

The Utilitarianism Perspective in A Life of Harmony to Reduce Mass Violence

Zainal Fadri

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Batusangkar
zainalfadri@iainbatusangkar.ac.id

Abstract. *This study aims to describe the consequences between utilitarianism and the concept of Indonesian unity as contained in the fifth principle of Pancasila. The formulation of this conception is an effort to overcome the problem of violence in society which is increasing every year. This research is also expected to provide another view in overcoming the problem of violence in society starting from the root of the problem and finally finding a formulation to overcome the problem. The method used in this study is a qualitative method by extracting data using literacy tracing. The data found are then classified and reformulated into a synthesis to answer the problems in the research. Data analysis and data validity were carried out using comparative and semiotic approaches. The results of this study indicate that there is a consequence in the understanding of utilitarianism in determining shared happiness so as to create a peaceful unity and far from conflict. The problem of community violence can be overcome with the concept of unity which has become the main value in the life of the community itself.*

Keyword: violence; mass; utilitarianism; unity

Abstrak. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk memberi gambaran konsekuensi antara pemikiran utilitarianisme dengan konsep persatuan Indonesia yang tertuang dalam sila kelima pancasila. Perumusan konsepsi ini menjadi sebuah upaya dalam mengatasi persoalan kekerasan dalam masyarakat yang mengalami peningkatan setiap tahun. Penelitian ini juga diharapkan dapat memberikan pandangan lain untuk mengatasi persoalan kekerasan dalam masyarakat dimulai dari akar persoalan dan akhirnya menemukan formulasi untuk mengatasi persoalan tersebut. Metode yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah metode kualitatif dengan penggalan data menggunakan penelusuran literasi. Data yang ditemukan kemudian dilakukan klasifikasi dan dirumuskan kembali menjadi sintesis untuk menjawab persoalan dalam penelitian. analisis data dan keabsahan data dilakukan dengan pendekatan komparasi dan semiotika. Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan adanya sebuah konsekuensi dalam pemahaman utilitarianisme dalam menentukan kebahagiaan bersama sehingga mewujudkan suatu persatuan yang damai dan jauh dari konflik. Persoalan kekerasan masyarakat dapat diatasi dengan konsep persatuan yang sudah menjadi nilai pokok dalam kehidupan masyarakat itu sendiri.

Kata Kunci: kekerasan; masyarakat; utilitarianisme; persatuan.

INTRODUCTION

Today the word "mass judgment" is no longer infrequently encountered in everyday life, both mass media and electronic media. Mass judgments are often triggered because there is a problem that worries the community and must be followed up in a short time. However, mass judgments are often triggered by misunderstandings between victims and perpetrators of judgment who take a short solution without considering the impact on the victims themselves.

What the masses do in the judgment of the masses seems utterly astonishing, irrational, and unusual when reasoned with normal reason. People who are known to be friendly and friendly seem to have turned cruel and punitive. They seem fierce, aggressive, cruel, and unstoppable.

Theoretically, beating and judging by the masses against people who are perceived as criminals are included in the category of collective violence. Collective violence is behavior that is carried out by a group or group of people with the intention of injuring, injuring, and endangering the life, body and property of others. According to Smelser (1979) violence is basically intended to achieve or otherwise prevent certain social changes. If this definition is used to define the case in this study, it can be said that the purpose of mass judgment is to punish others who are perceived as criminals, so that social change occurs, namely reducing crime and creating a sense of security in society (Abidin, 2005: 5).

Cases of violence that occur today as an example of mass judgments must receive special attention. Along the way, there were many people who looked at the event. The mass judgment in the end reaped the pros and cons of various parties. From the pros, they said that if criminal cases were left without any deterrent punishment, of course they would not be able to be resolved because the perpetrators felt safe and carried out activities that violated the agreed rules. However, on the contrary, it emphasizes more on the human rights of every human being. Other humans have no right to judge other human beings just because of mistakes or breaches of agreement, let alone to carry out mass judgments that might endanger the lives of the perpetrators of crime. From this problem, utilitarianism tries to look at the problem of mass judgment in the hope that it can be understood that the actions taken are in accordance with nature and long-term mutual benefit. In addition to utilitarianism, addressing the issue of mass judgment, it will also be

juxtaposed with one of the nation's ideals contained in the Pancasila precepts, namely the unity of Indonesia.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

John Stuart Mill states that there are two sources of utilitarianism. First, the normative basis means that an action is considered right if it intends to seek happiness or avoid painful things, and bad if it intends to cause painful or unpleasant things. Second, the basis of Psychology, meaning in human nature, stems from his belief that most, and possibly all, people have a basic desire to unite in harmony with their fellow human beings.

