

THREAT OF MASS VIOLENCE AND COLLECTIVE VIOLENCE AGAINST SOCIAL ORDER AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION

Indah Sri Utari

ABSTRACT

Mob violence in various regions, has resulted in socio-juridical pretty basic. Various agencies of social control, both formal and informal, are not able to reduce the incidence of these events frequency mass violence which over time tends to increase, has caused unrest and tension in society. Any disruption directly addressed violence. Anomistic situation ensued. People are so easy to "vigilante", so casually breaking the law, even feel safe wearing his own way. Acts of mass violence against the perpetrators of the theft, for example, from year to year an increase in the frequency of violence committed Surakarta and surrounding residents. In the period of 2012, there were five (5) events with three (3) dead and two (2) major injuries. In 2013, only 11 (eleven) cases, with three (3) dead and eight (8) major injuries. Whereas in 2016, going on 16 (sixteen) cases, with four (4) deaths and twelve (12) people were seriously injured (Suara Merdeka 2016). At the level of discourse, the argument that mass violence is merely a result of the euphoria of freedom. Citizens are considered impatient, disoriented, and less lawless. The roots of the violence lie in the self as individual citizens. But is it really? Observing the diversity of the mass violence that occurs, the following scale and the motive, apparently associated with the mass violence experienced structural mess our society today. Not only at the level of values and norms, but also on the dimensions of the structure (of authority) and the allocation of shared resources.

Key word : Mass Violence, Collective violence, social disintegration, sosial order

A. INTRODUCTION

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. The second form of vertical conflict, specifically between society and state-is characterized by mass anger towards state apparatus and institutions

"Collective violence" or "mass violence", there are a number of theories that deal with it. Charles Tilly (1976), defined collective violence, as forms of violence and the threat of violence by a group of people who were involved in a crowd, and to the goods found nearby. R Roberta Senechal de la Roche, sees collective violence as a self-help in social control (Roche, 1998: 97-123). Short and Wolfgang (1972), revealed that collective violence is related to social problems faced by the community concerned.

In explaining the collective (collective) action, Smelser mentioned the six deciding factors. Every factor, if it does not involve the next factor will not give birth to collective violence (Smelser, 1962: 15-17). The six factors are: (1). Structural conducting (structural conducting), which is the condition of society that has the 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 to public trust, and then identified sources of tension as well as ways to overcome those tensions. (4). Precipitating factors are situational factors that emphasize structural drivers, struktural 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.

The leadership role of mobilizing people and mobilizing collectivities is important. (6). Weak social figures are respected. Tilly categorizes collective violence in three forms (Moyer, 1983: 1619-1620). First, the primitive collective violence is the act of violence committed by a group of people who are not political and broad in scope are limited to local communi- ties only. Acts of violence that usually arise are the brawl, violence perpetrated by a group of vigilante groups, violence in the form of vigilante by a group of people, interactions of mutual hatred between different groups. Violence as a fun activity (for fun) can also be categorized in this category, especially the actions of teenagers who are usually in the influence of alcohol destruction bar, vandalism, and attack the opponent with armed groups.

Second, reactionary collective violence is the violence of a group of people who violently protest against the ways in which power holders perform their duties. In contrast to primitive violence, accounting violence is a form of criticism and resistance to systems, while primitives are intergroup competition. Third, modern collective violence, having clear and organized goals for political and economic purposes, such as violent strikes, the taking of legitimate power, guerrilla warfare, terrorism and so on.

As for the cause of someone joining in collective violence, driven by various causes. According to M. Olson (1965), a person joins in collective action with rational considerations, ie when there are selective and separate incentives. Involvement of people in collective violence is not always based on self-interest calculations as suggested by Olson. It is also based on a rational calculation of collective interests. Such as fighting for political interests that are sometimes done through social unrest (Rogowski, 1974).

