

Psychology of Justice for Welfare and Social Cohesivity

Abnan Pancasilawati¹, Esti Royani²

¹ University of Islamic Sultan Aji Muhammad Idris Samarinda

² Univeristy of 17 Agustus 1945 Samarinda

e-mail: abnanpancasilawati@gmail.com¹, esti.untagsmd.hukum@gmail.com²

Article Info

Article history:

Received:

10 Maret 2023

Revised:

15 Maret 2023

Accepted:

11 April 2023

Keyword:

Justice, Social Psychology, Articles, Psychology.

ABSTRACT

Justice is a condition that is fair to a character, act or treatment of something. justice is the vision of this country. We should maintain a large portion of justice as a vision of this country. This is what prompted us to venture to explore it in this article. This article is motivated by the many studies on justice in the literature that have developed in recent years. In this article, we discuss together what previous researchers have said on the psychological side of "justice" and then we compare it to the current condition of our country, where recently there have been issues that are not comfortable with "justice" in this beloved country.

In essence, justice only judges according to its own version of justice, so it is very difficult to realize justice for all people, because of differences in religion, norms, culture, and others. This injustice will also cause future losses such as material, physical, and psychological losses to the person. So the combination of individual justice issues will be more complicated. Therefore, we conclude that we can realize social justice together, by mutually helping each other, giving tolerance, not justifying any deviations, not limiting individual freedom in total, and always doing formulate/deliberate against all individuals or the people themselves. Indeed, there will always be sacrifices in realizing justice, but justice itself must be more altruistic than prioritizing personal interests. So that in society or the state, justice enforcers are needed to maintain justice in the country. The apparatus should also not be arbitrary just because they are trusted by the state so that they want to do something that wants to benefit themselves, because the state is the people themselves.



©2022 Authors. Published by Sabajaya Publisher. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

It tooks us a long time personally to venture into the topic of justice in this article. After a few years of studying this concept we are not getting any better, but more and more unsure of our understanding. Our biggest difficulty in understanding justice is because of the scarcity of justice practices that can be seen, read, and then studied. Why not, the law as the main body of justice in Indonesia in practice is actually stained with black spots of injustice. The case of the BLBI corruption investigator who was caught in the act of accepting bribes is just one example of the bad practice of law in this country. Our colleague from UIN's Faculty of Law told us in a flat tone : " law and justice are divorced". This expression has at least two meanings.

First, justice in the legal perspective is often seen as narrow and limited to the conformity of practice with regulations (Crosby & Franco, 2003).

Second, the practice is often interpreted in line with its interests, not directed as close as possible to values, morals, and ethics. Thus law and justice are made into two different things and run separately, not as a unit. Things like that are really very worrying. If justice continues to be crushed, and injustice runs rampant, it means that Pancasila is just a name, no longer the basis of the state as we believe. Just to remind us all, in Pancasila the words FAIR and JUSTICE are clearly stated in two precepts: **Just** and civilized humanity; and social **justice for all Indonesian people**. In the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution, justice is mentioned in paragraphs one, two, and four. In the body of the Constitution,

justice is mentioned at least 12 times. This all shows that justice is the vision of this country. We should maintain a large portion of justice as a vision of this country. This is what prompted us to venture to explore it in this article.

On the other hand, this article is motivated by the many studies on justice in the literature that have developed in recent years. The development of justice studies has become the interest of almost all disciplines, psychology is one of them. In psychology itself, this study initially developed a lot in social psychology, then the application of the study was continued in occupational, organizational and industrial psychology, as well as in other psychology such as educational psychology, and recently studied in counseling psychology (Brosnan, 2010). 2006; Prilleltensky & Fox, 2007). Almost all dimensions of justice have been studied from a psychological perspective. The intensive psychology of studying justice has opened a new vehicle, namely the psychology of justice.

It is not easy to define justice. It is even more difficult to achieve justice. Therefore, it is not surprising that there are those who firmly believe that justice belongs only to God. Because we do not know exactly how God determines this life, it is our duty to formulate and enforce justice. We agree with the opinion which states that the justice and injustice we feel are human products and every culture constructs its own norms regarding justice. In addition, each individual will perceive justice according to his culture rather than universally (Zhang, 2006). Therefore, experts state that justice is an abstract belief system and is a standard guide to regulate the relationship between humans and humans and their environment (Clayton & Opatow, 2003).

