Research Article

TRACKING THE ROOT OF VIOLENCE AND SYMPTOMS OF DEHUMANIZATION IN THE SOCIETY

I Ketut Wisarja and I Ketut Sudarsana

Institut Hindu Dharma Negeri Denpasar

A R T I C L E I N F O	A B S T R A C T
	The general notion stated that 'the more modern human beings, the more cultured they are' is not proven. The recent violence in society is actually driven by modern humans with all the modes inside of it. Thus, the violence phenomenon is a representation that violence can happen to anyone, anywhere and under any circumstances. Violence is not only personal, but also in bulk even globally like violence caused by war. The issue of violence becomes a sort of culture in modern-day reasoning. In this context violence means the actions of a person or group causing injury or death to another person or causing physical damage to another person's goods. Theoretically, violence, sadistic behavior in today's society and the like or so-called aggressive human behavior occurs for various reasons; partly because of *phylogenetically* programmed instincts, others may believe that aggression is formed by learning from the surrounding environment, or both. There are two forms of violence that occur are; (1) state violence against the people; and (2) people's violence against the people. When viewed from its type, then there are four types of root of violence in society, namely; (1) open violence, (2) closed violence, (3) aggressive violence, and (4) defensive violence. All of these violent phenomena, whether consciously or unconsciously, are a denial of the human beings for their humanitarian values.

INTRODUCTION

Violence is a historical fact which always appears in society, not only in modern societies, but also in underdeveloped societies. Moreover, if the community is in the transition process, violence becomes a phenomenon that always appears. Instead of a transitional society, modern society can never escape the reality of violence in it.

The general argument that emerges for example "the more modern human, the more cultured they are" is not proven. Violence that is happening now in society is actually driven by modern humans at least those who have lived in modern times. Violence ultimately does not become the monopoly of people who have been considered not civilized or primitive. The difference only lies in the correlation that is not the same; in primitive societies, violence and killings are encouraged to continue living and fighting over food lands; and in today's society, violence is confirmed precisely as a habit of solving problems (Nur Kholik Ridwan, introduction in Abdul Qodir Saleh, 2003: 26-27). The recent violent phenomenon of living in a society that lives in modern civilization is a representation that violence can happen to anyone, anywhere and under any

Corresponding author: **I Ketut Wisarja**
Institut Hindu Dharma Negeri Denpasar

circumstances. Violence is not only personal, but also massively even globally, such as war-torn violence. The issue of violence becomes a sort of culture in modern-day reasoning. Tragically, violence is the only means to solve problems, and also because of differences that are not substantial.

Psychologically, such violence arises because in human does have a will. The potential for violence as well as the potential for building is equally within human beings as the hierarchy of society. It creates freedom and self-existential manifestations. The realization of this freedom is influenced by many aspects from the outside, such as frustration, power syndrome, and so forth. Macro, the embodiment of violent freedom will only emerge if the culture prevailing in the society itself is not a culture of nonviolence, but a culture of violence.

Every society, consciously or unconsciously, contains violence. Violence can be both physical and symbolic. It is acceptable or suffered. Violence can also arise in the form of construction, reproduction or transformation in relation to social relationships. So the very fundamental reason of that should be sought from within the human heart (Francouis Houtart, 1997: 1). This is because just by looking at humans, the explanation of violence can be described in depth.

The subject of 'community terminology' is always given a different definition, depending on the point of view and the

paradigm it uses. But one thing for sure is society is a collection of individuals who live together in a certain place and space to achieve common goals. The process of relationships between individuals provides opportunities for various conflicts in the 'space' called community.

Society as a historical necessity, because it is mandatory present in the journey of human life activity, which always presents two faces that are ambiguous; positive and negative. Positively, society is needed because human nature is not only as an individual being who can stand alone, but also the nature of human being is social creature; who needs others, and vice versa. However, the bad thing is that in the process of human-to-human relationships that shape society also brings the reality of violence in it.