De Nardo (1985) identifies real community demands posed by perpetrators of violence as an attempt to gain broad concessions from the government as well as some of the government's tendency to change policy to avoid violence and unrest. Granovetter (1978: 44) says a person's decision to engage in collective action is based on the consideration of how many others are already involved in the collective action. In this connection, each individual has a threshold of the number of others who have been involved in collective action on a varied basis.

To analyze the phenomenon of mass violence as a social problem, it takes a kind of comprehensive analysis building. According to Nisbet, all social problems, possessing general elements. The elements are the existence of a number of structural factors that hook and complex (Nisbet, 1961: 3). As a social issue, mass violence is not adequately assessed by 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 (1938), by only looking for problems in individuals, it would tend to excessively look for 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 give birth to "dramatization of evil" which can actually reinforce the tendency of deviance (Tannenbaum, *Ibid*). Kingsley Davis calls this tendency an evil cause-evil fallacy-which he claims is neither objective nor desirable (Kohen 1951: 5-13).

On the basis of that consideration, the framework of Ian Taylor et al, (1973) will be used as a building analysis in this study. According to them, a new approach in research effort and a scientific understanding of crime, it is necessary to express 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.

Legal institutions as the "rule of the game" formal and applies to everyone, is currently experiencing a crisis of authority. So many offenders (both individual and collective) are not subject to legal sanctions. There are rules but rarely enforced it tends to favoritism, no courts but often a nest of mafia-sale decision, and there is often a difficult decision but the judge executed. Consequently, there is no certainty that the law is truly objective norms that apply to all. There is no assurance that the process through the courts produce truth and justice. That is why, difficult to ascertain that the person who is found guilty, should always be punished. In fact there is a tendency to discriminatory treatment between the perpetrators of the crime of ordinary citizens and the economically weak with perpetrators of crimes categorized as a strong economy, government officials, and even the perpetrators of environmental law enforcement officers themselves. As a result of further emerging collective disappointment against legal institutions. People lose motivation to obey the law. Society tends to not believe in the legal process, are not sure to get justice through the law, and appeared permissiveness of violations (Tanya, 2014: 5-6).

B. ROOTS OF CRIME or VIOLENCE (MASS)

The root of evil, explained by looking at the structural conditions present in society and placing it in the context of inequality and injustice, and its relation to economic and political change in society. Strain Theory (the theory of tension or frustration) believes that, under certain social conditions, traditional social norms and rules lose their authority over one's behavior (Emile Durkheim). Mass violence in the context of structural tension can also be seen as a social conflict. In this connection, the conflict is no less than one form of competition from parties who each recognize that they have objectives that are incompatible with each other (Boulding, 1962).

Structural strains, a condition of tension caused by the reality of community structures such as uncertainty, oppression, conflict, potential disparities for the growth of collective violence. David M. Gordon, points out that the basic structure of social and economic institutions in society, fundamentally shapes behavior in society. Therefore, violence can not be understood without first knowing the institutional formulated structures of opportunity in which members of certain economic groups are confined. (29).

In societies where competition forms underlying economic and social interactions, there is an inequality in the allocation of economic and social resources. The fear of economic insecurity as well as the impetus for competition to acquire unequally distributed assets will result in crimes that are rational responses to the structure underlying the society. In other words, in the case of such a large gap between the purpose and the way of achieving it, one tends to pursue unlawful channels by violating existing laws, norms and regulations (Merton). It is clear to Gordon that crime is a perpetrator's attempt to survive in a certain economic situation that is formed in a particular social order. Patterns of socio-economic relationships that characterize dominance and injustice can give rise to criminal attitudes and behavior (Kusumah 1982: 30).

C. THE ORIGINATOR OF VIOLENCE

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.