Psychology discusses less about the nature of justice but rather documents how people feel and think about justice issues (Skitka & Crosby, 2003). This is in line with the thinking that divides justice into two, individual justice and social justice (Clayton & Opatow, 2003; Skitka, 2003). Individual justice depends on the psychological factors of the individual concerned, in an interpersonal or small group context. While social justice depends on the structure of society, such as economic, political, and cultural structures (Bertens, 2000; Clayton & Opatow, 2003; Skitka, 2003).

Psychology initially put more emphasis on individual justice. In subsequent developments, the contribution of psychology in the development of justice integrates individual, social and moral aspects. Social psychology's concern in studying justice intensively has been running for more than 40 years. Various social psychology studies initially explored the answer to the question of **whether what they received was fair**. The fair distribution of resources and benefits, of rights and rewards, of position and convenience, will be judged satisfactory. On the other hand, a distribution that is considered unfair will cause dissatisfaction. A fair assessment will have a positive impact on social behavior, while an unfair assessment will have a negative impact. One of its forms is relative deprivation which is often expressed in protest behavior, anarchy, and rebellion.

Still related to the assessment of distributive justice, social psychology also explores the values and motivations behind a distributive justice formulation. In accordance with the values he adheres to, homo economists, for example, can in an extreme way choose the formulation of *the winner takes all* and if they are not too greedy they will choose a proportional formulation (*equity*). On the other hand, the humanist orientation, especially in an effort to raise the poor, tends to choose a formulation based on need (*needy*) so that human dignity can be realized. Meanwhile, those who care about equality will prioritize the formulation of an equal distribution.

The problem is, efforts to obtain justice then tend to be reduced to efforts to obtain the largest share of the distribution process or system. For that people want to be involved in the procedures that will determine the distribution. The assumption is that if he participates in determining the procedure, he will get the part he wants. Responses to such issues have opened the interest of experts to procedural justice. In order for the distribution to be fair, the procedures must also be enforced fairly.

The development of procedural justice in psychological studies begins with a *self-interest perspective*. According to this perspective, the procedure will be fair if all parties who have an interest involved can control it (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). There are at least two things that need to be controlled, namely information and decisions. In order for a procedure to be fair, all parties involved in the procedure must have the same information, be able to access the required information, and submit it for consideration in decisions. Control over decisions plays an important role in upholding justice because this is where interested parties will participate in determining their fate as well as the fate of those they defend. In the joint decision-making process, this is considered very important as a form of justice, as well as in the life of the nation and society. No less important control is at the time of implementation

of a decision. So that the participation of various interested parties does not lead to looting of state assets or corruption in the congregation, fair procedures must be ethical, unbiased, consistent, accurate and transparent (Leventhal, 1980). In other words, procedures can be controlled by all parties from the formulation and decision-making of a policy to its implementation.

Concern for procedural justice is not limited to efforts to get the desired share by controlling it. Fair procedures can serve as the basis for developing relationships, group status, and psychological legitimacy. For some people, the procedure can be considered fair by considering how the parties involved are treated. Fair procedures must reflect respect, trust and respect for all parties, as well as a neutral attitude when there is a conflict. Shared values are considered a key factor in this procedural justice. This model was later named as the *Group Value Model of Procedural Justice* (Lind & Tyler, 1988). This model is relatively easy to feel in public services. Without aiming for profit, every member of the community demands justice from the government apparatus, namely by getting good treatment. The procedural justice model that emphasizes the relationship between authority holders and audiences is known as *the Relational Model of Authority* (Tyler & Lind, 1992).

The development of social psychology studies on justice seems to have shifted from relative deprivation with its various variances which tend to have a negative impact towards neutral and finally towards a more positive one. In line with this, Tyler & Blader (2003) developed a *Group Engagement Model* that combines procedural justice, social identity and cooperative behavior. This model does not only answer social psychological problems concerning **how** but also includes **who**, especially identity and inclusiveness. That is, if at first the study of social psychology emphasized more on **what was accepted**, then developed on **how** to make procedures and relations fair, then there was an effort to develop a model of justice so that **anyone** could get justice.

Injustice causes material, physical, and psychological harm. Unfair treatment can cause material harm but actually has a bigger impact, causing psychological harm. Therefore, victims of injustice are entitled to compensation or restitution (Arbaour, 2006; Okimoto & Tyler, 2007; Wenzel et al., 2008) and at the same time the perpetrators must be punished. Actions for perpetrators and victims are not only directed at the relational interests between the two but more importantly to improve the format of justice. The method that is widely used for this is through the process of retribution and restoration, in terms of justice known as retributive and restorative justice.