Community construction not only has the optimistic side, but also has a pessimistic side. Optimistic believers have awareness that community construction is always mechanical, in which every conflict and violence will stop by itself because of the natural law that requires it. But the pessimistic believe that such a society is precisely the starting point of the process of annihilation of individuals, because in the process of relations, which emerges is the power to control each other or controlled (Bertens, 1999: 102). This principle seems to be reminiscent of a concept from Thomas Hobbes, that humans are essentially *'homo homini lupus'* (humans are wolves to other human beings) meaning that the construction of society, however good it is, will not be separated from the reality of the emergence of the evil traits of humans to master the others.

Regardless to that problem, whatever the basic conception about community is still needed as the requirement of the history. No matter how bad a human being is on one side, it still needs sociality to live together. This is because humans basically have a nature that must remain alive with others, which then becomes a community called society. From the description of the aforementioned background can be formulated the research problem are as follows: (1) How are the shape, model, and dimension of violence in society? and (2) How is the root of violence and symptoms of dehumanization can happen to society?

METHOD

This research used qualitative research method, which emphasizes the process and meaning that will be studied as a whole, static and concrete based on social philosophy. In the natural conditions of the emergence of various paradigm shifts in the facts of social life, the reality or phenomena occurring in such societies can be classified, fixed, concrete, observable, measurable, and causal relationships of causality. In the paradigm of change is seen as a naturalistic because the research is done on natural conditions, holistic, complex, dynamic, and full of meaning that is often called as the paradigm of positivism that develops the type of qualitative research.

The instruments used were various data collection tools, such as interview guides, observation guides, tape recorders and so on. The data collection methods used in this study included observation, interviews, documentation, and literature study. Then, data obtained were analyzed by steps such as; (1) Data reduction, (2) Data classification, (3) Interpretation of data, and (4) Conclusion.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Definition of Violence

Literally violence is defined as 'trait' or hard thing; power; coercion (Poerwadarminta, 1982: 488). While, the violence referred is translated from the word *violence*. Violence is closely related to the combination of the Latin word 'vis' (power, strength) and 'latus' (derived from *ferre*, carrying) which then means to bring power (Marsana Windhu, 1992: 62). Violence thus refers to the notion that it refers to a work related to force, coercion, and pressure.

In terminology, violence means the actions of a person or group who cause injury or death to another person or cause physical damage to another person's goods. The acts which have resulted in suffering or harm to others or a group can basically be categorized as acts of violence. Whether the act is overt or off (covert), whether offensive or defensive with the use of force to others is a violent act (Thomas Santoso, ed., 2002: 11).

Theoretically, violence, sadistic behavior, and the like or so-called aggressive human behavior occur for various reasons; partly because of phylogenetically programmed instincts, others may believe that aggression is formed by learning from the surrounding environment, or both. The problem is whether human violence is natural or not. Two great philosophers, Thomas Hobbes (1988-1679) and Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) have views of 'violence' that contradict one another.

According to Hobbes, violence is a state of nature and only a state government uses centralized violence and has the power (*leviatan*) to overcome this situation. This, of course, bases itself on Hobbes's assumption of man; beings possessed by irrational and anarchistic and mechanistic impulses that coexist and hate each other to become rough, wicked, ferocious and short-sighted. This assumption is later known as *'homo homony lupus'*, humans are wolves to other humans and consequently war all opponents of all (*belum omnium contra omnes*). Rousseau, on the other hand, assumes that man in his natural state as an innocent creation, loves himself spontaneously, unselfishly and not altruistically. It is only the chain of civilization that has shaped man to be like a beast that has an attacking nature like its present state (Marsana Windhu, 1992: 63).

The two different approaches are not the main topic of this study. The only thing to emphasize is that violence has become an integral part of the history of mankind. As Hobbes's thesis above, the presence of people who have the character of *'homo homoni lupus'* is more often disturbing and sowing dehumanization or exploitation of human rights violations amid life of society and state. This model man can be a wolf which pounces, tears, and prey or sacrifice others for his own sake.

The thesis that is introduced by Thomas Hobbes seems to portray a paradox in man; who desire to live peacefully, but at the same time have the power to destroy peace. Violence seems to be a 'nature' of humanity in addition to its gentleness. In the context of social life, people as social beings are often also drowned by their egoism as individual beings. The occurrence of various forms of violence that engulfed almost part of society is evidence of the paradoxical situation in humans.