If the hostile factor is formed for the possibility of violence, then for the realization of the violence, stay waiting for the trigger factor and opportunity. This triggering factor is preceded by the spreading of general belief, which is something that shows the source of tension, recognizes some of the characteristics of the source, and specifies a possible and appropriate response to tension (Smelser 1992: 16). There are several potential factors that trigger mass violence, such as feelings of threat and frustration, support or provocation of others, violent stimulus cues, opportunities, target characteristics, and victim factors themselves. Person threatened to make someone so sensitive to any stimulus from the outside. People who feel threatened are always in a state of alert and just in case. As a result, he perceives stimulus bias or excessive. Almost every stimulus is interpreted as a threat so the reaction is so instinctive and aggressive. Likewise when people are in a state of frustration, due to the unfulfilled wishes and expectations. In a state of frustration, the person acts not according to common sense, but the emotion so that his reaction is an emotional reaction

Support or provocation, triggers aggression because the offender gets encouragement, support, justification, and additional courage from others. Although at first there was a desire to engage in violence, the perpetrator dared not express his violence for fear or uncertainty of his actions. However, because there are others who provide support or provocation, then the courage to violence increases. Mobilization or mobilization of the masses is the mobilization of various resources owned by a crowd to take collective action. Without this mobilization capability, the crowd will not generate mass violence.

Crowds have their own souls. Some symptoms in a person when in the crowd (Mannheim, 1965: 645-646).

- a. By joining a crowd, a person undergoes a psychological change in the way of thinking, how to feel, and how to act.
- b. The change concerns the blurring of normative orientation and thus the loss of good values.
- c. The circumstances result in a total loss of personal responsibility for his actions, and on the other hand uncritically receiving instinctive encouragement.
- d. Therefore, there is a sense of security and unity of purpose amongst the crowd at a level impossible to achieve under normal circumstances outside the crowd when a number of people act together. The collective action in the crowd is sudden, unreasonable, and unpredictable, so unpredictable and dangerous.

According to Mannheim, these can be explained as a result of the psychological power of suggestion, transmission, imitation (Mannheim, Ibid: 646). Thus, the state of the crowd affects a person who can produce certain effects, including irrational attitudes. A situation system that controls a person's behavior in a crowd, has very situational demands and expectations that often do not refer to the existing norm system. And thus, the prevailing general rules are ignored. In any way, official sanctions are conventionally recognized, so they are not considered-as opposed to profound sentiments or perceptions of the reality of those who in their actions produce agitation. They deviate from the plot they normally follow and remain agitated (Lang & Lang, 1968: 556).

In the episode of collective violence when its participation loses the guideline to act temporarily, it can be specified that there is a condition which is a structural condusiveness, ie a state to accept the forms of collective action and not other forms (Smelser 1962: 15-17). In addition there is also structural tension, ie the mismatch of relations between the components of the action, and as a result is the inadequate functioning of the component of action (Ibid: 47).

Mass violence against criminals is more concentrated on time and place. That is why he is an active crowd. That is, actively identifying a target or a set of objectives outside of themselves and taking direct action directed towards that goal. This expressive crowd has the same deciding factor, social unrest and frustration. Therefore, members of the crowd release the tension that has accumulated through various means, including violence (Turner, 1980). In regard to this "coercion" level, its participation feels merely a collective representation. They act not for themselves, but merely for the good of the group they represent. That is why they tend to be more radical (Coser, 1956).

Violent stimulus cues also trigger violence because the offender is equipped by a stimulus that supports the aggression. For example, the existence of weapons, both sharp weapons and other objects that can be used and available there. When the offender is near a weapon, his aggression rate increases compared to if he does not have weapons (Berkowitz 1984). This is possible because in addition to the perpetrators get additional strength, also because there is a push to try the strength and usefulness of the weapon.

The target characteristic (victim) triggers aggression, because the perpetrator will choose the target or the victim. The offender tends to choose the target that the enemy sees. In this stage, it usually appears "hearsay". The rumor can bind the people concerned with the news to determine who the friend is and who the opponent is. In this connection, there are two important conditions for the occurrence of attachment. First, hearsay is binding, if a group of people have the same motivation to act but each is reluctant to do it alone. Second, hearsay is binding if the situation confronts the need for joint action from the participants (Turner 1980: 843).