Utilitarianism uses utility or the greatest happiness as the basis of morality. The basis states that an action is right if it tends to increase happiness or wrong if it tends to cause harm. So an action is good only if it maximizes human happiness and the end result of an action is far more important than the motivation behind it. That is, forgive lies when it has sufficient benefit (usefulness) to help people more than harm them. Thus, for example, stealing is morally acceptable, if stealing is for feeding hungry children.

Because the goal of human action and the standard of morality is to live free from sorrow, and to be as rich as possible in pleasure, both in quality and quantity. For Mill virtue is not the opposite of happiness. Virtue is one of the elements that make you happy. More than that, Mill continued, the benchmark for the morality of the happiness of the utilitarians is not the happiness of the perpetrators alone, but for the happiness of all. Perhaps the question will arise: what can move me to sacrifice for the happiness of others? To answer this question, Mill uses a psychological theory of association: As long as people get used to associating their own happiness with the happiness of the whole community, then the motivation to seek their own happiness will also encourage them to strive for the happiness of society (Suseno, 1998: 174).

For Mill happiness is divided into six dispositions, namely: First, both in the field of thought and work, there are happy and difficult consequences. The only thing desired is pleasure, as a logical consequence. Second, from a psychological point of view, wherever humans are, whatever they do, it is their nature, humans always desire/want pleasure. Third, between the pleasures themselves the quality is not the same. Of course, people will choose the type of pleasure that they think is better and more suitable for them. Fourth, the pleasure itself can be felt by many people. If there are other things that are needed apart from pleasure, then these other things are nothing more than a complement to the pleasure itself. Fifth, if there are two types of pleasure that

are considered equal, then the criteria for choosing which one of them is the best, then the one that gives the longest impression, the one that can be enjoyed the longest without relating the assessment to the cost. Sixth, that pleasure is something that is most appropriate for someone who has worked, has tried and has struggled in his life.

Utilitarianism expresses a critical and rational moral appreciation. It is not recognized that there are actions which in themselves are obligatory or forbidden. In itself all actions are considered neutral. What gives moral value to these actions is their purpose and consequences as far as can be calculated beforehand. For example, in terms of sex outside of marriage. A utilitarian will not accept that it simply cannot be. He will demand that he be given reasonable reasons by considering the good and bad consequences of sex outside of marriage, then he will give an assessment of whether it is permissible or not (Suseno, 2002: 124).

In general, John Stuart Mill's utilitarian ethics differed from his predecessors Jeremy Bentham, namely: first, Mill did not only distinguish pleasure according to its quantity, but also according to its nature. This characteristic does not only concern additional circumstances, such as expensive, valuable, etc., but also especially those which are essential; One pleasure is actually more valuable than the other pleasures. In a sense Mill considers that pleasures have levels of quality, because there are pleasures that are higher in quality and some are lower. Human pleasures must be higher than animal pleasures, strictly speaking the pleasures of people like Socrates are superior to those of fools. While Bentham stated that attachment is essentially the same, the only aspect that differs is its quantity. Not only the greatest number but also the greatest happiness can be taken into account (Bertens, 2000: 249-248).

Second, Mill puts forward social character. This means that the happiness that becomes the ethical norm is the happiness of all those involved in an event, not the happiness of only one person who may act as the main actor. The king and a vassal in this case should be required equally. One person's happiness should never be considered more important than the happiness of another. In Mill's own words; everybody to count for one, nobody to count for more than one. An action is considered good, if happiness exceeds unhappiness, where the happiness of everyone involved is calculated in the same way (Bertens, 2000: 250).

