to divert the attention of the lower classes from the demands of more fundamental change-which threatens the upper classes.

Class state perspective can explain why the usually become victims of development are small people, why petty thieves are punished harder than the big corruptors, and why a small percentage of people in prison more than their big man. Must be called a state of law, but little people do not have access to the law. As a result large people are protected, while little people do not. Since the state is always considered to be a class state that supports the upper classes, then the state belongs to the opposite of the lower classes.

If Marx's theory speaks of the economic motives behind a conflict, then the Dahrendorf conflict theory is different again.

Ralf Dahrendorf raises a broader explanation of Marx's all-round economic explanation. Dahrendorf proposed a new foundation for the formation of the class, in lieu of Marx's conception of possession of the means of production as the basis of that class distinction. According to him, power relationships provide elements for the birth of the class. There is a dichotomy between those in power and those who are in control. In other words, some people participate in the power structure, while others do not. Some people have power, others do not.

Dahrendorf recognizes that there are differences between those with little and much power. The difference in the degree of domination, can and always is very great. But basically there remain two social class systems, those who participate in power structures through mastery and those who do not participate through submission.

The class struggle discussed by Dahrendorf is more power-based than the possession of the means of production. In modern industrial societies, the owners of means of production are not as important as those who have power. Dahrendorf argues that any group characterized by opposition, there is tension among those who participate in the power structure and who are subject to that structure. As Dahrendorf says, empirically, group clashes may be easiest to analyze when viewed as contradictory about the legitimacy of power relations. Within each group, the interests of the ruling group are the values that are the ideology of the legitimacy of its power, while the interests of the underworld pose a threat to this ideology, as well as the social relationships contained therein.

Dahrendorf argues that wealth, economic status, and social status, though not a determinant of class, according to the terms he uses, can actually affect the intensity of conflict. He proposes the following proposition: The lower the correlation between the position of power and other aspects of socioeconomic status, the lower the intensity of class conflict, and vice versa. In other words,

groups enjoying relatively high economic status are less likely to engage in violent conflict with power structures than those who are wasted from social, economic, and power status.

The economic virtues of Marx's version of Dahrendorf's version of power are actually two important elements of the formation of social coatings in the theory of 'social stratification', in addition to the element of prestige. As is known, there are three main elements that determine the social strata in a society, namely the dimension of prestige, privilege, and dimension of power. From a number of theories on this, some have emphasized the importance of the dimension of economic privilege in determining the dynamics of relationships of the three dimensions of social stratification as proposed by Max Weber. There are also theories that emphasize the importance of power dimensions as proposed by Gerhard E. Lenski and C. Wright Mills. Medium E.A. Ross emphasized the importance of the dimension of prestige

According to Weber, privileges in the economic field have a great influence for a person in gaining access to resources in society. In this study, the control of these resources is land acquisition. Although the dimension of privilege is very decisive, but not the only one that determines the prestige.

In contrast to Weber, C.W. Mills actually says that the most prominent dimension of all three is the dimension of power. Horizontal mobility occurring in the same layer between the spheres of social life, politics, economics, also occurs among the elite so that they are truly outstanding and separate forces from the lower classes.

Like Mills, Lenski also emphasized the importance of the dimension of power in interfaith relations. Lenski's thought shows a very different antardimensional relationship with Weber. If M. Weber stressed the importance of the dimension of privilege in interdimensional relations, Lenski argued that "... most of the privileges are a function of power, and very little is a function of the interests of others (altruism).

That means that in order to explain most of the distribution of privileges in a society, we must determine the spread of power. In other words, if we can already determine the pattern of the spreading of power in a society, for the most part we have determined the pattern of distribution of privileges, and if we have found the cause of the occurrence of a certain distribution in the power dimension we have also discovered the causes. The distribution of the privileges associated with it.

To understand Lenski's thesis, it seems necessary to be associated with the overall G.E. approach. Lenski wants a synthesis between an individual-emphasized perspective and a societal perspective. In identifying the individual nature of G.E. Lenski argues, that although in essence the individual is a social being is not the same as saying that the individual in social life completely ignores his own interests.

On the basis of pragmatic morality, G.E. Lenski puts forward the argument that: "... If a person is confronted with decisions that force him to choose between his own interests or his group and the interests of others, he almost always chooses his own interests." The argument is actually reinforced by another proposition, that "... Most of the offerings, are rare ... ", and that everyone is not the same in his ability to

seize those opportunities. With these arguments, Lenski is willing to show that the tendency to pay attention to self-interest is very strong in society.