Factors that trigger violence, can also be a sense of hostility that was originally only on the level of "perceived conflict" to "actual conflict". The actual forms of this conflict, for example, are manifested in the actions of one mass group

identifying the alleged perpetrators as criminals. The action then spread to the public as a rumor, and after rumors were realized as a reality, then this situation will then involve more and more citizens engaged in mass violence.

The victim factor is also often the trigger of violence. The presumption that the overwhelming majority of the violence is an attack the citizens take against the victims is not entirely true. Provocation by the victim is another way of behavior that helps increase the anger of the perpetrators (Schepard, 1971: 12-19). The victims' social relationships in the mass violence that show the high victim precipitated criminal homicide, suggest that the victims are seen as an integral part of the situations of violence (Wolfgang, 1970: 269-578). The opportunity factor, also the originator of violence. Opportunity, is a circumstance that facilitates the occurrence of such violence. These circumstances include physical meetings, mobilization of participation, and lack of formal and non-formal control.

D. SOCIAL DYNAMICS BEHIND VIOLENCE

Social dynamics is a response, reaction, and embodiment of structural demands and basically evil is chosen as a way of solving problems. This is called a structural driver. Structural conducting (structural conducting), ie community structural conditions that have potential for the emergence of acts of violence, including mass violence.

Soerjono Soekanto, put forward five causes of violent crime, namely: material orientation that causes the desire to get the material with easy way, the absence of the distribution of the will, the courage to take risks, lack of guilt, and exemplary unfavorable (Soekanto, 1981). M. Judging from criminology, violence can be explained by looking at the culture and structures that exist in society. The cultural resources of mass violence lie in the espousing of violent sub-cultures which, among other things, are norms and values that support violence.

Wolfgang and F. Ferracuti (1967) argue that violent crime is an integral part of the violent sub-culture. A person who in his or her experience of life often encounters an attitude of aggressiveness reinforced by the norms of the violent sub-culture, will encourage the actuality of the potential for committing violent crime. Our society is experiencing a value crisis. The old norm is set aside, while the new norm does not fill that void. There is a tendency in which citizens are perceived to have "some sort of arbitrary right to act unlawfully to their actions". Such circumstances, an individual's reaction to abnormal circumstances. There are various kinds of abnormal circumstances that can cause such an effect. Abnormal circumstances not only provide opportunities for the development of lawlessness, but even also lead people to behave abnormally.

In an unhealthy society, society itself can be a major cause of crime. Erich Fromm, reveals that, unsupported by fertile soil, sufficient water, and a suitable climate, a seed will rot and die. Likewise man, will be transformed into a vicious creature-deviate from his sacred nature-if he lives in a "world" whose social, political, economic, and cultural conditions do not allow him to develop his human potentials.

E. SOCIAL REACTIONS AND RESPONSES ACTORS

According to the Theory of Social Control, criminal behavior is the failure of conventional social groups such as family, school, role model, peers develop a sense of affection, commitment, order and trust to bind individuals from committing crime. The pressure of this theory lies in environmental factors such as family, school, peers, and role models in developing a sense of affection, commitment, order, and trust in a person. Failure of all institutions, will affect a person's behavior to behave unnaturally.

Weak social control is also a factor that opens opportunities for violence. Hirshi (1969), Cohen & Felson (1979) states that crime tends to arise when social control, especially formal social control is weak and if the perpetrator's routine activities allow for a chance of committing a crime. Thus, the role of formal (and informal) social governance arrangements is important for crime avoidance. Collins, in its crime prevention efforts, should pay special attention to the feeling of increased risk of being detected by violation of the law. If the real risk is detected low, it is ineffective even counterproductive "(Collins, 1983: 74). Cohen and James Short performed the delinkuen sub delin culture as follows: (Utari 2012 : 48)