From the conception of thinking as above, then as a moral principle, Utilitarianism contains several fundamental weaknesses. First, overemphasizing usefulness, the benefits of profit, as a criterion for judging good and bad deeds. The question arises "useful for who?" Because usability, benefit, benefit always relate to the affected person. Whereas people's views about what is useful, useful, profitable are very subjective and different. Moreover, the principle of utility does not give any guarantee that happiness is shared equally. If in a society the largest majority live in prosperity and prosperity and there is only a small minority who are all poor and experience various kinds of shortcomings, according to utilitarianism from an ethical point of view, society is well regulated, because pleasure exceeds displeasure (Bertens, 2000: 252).

Third, Utilitarianism is very concerned with consequences and not the nature of actions. This causes in the name of Utilitarianism, people do not need to be busy thinking about nature, but what the consequences are for our lives. So in practice Utilitarianism is easy to override the basic human and ethical facts involved by action. The reason is clear because these basic human and ethical facts directly reveal their uselessness, disuse, and loss. In the name of profit, Utilitarianism will calmly violate human rights such as property rights.

Fourth, Utilitarianism encourages the growth of an instant, immediate, and short-sighted mentality. Trapped on the paradigm of usefulness, benefits and profits to meet the needs. It is possible to wear it to justify acts that according to public opinion are selfish, even immoral (Bertens, 2000: 229-230).

There are very positive things from Utilitarianism ethics behind, First, Rationality. An action is chosen, or in turn is considered good, because that action will bring more good results than the action. Here is a balance sheet. Thus, within the framework of decision making, especially in this case in the business sector, he provides opportunities for debate, argumentation and discussion in the context of calculating the benefits or surplus value that will be obtained by a particular action or policy. He does not just impose certain actions for the sake of that action, but for rational reasons. Second, Universality. The effect or surplus value to be achieved is measured based on the number of people who benefit from the surplus value. Utilitarian ethics prioritizes actions or policies that prioritize the interests of many people over the interests of a few people (Bertens, 2000: 78). Third, Happiness, which is the benchmark of utilitarianism regarding the right and wrong of human

behavior, is not the happiness of the perpetrator himself, but the happiness of all the people concerned. Utilitarianism demands that actors act impartially, as positive and selfless observers, in choosing between their own happiness and the happiness of others (Suseno, 2003: 182).

Meaning of Sila Persatuan Indonesia

Unity morphologically means a result of action (noun). Viewed from the dynamic point of view, unity is a dynamic process, Indonesia is a quantity, namely unity for the region, nation and state of Indonesia. The precepts above underlie and animate the following precepts. The precepts of Pancasila are a unity that can not be separated from consequences. The precepts of Indonesian unity are based on and inspired by the precepts of the one and only God, just and civilized humanity and the precepts of Indonesian unity animate and underlie the people's precepts led by the wisdom of wisdom in representative deliberation, and the precepts of justice for all Indonesian people.

Thus, the precepts of Indonesian unity are belief in one and only God, just and civilized humanity, democracy led by wisdom in representative deliberation, and social justice for all of Indonesia. Based on the statement contained in the preamble of the 1945 Constitution, the notion of Indonesian unity in the struggle for Indonesian independence is an important factor and greatly determines the success of the struggle of the Indonesian people, unity is an absolute requirement for the establishment of a state and nation in achieving common goals.

The meaning of Indonesian unity is that the nature and condition of the Indonesian state must be in accordance with the nature of one. The nature and condition of the Indonesian state which is in accordance with the essence of one means that it absolutely cannot be divided, so that the Indonesian nation and state occupying a certain area are an independent country that has its own characteristics and circumstances that are separate from other countries in the world. So that the Indonesian state is a personal self that has its own characteristics, traits and character which has a unity and is not divided.

independent Indonesia, is a key factor, a source of enthusiasm and a source of motivation, until the achievement of an independent Indonesia. In this sense, Indonesian unity is an embodiment in a dynamic form. The definition of Indonesian unity is also explained in the official explanation in the opening of the 1945 Constitution which is contained in the Second

Republic of Indonesia News, No. 7, that establishing the Indonesian state is used by the flow of the notion of a unitary state, namely a state that overcomes all group and individual beliefs, so it is not a state based on individualism and also not a class state that prioritizes groups. The Indonesian state is a country based on family, please help, help or on the basis of social justice, so it can be understood that the purpose of establishing an Indonesian state is to prioritize the entire Indonesian nation.