In criminal law, retributive justice is carried out by applying punishment to the guilty party. When using the concept of restorative justice, the solution is not formal and punitive, but seeks bilateral consensus to resolve problems by developing shared values. The results of psychological research (Okimoto & Tyler, 2007; Wenzel et al., 2008) show that victims of injustice and crime feel more dissatisfied with the settlement through the retributive process than through the restorative process. More specifically, emotional restoration is expected by victims more than others. Seeing this reality, psychology has contributed to the development of the study of restorative justice.

Psychologically, restorative justice is directed to restore a sense of justice and *moral order*. Viewed from the process, restorative justice is seen as more constructive because it renews consensus on values. Concern for togetherness and *moral order* which is the pressure of restorative justice is in line with the development of psychological studies in the *Group Engagement Model*.

RESEARCH METHODS

The method is optional for original research articles. This method is written in descriptive and should provide a statement regarding the methodology of the research. This method as much as possible to give an idea to the reader through the methods used. This Method are optional, only for original research articles.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Inclusivity in justice is not a new issue. It becomes interesting again because there is awareness of a new mode of exclusivism in line with the development of globalization. Developed countries may claim to have implemented justice in their country but practice injustice when facing developing countries and all their citizens.

Inequality between developed and developing countries occurs in various aspects and in globalization, developed countries share information with each other but developing countries that become partners are left with insufficient information and technology (UN, 2006). Thus the developed countries master a variety of strategic information that will benefit them. Under these conditions, it is impossible for a free market to run fairly (Stiglitz, 2006). The reluctance of developed countries to share technology that can reduce natural pollution as an effort to reduce global warming, once again shows the difficulty of implementing equitable distribution. In his interview with Kompas which was published on August 19, 2007, Stiglitz said that the injustices that plagued the world today stem from unfair access to information. With the mastery of technology owned by developed countries, various information in poor countries can be controlled, while the poor countries do not even have that information. It is impossible for poor countries to access information from developed countries. Exclusivism as an injustice at the world level is also still very real with the veto power that several countries have in making UN decisions.

With the information and capital they have, developed countries invest. Developed capitalist countries not only exploit developing countries by extracting their natural resources but also treat citizens of developing countries as inferior, stupid, and on other occasions do not hesitate to call them terrorists. There are many concrete examples of this kind of injustice. For example, the old story about experts from Indonesia who became consultants in their government who were paid less than foreign experts, even though the expertise of Indonesians was much higher, still continues.

There are still many Indonesian managers who are paid less than foreign managers. If these highly paid experts and managers are still treated unfairly in the global order, our workers will be increasingly unfairly treated. They become workers of foreign companies because they can be paid very cheaply, much cheaper than workers from the company's home country. These workers can also be released easily because they are contract workers. This contract work system is very beneficial for multinational companies because companies do not need to fulfill quite a lot of obligations as if they treat permanent workers (Faturachman, 1998; Tambunan, 2006). Foreign investment on the one hand opens up job opportunities but on the other hand is an exploitation practice. Contract work that is a model in the professional world, which is usually paid handsomely but is practiced on low-paid workers, is a legalization of action that tends to win itself. This kind of thing actually cannot be practiced in the country of origin of the investors, who are generally capitalists.

There are also many Indonesian workers who are treated unfairly by employers who are fellow Indonesians and are legitimized by the government by getting low wages or salaries. People with low incomes should be a concern in realizing justice, but in practice it is often the opposite. Low-income communities continue to be marginalized, subordinated, and exploited. They will not be able to invest to be empowered and able to fight for justice. Self-employed workers continue to be squeezed until they cannot escape the limited income. A clear example of this condition is the farmers. Indonesia as a country with most of the population working in the agricultural sector, the income of farmers is very small. Their income is impossible to invest because it is small. Let alone invested, the results of their work immediately run out at harvest, if there is an excess it becomes worthless when exchanged for other commodities (Faturachman, 2005). They will continue to struggle with poverty while those who have capital will get richer. People who cannot invest will find it difficult to fight for justice and the provision of wages that are not possible to invest is an indication of injustice (Deutsh, 2006).

Justice is not just a matter of division. Justice also means *sharing* in terms of access to resources, *power*, and profits. During the New Order era, **some** resources were distributed to the community, but accessing other resources, let alone controlling them, was very difficult. Wherever the authoritarian regime is in power, it will be a source of procedural injustice. In a different form, procedural injustice still persists in Indonesia today. Unaspirational legislatures and a corrupt judiciary are unlikely to be expected to implement fair procedures. In fact, it is to these institutions that the state and nation expect the realization of procedural justice. Members of the legislature are now trying to control the government disproportionately with the motivation to benefit themselves or their party. The interests of the people are ignored and the state is in shambles. The dynamics of the state like this are not in accordance with the rules of procedural justice. As a result, the people remain miserable and the country tarnished its good name. Injustice continues even though regimes and orders change.