- (a) *A parent male sub-culture the negativistic sub culture originally identified to delinquent boys ;*
- (b) *The conflict-oriented sub-culture the culture of a large gang that engages in collective violence ;*
- (c) *The drug addict sub-culture groups of youth whose lives revolve around the purchase sale, use of narcotics ;*
- (d) *Semi profesional theft-youths who engage in the theft or robbery of merchandise for the purpose of later sale and monetary gain ; and*
- (e) *Middle-class sub-culture-delinquent group that rise, because of the pressures of living in middle-class environments.*

In a society that greatly values obedience, especially compliance with the local order, but is always undermined by the threat of evil, this contradiction will be so confusing that some will resort to violent means to eliminate the threat. According to learning theory, one does not need to learn from one's own experience, but simply learns from others' experiences. Because other people (perpetrators) are not punished, it gets rewards from the people or groups, so people are not afraid to engage in crime.

Often the development of violent sub-culture is supported by social reactions to it, both from the public and from those who have a monopoly over legitimate violence such as law enforcement. In many cases, for example, it is not uncommon to find out about arbitrary abuse and shooting by officials. This is a manifestation of legitimate violence against illegal violence.

The development of norms that allow and support violence, will be more vibrant if added by organizing the structures in society. Forms of political repression such as bombing and kidnapping, for example, can condition the birth of violence as an attempt to defend themselves. For, to some degree, violence is a response that can arise to feelings of helplessness and hopelessness. Desperate people tend to unconsciously choose collective violence because the violence has a direct impact on the wider environment

G. SOCIAL DISINTEGRATION

Before discussing the issue of social disintegration, first talk about integration. About social intergreation, Steeman (1973: 15) says, "what formally constitutes a society is a public acceptance by all members of a society against a normative pattern of behavior. This normative pattern of behavior is what we should view as The most essential element of the phenomenon of society as an integrated structure ". Clearly, a society can function only when its members are willing to integrate themselves under a normative pattern of behavior. Or in other words, coexisting is possible only when members of the community are willing to abide by and follow the prescribed "rules of the game." But social integration requires more than just "rules of the game" per se. He also needs some kind of view or orientation of shared meanings. Therefore, every action is conscious or not, always based on the awareness of "meaning", that is what is believed as something that must be and at the same time considered noble enough to be considered and demand the loyalty and obedience of the community (Darmaputera, 1997: 8). According to Weber (1977: 88), human life and all its actions are actually marked by an ongoing quest for "meaning

Therefore, society requires not only the integration of norms (which govern the behavior, but also the integration of values, namely the shared conception of the understanding of living together, how to live together, and the basic commitment that leads to the organization of common life (Steeman, Ibid: 19) This is the requirement for a social integration (Steeman, Ibid: 16) .The norm and value agreement is the "spirit" of the world of life which guarantees the reproduction process of all elements of the life of the society in question Why, Reproduction of the world of life, as Habermas (1984) understands is no less than a basis for a society to maintain its survival and identity.The process includes three functions of society: cultural reproduction, social integration and socialization (Habermas 1984: 142) Cultural reproduction is the processes that ensure the continuity of tradition and the coherence of knowledge pr Daily acts. The existence of such continuity and coherence is characterized by a rationality of knowledge that is considered valid because it is achieved through the consensus of values and norms. The social integration of the living world is the processes that nurture the coordination of social actions by organizing interpersonal relationships to stabilize group identity. Coordination and stabilization can be measured by solidarity among citizens. While socialization in the world of life is a process that connects each group in society to achieve general competences for their actions so as to create harmony between individual life and the form of group life. This competence is measured by the personal responsibility (Hardiman, 1993)