13280

In this context, the various interpretations of the violence basically want to assert that the object of violence is physical or the goods that are damaged by a person or group, against another person or group. The implications of such actions are the loss of mechanical functions and the function of the use of a form which is physical and spiritual as well as relating to the goods and rights of an individual or group. Therefore, a further consequence of this action is the emergence of various forms of suffering suffered by individuals or groups who are subjected to such violence (Abdul Qodir Saleh, 2003: 60).

It is almost certain that suffering can never be accepted voluntarily by humans and society, regardless of its form. Suffering means something that is not good, or something that is completely opposite to what is desired either (John Rabini and HJ Suhendra, 1998: 107). The existence of suffering is in fact a form of deprivation of human rights to live properly with other human beings. Apparently, only Mahatma Gandhi is willing to suffer from violence as a logical implication of his struggle or his dharma to humanity.

According to Galtung (Marsana Windhu, 1992: 66-68), violence occurs when humans are affected in such a way that actual physical and mental realizations are below their potential realization. The keywords that need to be explained are actual (real) and potential (possible). Galtung believes that in humans there are two areas of mutual influence, namely the potential area and actual area. The first is the unseen and unrealized reality, such as ideals, dreams, wills, talents and all values held and championed by the person who is armed. The second is the reality that can be witnessed, seen and felt as well as heard and felt. Violence usually occurs when actual physical and mental realizations are under their potential realization. That is, there is someone who influences and how to influence or there is a subject-object-action, with the subject and the object being human.

Shape, Model and Dimension of Violence on Society

Violence has a number of shapes and dimensions. It all depends on the background of the violence. According to Nur Kholik Ridwan (2003: 24) there are two models of violence that occurred; the state's violence against the people, is used to continue repressive politics and to justify wrong political behavior, and repression is done to simply guard the 'name' of the state, as well as the people's violence against the people, arising from un-enforced justice due to the discriminations committed thus reaping the increasingly accumulated results into massive outrage.

According to Dom Camara (2000: 30-35) violence is basically often preceded by a situation of injustice. Injustice is fundamental violence or Camara calls it violence number one (1) because injustice actually displays humans in sub-human situations, humiliation and helplessness (restrictions). Camara further describes as follows; "Now the egoism of a handful of privileged groups leads countless humanity to this sub-human condition, so that they experience powerlessness, defamation and injustice; without the certainty of the future, without hope "(2000: 35).

The injustice situation is usually reproduced continuously by state or ruler power. This established violence, in turn, leads to violence number two (2), in the form of rebellion, either from the oppressed themselves or from the youth, who are strongly directed to win a more just and humane world.

In further developments, violence provokes new violence. Injustice breeds rebellion and ultimately the tragedy of rebellion will bring about a situation of repression from the state or the power that needs to see itself obliged to maintain or restore public order, even if then it also means force. This is what Camara referred to as violence number three (3). Violence confronted by violence only brings continuous violence. By Camara (2000: xiii) the reality is called the 'violent spiral'. That is, human civilization will only dwell from one violence to another, albeit with different dimensions and forms, but the same substance that is by using force and violence.

Facing such a reality, borrowing Galtung's thesis of violence (Marsana Windu 1992: 66), there are two areas, actual and potential territories that will lead to the perpetrated violence, and Galtung is referred to as direct violence, structural violence and cultural violence. Direct violence is violence that we can feel directly with the senses (actual reality). While, structural violence is a dangerous violence because this violence is a veiled violence that is behind the structure of violence. While, cultural violence is violence that is in the cultural aspects, the symbolic region of our existence-represented by religion and ideology, language and art, etc. that can be used to justify or legitimize both direct and structural violence (Galtung, in Discourse Journal, edition 9, 2002: 11).

Based on the mapping, Galtung then divided direct and structural violence into four groups of basic needs that involve self-generating violence. The four basic needs groups 'outcomes of extensive dialogue in various parts of the world' are: (1) survival needs (negation: death, mortality), (2) need for prosperity (negation: suffering, morbidity), (3) identity, meaning (negation: alienation), and (4) the need for freedom (negation: repression). In more detail Galtung then created a table;

Table 1 Typology of Violence

	Survival need	The need of Welfare	Identity Needs	The need of Independence
Direct Violence	Murder	Siege, Suffering, Sanctions	Desocialization of Resocialization of Second Class Citizens	Repression Detention Expulsion
Structural Violence	Exploitation A	Exploitation B	Penetration Segmentation	Marginalization Fragmentation

Source: Galtung in Jurnal Wacana, III edition, 2002).