Injustice is not only done intentionally and consciously but also often done without fully realizing it because it runs structurally. There are still many men who do not realize that their treatment

of women is not fair enough. We are also not sensitive to the needs and rights of those who are less fortunate (disabled) so that they are prevented from entering college and when they enter they still have to experience difficulties carrying out activities because the available facilities are only suitable for normal people. There are still many examples of our discriminatory actions that are clearly unfair. If we start to reduce discriminatory behavior by action, cognitively and affectively we must admit that there are still many forms of prejudice within us. Prejudice has the potential to become injustice and is essentially a part of injustice. At a certain level this is not part of the individual psychological problem but also a structural problem (Farr, 2007). The combination of individual and structural psychological problems makes injustice more complicated to solve.

Injustice can take the form of a legitimized culture. The culture of injustice has existed for centuries in the form of cultural imperialism. Historically, it was recorded that a culture was forced to subtly or roughly marginalize, dominate, and even erase other cultures. The Dutch for years forced the Indonesians to become lackeys and raised a few of those who were loyal to be priyayi. White Australians force Aboriginal children to behave like white people. The United States hijacked the Persian night story 1001 nights into the copyright of Walt Disney and then robbed so much of the heritage of the indigenous culture along with the oil of Iraq, that once rich Iraq became a very poor country.

Psychologically, colonialism caused great trauma to a nation, both mass and hereditary. Counseling psychologist Greene (2005) concluded that *post-colonial stress disorder* has a more severe impact than *PTSD* (*post-traumatic syndrome diseases*) such as natural disasters. Nations that have been colonized for a long time will find it more difficult to progress not only because of political and economic colonialism, but what is more serious is cultural colonialism. We seem to be still experiencing this.

Once again we say that injustice is more obvious than justice in the practice of everyday life. Assuming that justice must be based on truth, this dominance of injustice leads to a further question: is there still truth? With few practices of justice, the truth may have been lost first.

In psychology truth is tested through subjective judgments, not just based on objectivity. Psychologically, objectivity can be blurred or obscured. Therefore, the truth can also be blurred and obscured. Things like this actually happen not only in psychology but also become the basis of thought that is practiced and recognized by various disciplines (Liebig, 2001) . Among the assessments that follow these rules is a self-interest based assessment *model* with an egocentric ethical justification. That is, self-interest is morally acceptable and psychologically egocentric judgments often occur. People do this as an 'instant' way of self-defense mechanism when facing a threat (Epley & Caruso, 2004; Moore & Loewenstein, 2004; O'Brien & Crandall, 2005).

It must be admitted that when assessing justice we tend to be non-objective. Circumstances are judged to be fair more often when they are in our favour. On the other hand, circumstances are judged unfair when we do not benefit from them. This valuation model is problematic because self-interest often has to come at the expense of others. The self-interest model in the psychological study of justice is a continuing controversy. Self-interest can be accepted as the basis for an individual's judgment of justice. However, self-interest is suspected to be a source of judgmental bias and the cause of social injustice, namely when social forces are allowed to compete without fair rules. In practice, this model continues to be applied because some people are classified as *naive realists* (O'Brien & Crandall, 2005) .

The problem continues and is evidenced by the results of psychological research which shows that justification for self-interest is produced automatically or through unconscious psychological mechanisms (Liebig, 2001; Moore & Loewenstein, 2004). The trick is, first, people tend to interpret their perceptions in a way that is easiest, preferred, and tends to be repeated, namely egocentrically. Second, the results of individual interpretations will be simplified into positive or negative categories. Interpretation results in a more comprehensive format require higher skills so as to make such positive-negative categories personally considered more efficient. Third, positive judgments are associated as moral while negative judgments are associated with immorality. With a moral justification based on egocentric judgments like this, it becomes increasingly clear that egocentric judgments and based on self-interest will not reflect true justice.

In accordance with the character of the field, the self-interest model of justice has plagued politicians, power holders, and business circles. However, in fact every individual has such a tendency. Without strict regulatory signs, they will definitely prioritize their interests to gain maximum power

and profit without the need to share with other parties. The public will use this assessment model because it imitates figures who are widely exposed to the mass media. People are led to this kind of assessment model because there are few good examples that can be imitated or for comparison.