Disruption to the world of life according to Habermas, will give birth to pathologies that cover the three areas of reproduction. If cultural reproduction is disturbed, then give birth: (1) cultural crisis in the form of loss of meaning. (2) social crisis in the form of crisis of legitimacy; And, (3) an identity crisis in the form of disorientation. If social integration is disrupted, it will produce: (1) cultural crisis in the form of a sense of uncertainty about collective identity; (2) social crisis in the form of anomies; (3) and personality crisis in the form of alienation. Whereas if the socialization area is disturbed, then it will happen: (1) cultural crisis in the form of disconnection with tradition; (2) social crisis in the form of crisis of motivation; (3) and personality crisis in the form of psychopathology (Habermas, Op.Cit: 140-143). According to Charles W. Anderson, all "Third World" societies typically face three common problems. (1). The problem of national integration is above the sub-national loyalty divisions, (2). Problems of orderliness and political stability, and (3). The problem of creating an appropriate "ideology" capable of bringing the whole people together into a developed and civilized society (Anderson et al. 1967). In summary, the three problems are: the issue of nation building, the problem of political stability, and the issue of economic development. For us, Indonesia, the three problems are constructed thus: The problem of "nation building", is a problem related to the past heritage, namely the problem of cultural pluralism (racial, linguistic, ethnic, religious, etc.). The problem of "political stability", is a matter related to today's reality, the threat of political conflict. The problem of "economic development", is a matter related to the hope of the future, that is a just society, prosperous, and civilized (Darmaputera, Op.Cit: 9

H. Epilogue

The problem of tension and conflict between the poles of crime poses a potential threat to the intergration. To be more clear, the author will review this issue from the opposite point of departure, that is, the potential disintegration perspective in a society. In accordance with the basic scheme of "system theory" (Parsons,), there can be four potential disintegrations in a society.

The first, is on the cultural dimension. Here, disintegration occurs because there is no agreement or lack of agreement on basic assumptions (shared values) among citizens. This is called value disintegration. Apparently, many of the primordial differences that now surface, reflecting this dimension. A lack of basic agreement has also resulted in a lack of possibilities for building a cohesive political entity.

The second, is the disintegration of the norm, namely: when there is disagreement about the "rules of the game" among groups of people-when each group maintains its own rules of the game. The third, is the disintegration of structures, namely the conflicts over who has control over the decision-making institutions concerning the fate of all elements of the nation. Fourth, the problem arises from the lack of agreement on how shared resources are allocated equitably between communities

The four disintegration potentials are interrelated, one affecting the other. Conflicts at the cultural (primordial) level, for example, will have an impact on other fields and can develop towards a comprehensive antagonism in society. And the conflict that encompasses all of the four dimensions, will have far more consequences than the "partial" conflict. In such circumstances, solidarity and cooperation are very difficult to create, if not said to destroy each other. 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)

Bibliography

- Allen, N.H., 1980, *Homicide*, New York: Human Science Press.
- Anderson, Charles W, et. al, 1967, *Issues of Political Development*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Barnes, 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, hal. 127-158.
- Boulding, K, 1962, *Conflict and Defence: A General Theory*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Box, S, 1981, *Deviance Reality and Society*, London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Clinard, Marshall B, 1976, "Comparative Criminology and Developing Countries, dalam C.W.G. Jasperse, et.al, (eds), *Criminology Between The Rule of Law and The Outlaw*, Cluwer 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", dalam *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: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Kusumah, M.W, 1981, *Aneka Permasalahan Dalam Ruang Lingkup Kriminologi*, Bandung: Alumni.
- , 1982, *Analisis Kriminologi Tentang Kejahatan-kejahatan Kekerasan*, Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Lang, K, and G.E. Lang, 1961, *Collective Dynamics*, New York: Crowell.
- , 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", dalam R.K. Merton & R.A. Nisbet, *Contemporary Social Problems*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- 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 US*, Boston: Little Brown.

- Raharjo, M. Dawam, 1981, "Pembangunan dan Kekerasan Struktural", *Prisma*, 3 Maret, 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", dalam 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. Lippincott Company.
- 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, and F. Ferracuti, 1967, *The Sub-Culture of Violence: Toward an Integrated Theory in Criminology*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- *et. al*, 1970, *The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Indah Sri Utari
Faculty of Law Semarang State University
indahsuji@gmail.com