Values Contained in the Precepts of Indonesian Unity

The forms of realization of Indonesian unity are contained in the 1945 Constitution, namely Article 26 which states about Indonesian citizens, Article 31 concerning Indonesian National Education, Article 32 concerning Indonesian National Culture, Article 35 concerning the Indonesian State Flag, and Article 36 which states about the Indonesian Unity Language. The meaning of *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* is that although the Indonesian nation and state consist of ethnic groups that have various cultures and customs, the whole is a unity, namely the Indonesian nation and state. Diversity is not a contradictory difference, but rather diversity is united in a synthesis which in turn enriches the nature and meaning of the unity of the Indonesian nation.

Nationalism is formed into the equality of language, race, civilization, and territory of the country and citizenship. The nation grows and develops from the elements of the roots formed through the course of history. According to Ernest Renan, nationalism has the following elements:

- 1.Unity of spiritual hope (spirit)
- 2.Great unity of solidarity
- 3.Unity in the historical process
- 4.The nation is not an eternal entity

The principles of Indonesian nationalism (Indonesian unity) are arranged in a single plurality, namely:

- a. Historical Unity, the Indonesian nation grows and develops in a historical process
- b.The unity of destiny is in the same historical process and the same fate, namely colonialism.
- c.Cultural unity cultural diversity grows into a form of national culture
- d.Region unity the existence of the Indonesian nation cannot be separated from the territory of Indonesia's bloodshed

e. Unity and spirituality the existence of ideas, ideals and spiritual values that are collectively collected in Pancasila.

The essence of the unity of Indonesia is that the territory and the Indonesian nation consist of parts which are united and whose rights are contradictory. However, in the relationship of its unity as a territory and the Indonesian nation, all parts of it acquire the form and characteristics of its incarnation which is completely and completely

Mass judgment factors

The terms used by the mass media, researchers, police, and community members regarding mass judgment are different, but they refer to the same reality, namely violence perpetrated by the masses against people who are perceived as criminals. This violence causes a person or a number of people who are considered criminals to be injured and killed as a result of torture, beatings, murders, and even arson committed by the masses (Abidin, 2005:87). But in this article, I take the understanding of the judgment of the masses as an act of "vigilante" which means to act arbitrarily against the guilty without any comprehensive settlement first.

Researchers and research institutes conducting research on judgments or mass violence during the reformation or New Order era suspect that the emergence of mass violence was triggered by two things, namely: the first is the monetary crisis accompanied by an economic crisis. Poor economic conditions can increase the quality and quantity of crime, and the increase in crime will encourage some members of the community (the masses) to punish criminals directly.

The next is the political crisis accompanied by the weakening of the rule of law (the state). Weaknesses and ineffectiveness of the institution of the rule of law encourage some members of the community to self-punish criminals through mass judgment. This method was adopted because the community considered the police to be unreliable in giving fair punishments to the criminals.

However, other researchers, such as Welsh (2003), suspect that cases of mass judgments are not only caused by economic and legal factors, but the following three factors: First, there is the legalization of local acts of violence such as during the Suharto era. According to Welsh, cases of violence during the Suharto era were never thoroughly discussed, thus suggesting the government's justification for these cases. For example, the mass killings of

witch doctors that have existed since the Suharto era. Likewise, the judgment of the masses against criminals (thugs), which was made legal by the presence of Peter. Because it has never been thoroughly discussed, similar cases will develop rapidly wherever there is an opportunity.

Third, behavior does not educate regional (local) political leaders. For example, by hiring thugs for a specific purpose. The collaboration between political elites or government officials and these thugs encouraged some residents to imitate the same violence, including violence against criminals caught by the masses (mass judgment).