Based on the analysis, then Galtung (Marsana Windhu, 1992: 68) further classifies the following dimensions of violence;

1. Physical and psychological violence. This violence sees humans who are physically wounded must be in pain and so if their psychological mentality is hurt (humiliated, threatened and slandered) they will also feel pain.
2. Positive and negative influences. While this violence is closely related to reward oriented system (reward oriented). A person can be influenced not only by punishment if he is guilty, but also by giving rewards.
3. There is an object or not. This dimension exists when there is a demonstration on the streets or in a certain place that allows the destruction of community property which means also an act of violence.
4. There is a subject or not. Galtung divided the violence into two, namely structural violence; a violence where

the subject is unknown and personal violence; a violence that perpetrator can be traced.

5. Deliberate or not. This dimension is important when it comes to making decisions about 'mistakes'. In this dimension, Galtung seeks to uncover deviations of understanding of violence, peace and ethical systems intended to combat intentional violence. Understanding that only emphasizes the deliberate element is certainly not enough to see, overcome the structural hardness that works smooth and unintentional. If the action is directed to peace, then too little is reachable. Therefore, Galtung seeks to provide a broad perspective by involving elements of unintentional, and concerning the fate of many people. Thus, if this action is directed to peace, it is directed against the direct and indirect (structural) violence. Judging from the point of the victim, intentionally or unintentionally, violence remains violent.

6. The visible and the hidden. The apparent, manifest, both personal and structural violence can be seen indirectly. While the hidden violence is something that is not visible (latent), but can easily explode.

In this context, Galtung considered that violence becomes an obstacle to meeting basic needs. The basic need concerns the life of man himself as a whole person, distinguished from the more basic material needs of the rudimentary ones. There are four matters concerning this basic need, namely survival or survival, freedom, welfare and identity (Marsana Windu, 1992: 79). At the top it is mentioned that violence hinders development, as it becomes a hindrance to human development.

Table 2 Violence and the Fulfillment of Basic Needs

	Direct Violence Cause: Offender	Structural Cause: Structural
somatic/material	CONSERVATION OF LIFE violence DEATH	WELFARE suffering SILENT DEATH
spiritual non material	FREEDOM refresi KZ, GULAG	IDENTITY alienation SPIRITUAL DEATH

Source: Marsana Windhu, 1992. *Kekuasaan dan Kekerasan Menurut Johan Galtung*, page 79.

From a number of notions of violence above, it can be taken a typology of violence consisting of three major groups, namely; (1) Violence as actors' action or actor groups; (2) Violence as the product of the structure; and (3) Violence as a network between actors and structures (Tomas Santoso, 2002: 1). Thus, violence always involves subjects and objects. No violence can stand alone without involving both.

First typology; argues that humans perpetrate violence because of innate tendencies or as a consequence of genetic or physiological abnormalities. Second typology; is the structure-related violence. This violence is relevant to Galtung's opinion that violence as everything that causes people to be obstructed to actualize his potential naturally. The structural violence proposed by Galtung shows the form of indirect, static violence and exhibits certain stability. Thus, violence involves not only actors or groups of actors, but also by structures like the state apparatus.

Third Typology; is violence as a network of actors with structures based on an assumption that conflict is endemic to people's lives (conflict as something is determined), there are a number of alternative tools for conveying social conflicts and addressing the problem of violence effectively requires changes in social organizations and individuals. The problem of violence is one of the main issues of modern life, there is a relationship of micro-macro-level violence and between actors-structures (solving the problem of structural violence requires involvement in actor violence, and vice versa), and finally academic specialization obscures the problem of ignoring the holistic approach including the dimensions of space and time (Thomas Santoso, 2002: 3).