Society is generally not as selfish as these unethical politicians, officials and businessmen. The results of our study show that rural communities (Faturachman&Walgito, 2002), groups with relatively low incomes (Faturachman, 2002), women (Faturachman&Sadli, 2003), and students (Faturachman&Ancok, 2001) do not use personal interests as a basis. fairness assessment. Society can use the model of social comparison in assessing justice. For example, people are smart enough to compare financial policies that tend to benefit big entrepreneurs over small and medium entrepreneurs, and then judge it as unfair. The public is also not blind to the inequalities of punishment for thieves of people's money, aka corruptors, by stealing motorbikes or other personal belongings. This ability to judge fairness is helped by increasing access to information and scholarly opinions through their opinions and research results. Such people do not use a model of judgment that tends to be egotistical, but psychologically they use certain references. Such a mindset in psychology is called the *Referent Cognition Model* (Folger, 1987).

Injustice practices that are based on self-interest on the one hand and the results of community assessments through comparisons or references to things that are visible on the other hand, seriously hurt the sense of justice. When this happens and gets worse, it will move people to protest and disobey, and for some other groups they will react in the form of terror. Almost all terrorists place injustice as one of the backgrounds of their terror behavior (Ancok, 2007; Milla, 2007).

Some psychologists are beginning to realize that models of judgment of justice that are too individual will make it difficult to achieve social justice. The word social plays a very important role in formulating justice. For this reason, the assessment of justice should also prioritize social values. In the formulation of the group values model (*Group Value Model*) justice must at least be based on respect, togetherness, trust, and neutrality in other parties (Tyler, 1989). Fair distribution, procedures, and relationships are difficult to achieve without an effort to respect and trust others as neighbors.

Neutrality is also required not only when there is conflict, but as basic values and attitudes in social interactions. Togetherness must be emphasized on justice because on each side justice will involve other parties. These criteria should be a minimum requirement to assess fairness. Cognitively, such an assessment must be a model that can be accessed together. Stitka (2003) developed the model in question and named it the *Accessible Identity Model*.

According to this latter model concern for justice should not be egocentric. This model also explains that fairness assessments will not be too problematic to be carried out at the individual level. However, when carried out at the individual level, this model requires that the assessor who is not egocentric is an appraiser who knows who he is. In addition, assessment at the individual and social level (in psychology it is more defined as a group) will depend on the identity that is accessed from each person. There are three identities that can be accessed, namely material identity, social identity, and moral identity. Material identity is related to the body (my body, my hands), self (my ability, my position), and possessions (my house, my wealth). People develop material identities to maintain their possessions. Social identity is related to membership and status in society. Social identity is developed in order to maintain its existence in the group and its image in the eyes of other groups. Moral identity is concerned with moral authenticity and the achievement of people's maturity. This moral identity is an internalization of the responsibilities and obligations that are carried out as human beings.

The originator of this *Accessible Identity Model* (Stitka, 2003) uses the Neo-Kohlbergian theory of moral development (Rest et al., 1999) to explain the judgment of justice. According to Stitka, there are three stages of the Neo-Kohlbergian moral schema that correspond to the three types of accessible identities.

First, *self-interest moral schema* is strongly associated with material identity. In this moral scheme the main orientation is self-interest. People who access material identities tend to use self-interest schemes to justify justice. The more profitable the distribution, procedures, and relationships, the more fair it will be judged.

Second, the *conventional norms schema* which is characterized by the need and efforts to cooperate as well as efforts to apply laws and social norms in a 'uniform' manner as an obligation or necessity, in harmony with social identity. This moral scheme is in harmony with social identity. People

who emphasize shared identity will try to be fair in their social relations and obey the rules or mutual agreements.

Third, *postconventional moral schema* which is characterized by firmness in holding beliefs about right and wrong is an inseparable part of moral identity. In assessing fairness, those who use this identity have strict criteria in accordance with applicable norms. The assessment of justice according to *the Accessible Identity Model* depends on the identity that is accessed by the assessor, so people can not consistently judge justice. So, it could be that someone at one time judges justice by accessing material identity so that he emphasizes his personal interests, at other times he seems wise to judge justice because he accesses moral identity. However, this shift in accessing identity tends to a more mature direction, namely from material, to social, then to moral. The more mature a person's morality will be, the more often he will access social identity or moral identity in assessing justice. Therefore, the ability of individuals and society in realizing justice depends on the moral level of the person or society.