According to Lenski, to a society that already has more surplus, the dimension of prestige to a large extent is influenced by the dimensions of power and privilege. As long as the dimension of privilege is influenced by the dimension of power, the influence is dominated by the power dimension.

In contrast to Weber and Lenski, E.A. Ross in his study of social control suggests that the dimension of prestige has an important role in society. Those who have high prestige, will have high power as well. Robert Bierstedt adds that the prestige that is

the source of social power is very important in modern social life. But both dimensions must be seen as independent variables. Often the prestige is not accompanied by power and when both appear together the power dimension is usually the basis for the dimension of prestige, more than the opposite

#### **IV. Social Stratification and Dimension of Privilege**

The study of social stratification developed by Vincent Jeffries and H. Edward Ransford shows a somewhat other trend related to the three dimensions of social stratification. They see the dimension of social stratification in relation to the Theory of Conflict and Functional. Functional Theory experts often feature the dimension of privilege, and the power dimension is poorly cared for and tends to be ignored. Conflict theorists, on the other hand, pay particular attention to the dimensions of power. After that just pay attention to the dimension of privilege, and the last is prestige.

The pressure provided by the Functional Theory and the conflict on social stratification shows quite striking differences, as can be seen as follows. Functional theory Theory of Social Stratification: (1). Stratification is a social structure that has shared values and traditions that are used as a basis for social integration and stability. (2). The spreading of power, privilege and prestige in society is essentially fair is a necessity and useful for the welfare of the individual on the one hand and for the society on the other. (3). The use of power to maintain the existing privileges system in society is minimal. (4). The existing institutions in society contain consensus values and implement policies that promote the common good. (5). Uneven appreciation for social positions in society helps to maintain and enhance the interests of the upper layer. (6). Individual positions in society basically do not provide equal opportunities in achieving motivation, training and developmental channels for them.

From a number of theories above, it appears that G.E Lenski provides a line of relations between the three dimensions of social stratification is quite assertive. Although the pressure applied to the power dimension is in line with what is given C.W. Mills, R. Bierstedt and Conflict Theory in general, generalizations given G.E. Lenski was too bold and lacking in the possibility of social change that occurred in the development of history. Such generalizations, too, ignore the peculiar characteristics of a particular society in its distributive dynamics.

C.W. Mills and R. Bierstedt show a more open view of G.E Lenski. C.W. Mills emphasizes the importance of the power dimension, but does not construct a particular sequence as G.E. Lenski. R. Bierstedt emphasizes the importance of the dimension of power, but still sees these dimensions separately. This latter R. Bierstedt trend is in line with Weber's basic view, although he acknowledges that in the dynamics of the distributive system, the dominance of the dimensions of economic privilege will in turn show its influence

Unlike Dahrendorf and Marx, Lewis Coser came up with a 'scapegoat' theory behind a conflict. Coser formulates social conflict as: the struggle over values and claims to rare status, power and resources, in which the objective of the adversary is to neutralize, injure or remove rivals altogether.

In discussing various conflict situations, Coser distinguishes realistic conflicts from unrealistic ones. Realistic conflicts, derived from disillusionment with the special demands occurring in relationships and from the expected likelihood of the participants' profits, and which are shown on objects that are considered disappointing. Employees holding a strike against management are examples of realistic conflicts, insofar as management is powerful in terms of salary increases and other labor benefits.

On the other hand, unrealistic conflict is a conflict that does not come from antagonistic rival goals, but from the need to ease tension, at least, from one party. In an illiterate society, vengeance

through occultism is often a form of non-realistic conflict, as is the case with the frequent scapegoating in advanced societies.

In intergroup relations, scapegoating is used to describe the circumstances in which a person does not release their prejudices against a truly opponent group, and thus uses the substitute group as the object of prejudice. Strikes against employers, for example, may be hostile traits not only as a result of the tension of relationships between labors and employers, but may also be due to the inability to remove feelings of disappointment and hostility towards politicians and rulers.

The line of critical views above views the occurrence of conflicts within society due to unequal social impacts and structures in which the group of capitalists exploits the lower classes (working class). The unbalanced social conditions continue to survive because basically the class of capital owners is able to sustain the support of the state policy that has been mastered. Even law itself, in fact, owned by the owners of capital and serve as a tool to maintain power. The capital owner class also controls the bureaucratic networks of both civilian and military government

The emergence of intergroup conflicts is not the result of gratuitous structural power relations. The relationship of authority usually takes the form of a relationship between supraordinate and subordinate, top-down relationships. Every authority relationship there must be an element of supra-coordination-with command and command, warning and prohibition-controlling subordinate behavior. The division of authority is the main cause of conflicting groups. As long as the subordinate or working class group still possesses false consciousness or does not yet have a critical awareness of the class, the conflict will continue to be buried because the subordinate group has not yet had an awareness of the inequality that occurs.