Roots of Violence and Dehumanization Symptoms in Society

The Roots of Violence in Society

Understanding the above, it is necessary to identify the types of violence that occur in the community. Jack D. Douglas and Frances C. Waksler (2002: 11) said that there are four types of violence that can be identified, namely; (1) Open violence is visible violence, such as fights; (2) Closed violence, is violence that is hidden or not done directly, such as threatening behavior; (3) Aggressive violence, is violence that is not done for the protective, but to get something; and (4) Defensive violence, is violence only for self-protection. The violence presented indicates that in society in spite of many perceptions of violence, it also shows the number of variants in violence. Violence in society takes its shape differently, but its mainstream remains the same that shows behavior that harms other people or groups.

According to Ted R. Gurr as quoted by Eko Prasetyo (2001: 3) views violence as a result of social relations or structures in which the perpetrators are located. The existence of values and norms is merely a 'structural imperative' internalized within the individual. Therefore any violence exists, for this approach always sees the cause of the product of a structure. It is clearly different from those who perceive that violence is entirely dependent on the actor's interest, character, and motivation of an individual.

The above conflict was mediated by Anthony Giddens as quoted by Herry Priyono (Jurnal Basis, No. 09-10, 1999: 48) by saying that between structure and subject are in an interplaying position. The social structure not only poses an obstacle to human action but also creates opportunities for autonomous action. Therefore violence according to Giddens, is a dialectic between the weakness of individual moral values with strong structural pressure on the other side.

In this context can be described an understanding that the process of reducing humanity to one another and the object of one human being to another can develop into the base of violence in society. That is, the relationship between individuals in society is reduced to mutually reduce, objecting as well as mastering the other. So what happens is the reality of efforts to mutually discredit and humiliate others and even seek to hate and enmity (Abdul Qodir Soleh, 2003: 65). Such as; in the case of the election of Governor and Deputy Governor of DKI Jakarta, in which the parties involved mutually and disparage one another or borrow Thomas Hobbes' term in 'Leviathan', one on one, one against all, all against all (*bellum omnium contra omnes*).

According to Erich Fromm as quoted by Drajat Setio Soemitro (1998: 53-54) psychologically, there are various motivations behind violence acts committed by humans. First, playful

violence, such as boxing and cock fighting; Second, reactive violence, like people kill thieves; Third, revengeful violence, such as people killing each other due to inter-group or individual dispute as a form of causality; Fourth, violence due to the loss of confidence (shattering of faith), such as a person who becomes a murderer because he does not believe in his future or disappointment; and Fifth, compensatory violence, such as people being rude to their wives to avoid their weaknesses.

In this terminology, it becomes clear that the first violence arises from the urge to become famous and generate economic returns. The second motivation is a pure act of violence, meaning that it is not intervened by a greater interest than the desire to deter the offender. The third motivation is a very complex violence, because the actors behind the violence are not well identified. That is, in this violence, tracing the dimensions of the Galtung violence above, there is already visible and hidden violence. The visible violence is usually done by personal and hidden violence mostly done on the structural path. While the fourth and fifth motivations appear more in individuals due to the morale of individuals who cannot be controlled including marriage violence (KDRT).

Based on the above opinion, it can be concluded that the root of violence was never single. Violence as an anti-thesis of nature or human nature clearly presupposes the narrowness of understanding and appreciation of human nature. Humans often reduce themselves to each other in concepts not related to the sublime of their existence. Humans then reduce anything including human values. Relations between people in the event of reduction process, then only be 'space' for continuous violence. Ultimately, violence seems to be a historical necessity that must be accepted in every space called society. Though violence arises not because of natural processes, but there is a causality involved in it.

Dehumanization Symptoms in Society

The phenomenon of violence is recognized as a form of denial of human values either are involved as objects or the subject of violence. Both are considered inhumane. The object of violence is dehumanized, because it is treated inhumanely, while the subject of violence becomes inhumane because it causes others to experience the dehumanization situation.

Violent behavior actually suggests that there has not been a conducive relationship process in society. On the one hand there are others who regard others as 'enemies' or borrow the term existentialism as an object, whereas we are the subject. Others even 'we' position ourselves as 'lupus' (wolf), not as 'socius' (friend) to fellow human beings. Violence indicates the deterioration of the 'socius" situation in society.