CONCLUSION

Efforts to realize social justice can be started from the application of the group values model. However, it must be admitted that maintaining togetherness, respecting and trusting others is not an easy thing to do. Humans always face a social dilemma, namely the conflict between personal interests versus self-sacrifice for the common good. In the face of this dilemma, it is almost certain that everyone chooses personal interests first. It is not surprising that people then try to get as much freedom as possible so that their personal interests can be realized. It should be realized that if all parties fight for their freedom and interests, destruction will soon follow. This phenomenon is currently engulfing this country.

People try to take everything they want for their own satisfaction. Destruction has already begun to appear here and there. Unfortunately, the realization that freedom and excessive self-gratification are the root of the destruction of common life has not yet emerged. Do we need to wait until more severe devastation comes for that awareness to emerge?

Unlimited freedom is impossible. Restrictions are necessary, but not totally. The limit in question is at least the common interest. Formulating this common interest is the first step in the formulation and enforcement of social justice. When talking about common interests, at that time there must also be self-sacrifice. As already mentioned, a concern for social justice must naturally be more altruistic than self-interested.

In the current social and state order, the enforcement of justice cannot be left to the community, let alone individual to individual. The authorities in this field already exist and from there the enforcement of justice should begin. The limitation of freedom that must first be controlled is on the authorities. One way is to apply the concept of *veil of ignorance* from John Rawls. The existence of a *veil of ignorance* means that the parties involved in developing the justice enforcement process should not know that they will benefit if the system they develop or the decisions they formulate will be implemented.

This principle seems very difficult to apply in this country. People want to be leaders, officials, members of the DPR, and others precisely because they want to get a good position and get lots of benefits. With that position they can control the decisions that are in their favor. However, they must be warned that it will lead to destruction. *Veil of ignorance* is a limitation for policy makers and implementers. In other words, it is the leaders and policy makers who have to start to be willing to be limited.

Leaders are those who have obtained more than sufficient facilities. Therefore, it is very bad if the leader still expects to get more benefits than what has been obtained. They should be role models. This opportunity to be a role model is still very possible in a country like Indonesia because psychologically leaders are still a reference for our society whose lives are still colored by intuition and emotion. If the leader can abandon his personal, party, and group interests, and play an instrumental role in maintaining public relations and cohesiveness, it will be easy to enforce justice (Schroeder et al, 2003).

It must be admitted that the *veil of ignorance* will be easier to apply in a small scope. The implication is that justice will be more easily enforced in a decentralized system. Decentralization is not only the use of authority but also means limiting authority to a smaller scope. Socially,

psychologically, decentralization is an effort to increase the efficacy and self-confidence of the local community. The fatal error in decentralization that is still continuing is rooted in the interpretation of the concept of decentralization as an attempt to become petty kings. By straightening the application of the concept of decentralization as an effort to increase self-efficacy, it is hoped that justice will be realized more quickly.

It is impossible for justice to be served without the application of sanctions against lawbreakers and oppressive behavior. A strong system of sanctions is not only directed at capturing anti-social actors but also to return unjust perpetrators to behaving fairly. Law enforcement is clearly a very important part in efforts to create justice. Unfortunately, we only continue to hope about this while reality is pointing in a different direction from that expectation.

Injustice is also suspected to cause social conflicts in various places. Therefore, realizing justice will reduce conflict. In addition to the need for the dimensions of justice as described earlier, in conflict resolution, it is also necessary to apply restorative justice. The application of values and restorative processes has been used to solve social and legal problems in various countries with the successful example of South Africa (Arbour, 2006; Roche, 2006). Restorative values emphasize the importance of victim prevention and remediation. The restorative process prioritizes solutions through negotiation and cooperation among residents rather than relying on formal legal remedies. Thus, restorative justice is directed at strengthening the relations of all parties involved and constructing their future together as well.

The principles of developing restorative justice are in line with the orientation of positive psychology. Oppressive treatment, unfair actions, conflicts, and various social problems which are generally repaid by retributive means such as imprisonment, are directed into understanding and beneficial cooperation, especially for the victims. Forgiveness from the victim which is followed up with kindness from the perpetrator is a positive transformation that is not easy to do but the results are very good for developing a harmonious life together.

Social justice in terms of distributive justice dimension means welfare for all parties. The languages commonly used are FAIR and PROSPEROUS. Unfortunately, these two things are often competed or contradicted. Competed in practice, it seems we have to choose which is first, fair or prosperous first. It is contradicted because there is an assumption that if justice is the goal, it will not be difficult to achieve prosperity. On the other hand, there is an assumption that if prosperity is to be achieved, justice can be ignored.