In this context, Pareto confronts that history is an endless struggle for power. Dominant groups try to maintain and maintain their position; Strength is the most important factor in

maintaining stability. Violence is necessary to restore social balance if the balance is disrupted.

Gramsci proposed the importance of the role of ideology as a factor in the class struggle. In the class struggle and social change is necessary increase of ideological awareness, because the ideology of the lower classes not only embraced its own ideology, but unconsciously the ideology has been awakened by the ideology of the dominant class. The dominant culture and the upper middle classes have also shaped the culture of the working class, through school education and the various social rules prevailing in society, reflecting the strength of the dominant class. The process of ideologization among the working class will arouse class consciousness and reduce false consciousness.

Violent conflict is a reality that does not require moral justification, because violence follows the irrational and inherent nature of its nature. Violence even in some circles has become an ideology, lifestyle and culture that are difficult to separate in everyday life. Albert K. Cohen calls it a sub-culture of violence. Even according to Shaw and McKay, not infrequently the violence is inherited. But according to Tilly (et al), collective violence actually symbolizes the struggle for power, and not the result of social depravity, material misery, or irrational action

Talcott Parsons as adherents of structural-functional theory, saw somewhat differently from the critical camp above. Conflict for Parsons spelled the problem inherent in decision-making because of differences in choices, wants, and interests. The choice is dependent on the norm, the reality of thinking, and the rational and irrational argument of a person. According to Talcott Parsons, a person's decision making is influenced by various normative and situational constraints. A person will face his personal interests to achieve his goals and what alternatives will be made in achieving that goal. A person will face the circumstances affecting his decision.



Intergroup conflicts are also largely determined by the building of values and the use of different symbols between the groups, giving rise to different interpretations and flavors to be respected or appreciated. In Talcott Parsons's view, every society must be viewed in an integrative way, and the social behavior of a group is strongly influenced by values and culture. Cultural values and other patterns can animate the personality, thus affecting the structure of needs which further determines the will of a person or group in applying its social role.

In Parsons view each person or group will be confronted with dichotomous pattern variables, namely: (1). Affectivity-neutrality, (2). Extensions, (3). Universalism-particularism, (4). Accomplishment, (5). Personal-collectivity. The dichotomies are the values orientations that limit the rules of a social system and decision-making process.

Conflict between groups is often happened because of the history of competition, prejudice and hatred, whether it is personal, political, and ideological background. For example, to understand the conflict at Ruanda, one must understand how the Belgian colonial rulers had divided the Ruanda community into Tutsi and Hutu groups by having different privileges.

Conflict buildings can be created by outsiders and non-harmonious social relationships. Conflict created by outsiders in the past in Indonesia was carried out by the colonial government with an interest to be able to build hegemony over its colonies trying to build conflict between the colonies so as not to build regional unity. Disunity among people, ethnicity and religion will facilitate the intervention of power. The crown politics (*divide et impera*) is used as a tool for mastery over both spatial and primordial domains. Some of the spatial territories in the colonized countries were subdued because the primordial region of society was also intervened, for example the Padri Wars in West Sumatra, as local community leaders were intervened by the

colonial government not to establish a collective agreement in the control of influence.

Conflict, being the best-selling commodity to be exploited for a particular interest. Some areas in Indonesia are allegedly committed by various parties who want to cover up mistakes in the past. With the conflict is expected to create instability of power and a legitimate government. The indicators are that conflicts occur neatly and simultaneously, and the organizers are ensured that they have strong funds, organized networks and recognize the legal weaknesses and capabilities of the apparatus.

## V. Community Conditions and Trigger Conflicts

City conditions can also trigger conflicts. The burden of cities with the immigration of various ethnic, religious, class, and group groups can indeed create the inevitable conflict. The potential form of conflict can be a tension in the way of view, the use of symbols, and so forth. Small group entities become dominant while large group entities are a threat to the existence of small groups. Not only on the pattern of social communication, also on the pattern of settlements based out-group and in-group. This is evident in some form of housing groupings in major cities indicating the existence of social group entities based on cultural and ethnic backgrounds. In Jakarta there are Kampung Melayu, Kampung Bugis, Kampung Makasar, Kampung Jawa, Kampung Ambon, and others. In other cities there is also the naming of local areas based on ethnicity.