The last, the mass media reporting directly or indirectly has "educated" the public about mass judgments. In this context, Welsh refers to the newspapers that are consumed the most by the lower classes, such as *Pos Kota* and the *Red Light*. Both newspapers often report mass judgment cases in detail, step by step, so that readers can learn how to massacre and burn criminals effectively and efficiently (Abidin, 2005: 90-92).

The process of Judgment Mass Violence

Physically the case of mass judgment can be divided into several stages. Called physically because it relates to things that appear on the surface, or can be observed directly. The stages are:

a. Pre-violence stage

At this stage we can see the various variations and characteristics of cases. For example, the pursuit by a number of residents of people they have caught stealing or robbing, the state of being on standby to catch criminals whose perpetrators are not yet known, or efforts to search and arrest by a number of residents of people who are perceived as criminals. One characteristic that appears at this stage is that the number of people involved in this problem is relatively small compared to the later stages. In this matter, it should be noted that the masses do not always gang up on the criminals they catch. Sometimes the public conducts an interrogation first at the place where the criminal was caught, at the *Hansip* post, at the *RW* office, or in vacant land. But whether the victim admits his crime or not, the crowd will still gang up. This happened because in the interrogation stage the number of people grew larger, rational considerations weakened, emotions increased, the reaction of the victims often made the masses worse.

b. Real level of violence

At this stage there is a beating or burning of criminals. This stage usually starts with the fans shouting to immediately beat the criminals, or the beating or kicking by one or two perpetrators followed by punches and kicks by other perpetrators. The types of blows inflicted by perpetrators on criminals varied. Some are empty-handed (not using weapons), but some are using tools (iron, wood, helmet, stone). This stage is the culmination (climax) of the mass judgment case, which is marked by the high emotions of the perpetrators and supporters.

c. Post violence stage

This is the anticlimax stage of a mass judgment. At this stage the crowd began to disperse. They leave the scene, not out of fear of the police arriving at the scene, but often because they believe the criminal is dead. However, there are cases where criminals thought to be dead are still alive. This stage is marked by the beginning to recede the emotional level of the perpetrators. Some of them seemed satisfied. Almost all perpetrators admitted that they felt satisfied and relieved after successfully catching, beating, or killing the perpetrators of the crime (Abidin, 2005: 99-100).

Mass Judgment in Mill's Utilitarianism

In principle, mass judgment occurs when one member of the community violates a mutual agreement, then a conflict occurs between the perpetrators of the crime and the surrounding community. The problem will become bigger and more difficult to follow up or resolve in a familial way, then initiatives from some groups emerge to carry out attacks against the perpetrators of the crime until finally there is a case of mass judgment.

Mass judgment does not only hit areas with simple pattern policy models that are sometimes not too concerned with the rules and legal order of the State or formal law, but also not infrequently occurs in areas that already have a neat legal order. The basis of mass judgment is often based on the ego and emotions of a particular person. Emotions that are too peaked make humans take actions beyond the reach of reason and common sense.

Utilitarianism argues that a good thing is the extent to which it benefits the most or more people. With the principle of mill utilitarianism, it highlights the state of the majority and minority. In other words, the wrong action when someone's actions can hinder and rob people of the comfort of life, then the best action that must be taken is to condition the perpetrators of the crime from the possible suffering of many people

The issue of mass judgment is a reward for perpetrators not just judging one person but rather giving rewards and lessons for the actions of other criminals. With this mass judgment case, people will think again in committing crimes and violating norms, which will ultimately lead the community to a safe and peaceful condition. This issue is in accordance with the focus of utilitarianism which favors the common good of the actions taken, but the question has not been answered until now on what basis we can judge a human being on the grounds of the common good. Utilitarianism answers simply on the grounds of the common good and in general morals also the guilty deserve consequences and punishment.

Utilitarianism and Indonesian Unity Principles in Mass Judgment Cases.

Utilitarianism uses utility or the greatest happiness as the basis of morality. The basis states that an action is right if it tends to increase happiness or wrong if it tends to cause harm. An action is good only if it maximizes human happiness and the end result of an action is far more important than the motivation behind it. That is, forgive lies when it has sufficient benefit (usefulness) to help people more than harm them. Thus, for example, stealing is morally acceptable, if stealing due to feed starving children.