According to *the World Bank Indicators Database* published on April 11, 2008, it is stated that Indonesia's *Gross National Income* (GNI) per capita is 1420 US dollars. With an average world GNI of US\$7448, Indonesia ranks 140th in the world. If the indicator used is *Purchasing Power Parity* (PPP—*international dollars*), Indonesia's ranking is at position 149 with an average PPP of 3310 while the world's average PPP is 9209. From these figures we can conclude that Indonesia is not yet prosperous.

It must be admitted that from time to time there has been an increase in the average income of the Indonesian population. Unfortunately, in recent years the increase has not been as fast as in other countries. In addition, the increase that occurs is not enjoyed by all levels of society. In various media it is often stated that along with the increase in the average income of the population, the number of unemployment and poverty also increases. With the recent increase in the prices of various necessities, we can also predict that the increase in income will not raise the welfare of society in general. The increasing number of people who are at risk of becoming poor also indicates a problem of social justice.

Conditions as mentioned above teach us that welfare and justice should be parallel. Competing and contrasting justice with prosperity means failing to harmonize needs, *deservingness*, and equality. These three things require different distribution models. Each model will be more suitable to be applied in different situations. At the individual and family level, distribution is generally based on basic needs. For example, parents should provide different facilities for their children who are studying in college with facilities for their children who are in elementary school. In the work environment, distribution will be more suitable if applied proportionally (*equity*). It is a common understanding that workers with different levels of education, different lengths of work and different achievements get different wages. Meanwhile, for the scope of distribution countries, it will be more suitable with the application of the principle of equality, especially in public services. Therefore there needs to be a minimum service standard. However, the application of the distribution principle cannot be rigid. The group of poor and disabled people, for example, cannot be equated with the rich and healthy, so there needs to be a special

policy for them. Unfortunately, good policies such as 'rice for the poor' or 'health cards for the poor in' have not been implemented well. In other words, the principle of justice that is considered good may not necessarily be implemented properly.

We really want the fifth precept of the foundation of our country to continue to be strengthened. It is wrong if this precept is still our goal and has not become one of the foundations even though we have agreed to be unanimous in being loyal to it. Justice should not be a goal but a prerequisite, and sometimes as an instrument, to achieve various goals of living together at various levels, both personal, interpersonal, and collective. Besides justice is a prerequisite and instrument for achieving prosperity, with justice social cohesiveness can be achieved.

Socio-psychologically, it seems that currently the Indonesian people feel less proud to be Indonesian citizens. The image of the nation that tends to be low in the eyes of the world due to high levels of corruption, poor transportation management skills, undeveloped ways of dealing with disasters and various other problems, are the causes of the people's lack of pride in their status as Indonesians. Pride that does not stand out is exacerbated by the attitude of the community that lacks respect for officials and leaders as representatives of the government. Therefore, it is understandable that we feel that it is not enough to have a strong identity as citizens. A weak identity is also seen externally with the lack of respect from other citizens. The cases of unpaid workers and TKWs, being tortured, even killed, claims of reog art as belonging to other nations, or the copyrights of *tempe* and *batik* belonging to other nations, are examples of what we mean.

Another factor that causes us to not have a strong identity is the level of welfare that is still low. Nations that have a high level of welfare certainly have a stronger self-confidence and identity. By using the explanation as described earlier, where the welfare of the community can be more guaranteed if justice is served, it means that a strong identity emerges when distributive justice is enforced. However, it must be realized that although distributive justice is important to uphold, psychologically this dimension of justice has no long-term effect.

A strong identity is more influenced by procedural justice than distributive justice (Tyler & Blader, 2003). Procedural justice that affects the strength of identity includes formal procedures and relational treatment both formally and informally. This means that the fair treatment of community members as reflected in official regulations and the relationship between community members and power holders will significantly strengthen identity. The Indonesian government is known for its complicated bureaucratic system, so that it is still difficult for residents to get an ID card (Kedaulatan Rakyat, 27 April 2008). As a citizen, it is difficult to get an ID card. This fact causes people to feel less dignified. This is made worse by bad behavior and representatives of the people, for example by demanding additional benefits and facilities.

A strong identity built from pride and respect and based on justice will form social cohesiveness, a sense of unity and togetherness. Unity is more essential can be seen from the level of cooperation that occurs in society. Cooperation is mandatory or discretionary. Mandatory cooperation is generally carried out because of obligations while discretionary cooperation is more influenced by the internal motivation of the parties involved. Social cohesiveness is manifested in the form of cooperation because mandates/obligations tend to be oriented towards avoiding sanctions and getting *rewards*. Psychologically mandatory behavior is not strong enough and permanent. Therefore, uniting society and the nation by emphasizing the mandatory system will not last long.