According to Herudjati Purwoko (Journal of Renai, Year. I No. 1, 2001: 5) *socius* means 'friend', sociable means 'friendly' and sociability means 'friendliness'. According to Goffman (1972: 20), sociability is the basis for the smooth social interaction between humans. In this context Goffman takes the concept of sociability from George Simmel's classic book, saying that sociability is a game in which 'we' act as if everyone is equal, and at the same time 'we' are obliged to respect everyone in particular (Simmel 1950: 49). The principle of equality becomes important and clear from the above quotation. However, Simmel not only stopped here, he even advocated; "The characteristic sociable behavior is manners where the

strong and privileged individual strives not only to be equal to the weaker individual but also to treat the weak individual as a man who seems more valuable and important" (1950: 50).

Simmel's terminology of manners is based on his weak respect and principle of equality, so everyone should avoid violence even if he feels stronger or weaker. Violence will only undermine the principle of life in sociable. The breakdown of sociable is the beginning of the "dehuman" situation that will be faced by the perpetrator or the victim of violence.

Violent phenomena often occur because one feels superior, while the other is *imperior*. Superior logic always tries predominantly against the one who feels as *imperior*. In such circumstances there has actually been a reciprocal relationship, the superior use of repressive means to master, ultimately raises the resistance of the *imperior* to fight. The resistance to the violence eventually became transformed into Camara's term (2000) -as a violent spiral. Violence will present resistance to other violence. Violence which fights to other violence will drown mankind into a vicious circle of violence.

In the logic of society, it is often assumed that there is legalized violence when it is seen as an act of securing a system or a rule of society. From this opinion comes a question, which community rules to be enforced or secured?. This question implicitly outlines the fact that in practice community groups that are interested in enforcing the rules are not just one. Each group wants its community system to be accepted even by other groups. Thus, conflict is inevitable and violence is often the only way to go. In other words, the violence practiced to 'enforce' or secure a social system may also mean an attempt to abolish or destroy alternative systems of other societal groups (Ignatia M. Hendrati, 2001: 20-21).

Violence is the most common phenomenon that occurs in a social life called society. This is because there is an opinion that social life is seen as an 'arena of power and struggle'. Violence can thus occur anywhere; at home, at school / campus, on the road, at work, and so on. Violent acts are not only adequately described linearly, for example; only by seeing as the actions performed by the ruler over the controlled, or done by the subordinate to the master, so that when social life is understood as the arena of power and struggle, then violence should be seen as a power contest by one party in reaction to resistance from other parties. The main point, violence is a way to strengthen power or maintain a position.

In this terminology it can be simplified that violence is a problem in the spaces of human relationships. Every human being or group seeks to always defend themselves and their identity and strengthen power in various ways, including violence. Violence is a common phenomenon in the construction of ailing society. The ailing society according to Erich Fromm (1995: 65) contains a number of dignities of their own humanity.

CONCLUSIONS

Violence means the actions of a person or a group who cause injury or death to another person or cause physical damage to another person's goods. The act which causes suffering or loss of another person or group can basically be categorized as violence. Whether the act is open or closed, whether it is offensive or defensive, with the use of force to others is an act of violence.

There are two forms of violence, namely; (1) state violence against the people; used to continue repressive politics and to justify wrong political behavior, and refreshing is done to keep the country's good name; and (2) people's violence against the people; can occur because justice is not enforced, resulting in repeated discriminations, thus reaping the results that are increasingly accumulated into mass anger. While, Galtung grouped the dimensions of violence as follows; (1) physical and psychological violence, (2) positive and negative violence, (3) any object or not, (4) any subject or not, (5) intentionally or not, and (6) visible and hidden. Typologically, violence always involves subjects and objects. No violence can stand alone without involving both. There are three typologies of violence, namely; the first typology, humans perpetrate violence due to innate tendencies or consequences of genetic or physiological abnormalities. Second typology is structural violence. This kind of violence causes people to be obstructed to actualize their potentials naturally; and third typology is violence as an actor network with a structure based on an assumption that conflict is endemic to people's lives.