In a study of the city it was mentioned that the emerging cities in Indonesia, including Jakarta, were worthy of being called "big-city towns." Large villages, which characterize the reality of unplanned kampung life, the city is very difficult to control its

regularity, because Each party that exists in the government bureaucracy, is more concerned with ethnic primordial interests.

On the one hand, this increasingly larger village can not ultimately deny the arrival of the people who come from the villages (villages) around the big cities. On the other hand, the city also belongs only to the political and economic elite. The conglomerates "nurtured" by the rulers are expected to accelerate economic development by expanding the manufacturing and service industries. Conglomerates and rulers in Indonesia are like "conjoined twins" that can not be separated from one another. The conglomerates only become parasites, and increase wealth, by acquiring projects from the rulers, without going through an open competition. The pattern of trickle down effect development that is expected to grow the sector-sektor middle and lower economic, it was only part of the imagination. The lower economic group remains neglected and only a victim of urban development.

This is the case in some urban areas of Indonesia, a strong economic sector that defeats weak economic entrepreneurs-who are also commonly associated with indigenous non-indigenous businessmen (*vis a vis*) (mainly Chinese descendants). For example, street vendors are removed by giving permission to establish a magnificent supermarket. The pattern of handling informal economic issues involving lower-income people in urban areas embraces the policy of "banish and evict for the cleanliness, security, and comfort of the city". It is in this context that the emergence of tension between the two sides of the economy: the formal and the informal economy (small).

Similarly, in the process of recruitment of labor both in the government and private sector shows the process of marginalization of lower class society. The policy of "free recruitment without special privileges", is only detrimental to the local population, as the local population has limited capacity. The difficulty of the lower class population performs vertical mobility in the employment sector, resulting in building communication

between groups based on one direction (stereotype). This is what enables lower-class residents to lack a sense of belonging to local assets. The impact of the process of marginalization of the lower classes results in the strengthening of the "vis a vis poor" community grouping.

The conflict according to Dahrendorf is strongly influenced by the role of actors in organizations supported by ideologies and particular interests. Even Talcott Parsons mentions that conflicts occur because of conflicts of interest (seizure of status, power, and material) of the existing actors. The underlying assumption of the conflict, because every actor in the organization mutually seize certain goals, and the actors have a way to achieve that goal. The different actors and groups, confronted with certain situational conditions that can lead to social tension and open conflict.

- a. Conflict among actors, especially the political elite, will always occur in every society in two ways, that is related to the same conflict of interests in self-development, and opposition in the interests of the same organization to ignore other elites of different groups. The means employed in a normal society will follow the rules agreed upon in the applicable law. But the inability to adapt to the applicable law because it will fail, then done an illegal way. These illegal ways, one of which is violence as a reaction or a way of resistance.
- b. Violence done collectively will arouse fear for other groups being targeted. Members involved in collective conflict will create a new awareness, foster courage, promote solidarity. Individuals involved in the mass conflict will dissolve in a variety of behaviors in which the individual is no longer able to exercise control over himself. Gustave Le Bon mentions that the hallmark of collective movement has a very rapid contagion effect, as if the members of the movement are hypnotized, the members in it seem to lose their identity, which is the identity Group (anonymity). On the basis of all

the above theoretical statements, the author will use the framework of criminology theory in analyzing the events of conflict such as the proposed theory N.J.Smelser. According to Smelser, the occurrence of collective violence is an accumulation of several factors namely, (1). The existence of structural conditions of society that have the potential for the emergence of collective violence. (2). Structural tensions arising from the reality of community structures such as uncertainty, oppression, conflict, potential gaps for the growth of collective violence. (3). The existence of growth and dissemination of tension that occurs, to the wider circle so that the general belief, (4). The existence of trigger factors, and (5). There is mass mobilization to act anarchically. Besides, the condition of the people in conflict also analyzed with other conflict theory. Utari in the book of Flow and theory in Criminology states at least, there are four basic assumptions of commonly recognized conflict theory: (Utari 2012: 97)

- 1) Conflict is a natural thing in society;
- 2) Society tends to experience change. In every change, the role of power against other groups of people continues; there is always competition for change;
- 3) In that competition, the use of the rule of law and law enforcement has always been a tool and has an important role in society.
- 4) These assumptions cannot be separated from the number of facts that conflict theory applies to relatively general. The facts are as follows: the community consists of different groups;
- 5) There are differences of judgment in these groups about good and bad; conflicts between groups reflect political power;

- 6) Laws made for the benefit of those with political power; the main interest of the holders of political power to enforce the law is to guard and maintain its power.