On the other hand, discretionary cooperation as a form of social cohesiveness will be more permanent and resilient in facing challenges. This collaboration is psychologically based on a positive attitude to invite other parties to get involved while at the same time it will benefit the community and individuals in it. In addition, discretionary cooperation is also based on a sense of responsibility as a member of society (Tyler & Blader, 2003). The basic idea of restorative justice is in line with this (Boraine, 2006; Okimoto & Tyler, 2007). Building the future together by not fixating on the problems of the past and leaving the conventional ways of the retributive process is the application of the principle of discretion.

In an era that continues to change as it is today, welfare and social justice together are the keys to the formation of a strong social cohesiveness and identity. On the other hand, prioritizing personal interests and only being oriented towards achieving individual welfare will make it difficult to achieve justice, cohesiveness, and shared identity. There is no prohibition to seek individual welfare but prioritizing material identity means that we are only at an immature moral stage. On the other hand,

when welfare and social justice are realized, individuals also achieve prosperity and have a high assessment of justice.

The above description has important implications for psychology which has so far been too focused on individual problems. The sense of justice and subjective well-being for some psychologists is often considered as separate things from the surrounding social conditions. Such 'asocial' views should be shifted to a more 'social' direction.

Individual psychological studies should pay attention to the social context. This may still need to be fought for because psychology has so far been too individualistic, as well as the people involved in it.

We believe that if this nation can practice justice, we will appear more confident in the eyes of the world. Our identity as an Indonesian nation will also be the pride of its citizens. The government's job is to uphold justice and create prosperity. If the government apparatus and state institutions are still a source of injustice, we cannot expect the people to feel justice and enjoy prosperity. It is our duty as citizens to observe and control the practices of (un)justice. Hopefully the description in this article is also our effort as citizens so that justice can be realized.

REFERENCES

- Ancok, D. 2007. *Injustice as a Source of Radicalism in Religion: An Analysis based on Justice Theory in a Psychological Approach*. Paper presented at the Indonesian Psychological Association Congress, Denpasar, Bali, 1-3 March.
- Arbor, L. 2006. *Economic and Social Justice for Societies in Transition. A paper presented in the Second Annual Transitional Justice Lecture*. The Center of Human Rights and Global Justice, New York University School of Law and the International Center for Transitional Justice.
- Bertens, K. 2000. *Introduction to Business Ethics*. Gramedia PustakaUtama, Jakarta.
- Boraine, AL 2006. *Transitional Justice: A Holistic Interpretation*. *Journal of International Affairs*, 60(1), 17-27.
- Brosnan, SF 2006. *Nonhuman Species' Reactions to Inequity and Their Implication for Fairness*. *Social Justice Research*, 19(2), 153-185.
- Clayton, S. & Opatow, S. 2003. *Justice and Identity: Changing Perspectives on What Is Fair*. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(4), 298-310.
- Crosby, FJ & Franco, JL 2003. *Connecting between Ivroy Tower and the Multicolored World: Linking Abstract Theories of Social Justice to the Rough and Tumble of Affirmative Action*. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(4), 362-373.
- Deutsch, M. 2006. *A Framework for Thinking about Oppression and Its Change*. *Social Justice Research*, 19(1), 7-41.
- Epley, N. & Caruso, EM 2004. *Egocentric Ethics*. *Social Justice Research*, 17(2), 171-187.
- Farr, A. 2007. *Beyond Diversity, Toward Social Justice*. *International Journal of Diversity*, 6(4), 101-106.
- Faturochman. 1998. *Relative Deprivation: Sense of Justice and Psychological Condition of Factory Workers*. *Journal of Psychology*, 15(2), 1-15.
- Faturochman. 2002. *Antecedents of Procedural and Distributive Justice Assessment and Their Impact*. Dissertation. GadjahMada University.
- Faturochman. 2005. *Rice Cycle, a paper presented in Workshop on Food Security*. Neys Van Hoogstraten Foundation and Vietnam National Institute of Nutrition, Hanoi, Vietnam, May 1-6.
- Faturochman & Ancok, D. 2001. *Psychological Dynamics of Justice Assessment*. *Journal of Psychology*, 18(1), 41-60.
- Faturochman & Walgito, B. 2002. *Powerlessness and Injustice to Farmers*. *Population*, 13(1), 67-92.