There are four types of root of violence in society, namely; (1) open violence, visible violence, such as fights, (2) closed violence, hidden or non-direct violence, such as threatening behavior, (3) aggressive violence, violence not for protection, but for obtaining something, and (4) defensive violence, violence committed only for self-protection.

All of these violent phenomena, whether consciously or unconsciously, are a denial of the human person for his humanitarian values. Both the violence involved in the object, especially the subject of violence. Both such violence are considered inhumane. The object of violence is dehumanized, because it is treated inhumanely, while the subject of violence becomes inhuman because it causes others to experience dehumanization situation.

References

Bakker, A. dan A. Charis Zubair, (1990). *Metodologi Penelitian Filsafat*. Kanisius: Yogyakarta.

Bertens, K. (1996). *Filsafat Barat Kontemporer Prancis*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama: Jakarta.

Bertens, K. (2002). *Filsafat Barat Kontemporer Inggris Jerman*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama: Jakarta.

Douglas, Jack D., Frances C. Waksler. (2002). 'Kekerasan' dalam Thomas Santoso (editor), *Teori-Teori Kekerasan*. PT. Ghalia Indonesia: Jakarta.

Fromm, Erich. (1995). *Masyarakat yang Sehat*, terj. Thomas Bambang Murtianto. Yayasan Obor Indonesia: Jakarta.

Galtung, Johan (2002). Kekerasan Kultural, *dalam Jurnal Wacana*, edisi 9 Tahun III, 2002. INSisT: Yogyakarta.

Goffman, Erving. (1972). *Encounters*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hendrarti, Ignatia M., Kekerasan Simbolik: Protes Terselubung dalam Cerita Fiksi Wanita Indonesia, *dalam Jurnal Renai*, Edisi Musim Penghujan 2000-2001. Pustaka Percik: Salatiga.

Houtar, Francouis (1997). *Religion as a Source of Violence*. SCM Press: London.

Prasetyo, Eko. (2001). Kekerasan dan HAM: Sketsa Teoritis. PUSHAM UII: Yogyakarta.

Priyono, Herry, Anthony Giddens dan Teori Strukturasi, *dalam Jurnal Basis*, No.09-10 Tahun ke-48, September-Oktober. Kanisius: Yogyakarta.

Purwadarminta, WJS. (1982). *Kamus Umum Bahasa Indonesia*. Balai Pustaka: Jakarta.

Rabini, Johanes, dan HJ. Suhendra. (1998). *Penderitaan dan Problem Ketuhanan: Suatu Telaah Filosofis Kitab Ayyub*. Kanisius: Yogyakarta.

Richards, Glyn. (1982). *The Philosophy of Gandhi, A Study of his basic ideas*. Curzon Press, Barnes & Noble Books: London.

Saleh, Abdul Qodir (2003). *"Agama" Kekerasan*. Primasophie: Yogyakarta.

Santoso, Thomas (2002). *Kekerasan Agama Tanpa Agama*. Pustaka Utan Kayu: Jakarta.

Santoso, Thomas, ed. (2001). Teori-Teori Kekerasan. PT Ghalia Indonesia: Jakarta.

Selasih, N. N., & Sudarsana, I. K. (2018). Education Based on Ethnopedagogy in Maintaining and Conserving the Local Wisdom: A Literature Study. *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*, 6(2), 293-306.

Simmel, George (1950). *The Sosiology of George Simmel*. Free Press: New York.

Soares, F., & Sudarsana, I. K. (2018). Religious Harmony Among Senior High School Students Multicultural Education Case Study in the Cova-Lima District of East Timor. *Vidyottama Sanatana: International Journal of Hindu Science and Religious Studies*, 2(1), 154-162.

Soekamto, Soerjono (1999). *Sosiologi, Suatu Pengantar*. Rajawali Press: Jakarta.

Soelaiman, Munandar (1993). *Ilmu Sosial Dasar*. PT Eresco: Bandung.

Veeger, K.J. (1993). *Realitas Sosial, refleksi filsafat sosial atas hubungan individu-masyarakat dalam cakrawala sejarah sosiologi*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama: Jakarta.

Windhu, I. Marsana (1999). *Kekuasaan dan Kekerasan Menurut Johan Galtung*. Kanisius: Yogyakarta.

****