The reality of society in Indonesia, at first the government declared that the problem of conflict and violence must be solved by the society itself. However, when society can no longer cope with it, while murder continues with an absurd degree of irrationality, the authorities are obliged to restore security and order there. Of course, the problem is very complex and cannot be overcome with excessive simplification. However, the complexity of the problem cannot entitle the government or anyone to continue allowing the killing. Hospital hospitals have been burned down, and the last hope for those who are seriously injured and threatened by their lives has disappeared with the smoke of fire.

There are several levels of problems there, such as political conflicts, particularly political elite conflicts, revenge between religious groups whose members have been killed, and possible conflicts arising out of the imbalance of economic mastery that surfaced as an interreligious conflict. The problems can be solved on several levels. What has not yet been resolved has to wait for time (like peace returns between family and religious communities). However, what can be solved now must be completed as soon as possible. The problem of killing is a matter that the government can handle with its repressive apparatus (and for this reason the state is authorized to monopolize the use of force). The issue of human rights cannot be a pretext that the police, with military help, do not intervene directly to stop the killings. The right of citizens to live is the first right to be defended. And if the right is threatened by others, the state is obliged to defend those who are threatened and take action against those who threaten it. This principle is so clear, although in practice it may be complicated. The enactment of a civil emergency is a very late act because the discourse developed in Jakarta does not support

the settlement. The assumption that the Ambonese people themselves must solve their problems sounds very democratic, but in fact neglect the main duty of the state as the guardian of public order and the protector of the rights to the lives of its citizens.

There are communities when there is conflict at all, both at the level of consciousness and the level of social organization. The presupposition that chaos has arisen because of provocateurs cannot be a busy political discussion. Why the fuss is precisely the shrewdness of the provocateurs and not the bitter fate of the people and society that is getting worse. This is to be a student concern incorporated in a legal clinic

## VI. Conclusion

Comprehending the form, nature, or character of crime within a community is pivotal for discerning the underlying traits of malevolence. This understanding serves as a foundation for formulating diverse policies aimed at prevention and intervention. While it is acknowledged that crime can manifest anywhere, encompassing theft, murder, torture, fraud, embezzlement, and rape, it is essential to recognize that certain forms of criminal activity find facilitation or exclusive feasibility within urban environments. It is imperative to note that the inclination toward criminal behavior is not solely attributable to an inherent predisposition for malevolence; rather, it is influenced by a complex interplay of values, circumstances, and the environment. Crime, acting as a catalyst, can set off a domino effect leading to impactful conflicts. Cultural conflicts, for instance, may escalate into broader societal antagonism, transcending various dimensions. In such instances, the creation of solidarity and cooperation becomes exceptionally challenging, often resulting in destructive dynamics among community members. Recognizing the multifaceted origins of criminal behavior allows for a more nuanced approach to policymaking. By addressing the underlying

factors that contribute to criminal tendencies, policies can be tailored to foster a more harmonious and secure community environment.

## VII. References

- Allen, N.H., 1980, *Homicide*, New York: Human Science Press.
- Anderson, Charles W, et. al, 1967, *Issues of Political Development*,
- Barnen, A, et.al, 1980, "Urban Homicide: Some Recent Development", *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol 8. No. 6, 1980.
- Blumer, H, 1957, "Collective Behavior", dalam J.B. Gitter (ed), *Review of Sociology: Analisis of Decade*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Boulding, K, 1962, *Conflict and Defence: A General Theory*, New
- Box, S, 1981, *Deviance Reality and Society*, London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Clinard, Marshall B, 1976, "Comparative Criminology and Developing Countries, In C.W.G. Jasperse, et.al, (eds), *Criminology Between The Rule of Law and The Outlaw*, Kluwer Deventer.
- Cohen, A.K, 1951, "Juvenile Delinquency and The Social Structure", Ph.D Thesis, Harvard University.
- Cohen, L.E. dan M. Felson. 1979, "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach", *American Sociological Review*, 44,588-608.
- Collins J.J, 1983, "Can Criminologists Measure Deterrence", *Security Management*, June: 73-74.
- Dahrendorf, R, 1959, *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.