The essence of the unity of Indonesia is that the territory and the Indonesian nation consist of parts which are united and whose rights are contradictory. However, in relation to its unity as a territory and the Indonesian nation, all parts of it acquire the form and characteristics of its incarnation which is as complete and perfect as possible.

The case of mass judgment is used as the foundation of justice equal to the treatment of criminal acts. This treatment does not only prioritize punishment for the perpetrators, but also sees the deterrent effect caused for perpetrators who will commit violations. This is in line with the actions and thoughts carried out by utilitarianism in which the judgment of the masses is hopeless as a form of consequence for the perpetrators of crime, which if mass judgments are carried out, mutual happiness and prosperity will be achieved. The matter of the judgment of one man by many regardless of the consequences. If happiness and shared prosperity have been achieved, the Indonesian people will achieve one essence as stated in the values of the Pancasila, the unity of Indonesia. With the presence and nature of one's happiness with the principle of unity of Indonesia will be realized seining time.

CONCLUSION

Mass judgment is an action taken by some people against the actions of criminals in an effort to provide a deterrent to the perpetrators and in cases of possible further crimes. John Stuart Mill's principle of utilitarianism focuses more on indirect utility which does not prioritize hedonism and dolor (prioritizing quantity) but more on quality rather than mutual benefit. The unity of Indonesia is based on the unity of the people, both in joy and in sorrow, as the embodiment of the ideals of Indonesia, namely a unity that is divinity, humanity, democracy and justice. Utilitarianism views mass judgment as a consequence of evildoers in realizing shared happiness. Utilitarianism is in line with the aim of the principle of Indonesian unity as an effort to realize a unified Indonesian society.

Mass judgment is more viewed from many sides. Efforts are made to extract further data regarding material regarding mass judgment or from formal objects, namely utilitarianism and Pancasila or any major of discipline. Further exploration of the latest developments in responding to the challenges of globalization in realizing the ideals of Indonesia as stated in the precepts, especially in the precepts of Indonesian unity.

REFERENCE LIST

- Abidin, Z. (2005). *Penghakiman Massa*. Jakarta: Accompli Publishing.
- Aizenman, J., & Jinjark, Y. (2011). Income Inequality, Tax Base and Sovereign Spreads. *UC Santa Cruz: Department of Economics, UCSC*.
- Baswir, R. (2015). Ekonomi Kerakyatan Vs Neoliberalisme. *Gema Keadilan*, 2 (1).
- Bertens, K. (2000). *Etika*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka.
- Efendi, M. B. (2006). *Kebijakan Perpajakan di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Alinea Pustaka.
- Gie, K. K. (2003). *Membangun Kekuatan Nasional untuk Kemandirian Bangsa*. Yogyakarta: Cindelar Pustaka.
- Kaelan. (1996). *Filsafat Pancasila*. Yogyakarta: Paradigma.
- Kingsbury, D. (2005). *Peace in Aceh a Personal Account of Helsinki Peace Process*, Jakarta: PT Equinox Publishing Indonesia.
- Mill, J. S. (2005). *On Liberty: Perihal Kebebasan*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

- Nugroho, A. D. (2011). Kedudukan Asas Efisiensi Pemungutan Pajak dalam Hukum Acara Perpajakan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Mimbar Hukum*, Edisi Khusus.
- Patji, A. R. (1998). Zona Industri Lohseumawe (ZILS): Studi Tentang Kesenjangan Sosial Budaya di Aceh Utara. *Journal Masyarakat dan Budaya*, 2 (1).
- Rawls, J. (2006). *Teori Keadilan*, judul asli: *A Theory of Justice*, terj. Uzair Fauzan dan Heru Prasetyo. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Salamun, A.T. (1985). *Pembaharuan di Bidang Perpajakan, Suatu Tinjauan Umum*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Santoso, I. (2018). Kedaulatan dan Yurisdiksi Negara dalam Sudut Pandang Keimigrasian. *Binamulia Hukum*, 7 (1).
- Susan, N. (2009). *Sosiologi Konflik dan Isu-isu Konflik Kontemporer*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Suseno, Frans-Magnis. (1997). *13 Tokoh etika*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.