- Darmaputera, Eka, 1997, *Pancasila: Identitas dan Modernitas, Tinjauan Etis dan Budaya*, Jakarta: BPK. Gunung Mulia.
- Granovetter, M, 1978, "Threshold Models of Colective Behavior", *American Journal of Sociology*. 96:1117-1150.
- Habermas, Jurgen, 1984, *The Theory of Communicative Action, Reason, and Rationazation of Society*, Vol.1 Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hardiman, F. Budi, 1993, *Menuju Masyarakat Komunikatif*, Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Hardin, R, 1982, *Collective Action*, Baltimor: Johns Hopkins University.
- Hirschi, T, 1969, *Causes of Delinquency*, Berkely: University of California Press.
- Kitsuse, J.I, 1962, "Societal Reaction to Deviant Behavior: Problem of Theory and Method", *Social Problem*. 11:131-139.
- Kriesberg, L, 1973, *The Sociology of Social Conflict*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kusumah, M.W, 1982, *Analisis Kriminologi Tentang Kejahatan-kejahatan Kekerasan*, Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Kusumah, M.W, 1981, *Aneka Permasalahan Dalam Ruang Lingkup Kriminologi*, Bandung: Alumni.
- Lang, K, and G.E. Lang, 1961, *Collective Dinamics*, New York: Crowell.
- Lang, K, and G.E. Lang, 1968, "Collective Behavior", *International Encyclopedia of The Social Science*, Crowell Collier & Macmillan, Inc.
- Lemert, E.M, 1951, *Social Pathology*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mannheim, H. 1965, *Comparative Criminology*, Vol.2. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Mayer, E.K, 1983, "Violence" dalam Stanford H. Kadish (ed), *Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice*, Vol. 4, New York: The Free Press.

- Muller E.N. & K.Opp, 1986, "Rational Choice and Rebellious Collective Action", *American Political Science Review*, 80: 471-487.
- Nisbet, R.A, 1961, "The Study of Social Problem", in R.K. Merton
- Olson, M, *The Logic of Collective Action*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Parsons Talcott, 1951, *The Social System*, New York: The Free Press.
- Quinney, R, 1974, *Criminology: Analysis and Critique of Crime in The*
- R.A. Nisbet, *Contemporary Social Problems*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Raharjo, M. Dawam, 1981, "Pembangunan dan Kekerasan Struktural", *Prisma*, 3 (1981).
- Roche, de la R, 1996, "Collective Violence as Social Control", *Sociological Forum*, Vol. 11. No. 1, hal. 97-123.
- Rule, J.B, 1988, *Theories of Civil Violence*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Short Jr, J.F, 1974, "Collective Behavior, Crime, and Delinquency", In Daniel Glaser (ed), *Handbook of Criminology*, Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co, hal 403-449.
- Smelser, N.J, 1962, *Theory of Collective Behavior*, New York: The Free Press.
- Steeman, T.M, 1973, "Religious Pluralism and National Integration", Ph.D Disertation, Harvard University.
- Sutherland, E.H, 1947, *Principles of Criminology*, Philadelphia: J.B.
- Tannenbaum, F, 1938, *Crime and The Criminology*, Boston: Ginn.
- Tanya, B.L. 2001, "Meretas Konsep Integrasi Nasional", Makalah pada Dialog Antar-Generasi, yang diselenggarakan oleh KNPI Jawa Timu dan Bali di Surabaya 20 Oktober 2001.

- Tilly, C, 1966, *From Mobilization to Revolution*, New York: Random House.
- Turner, R.H, dan L.M. Killian, *Collective Behavior*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Utari, Indah Sri, 2012 *Aliran dan Teori dalam Kriminologi*, Yogyakarta: Thafa Media
- Weber, Max, 1977, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wolfgang, M.E, et. al, 1970, *The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wolfgang, M.E, and F. Ferracuti, 1967, *The Sub-Culture of Violence: Toward an Integrated Theory in Criminology*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

### **Acknowledgment**

The earlier version of this paper was presented at the International Conference on Clinical Legal Education (ICCLE) held by the Faculty of Law, Universitas Negeri Semarang (UNNES), Indonesia. The conference held in cooperation between the Faculty of Law Universitas Negeri Semarang, Law Clinics, Bridges Across Borders South East Asia Community Legal Education (BABSEACLE), and Indonesian Clinical Legal Education Associations, May 20-21, 2017.

### **Funding Information**

None

### **Conflicting Interest Statement**

There is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

### **Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement**

All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.