



ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE SETTLEMENT INTERNAL POLITICAL PARTIES COURT BY PARTIES

Faisal Riza,

Faculty of Law UMSU

Email : faisalriza@umsu.ac.id

Abstract

Political party (parties) in a democratic political system becomes very important presence in the community. Political parties receive special role as a forum to bridge the aspirations of the community, distribute and reallocate social community or political strength to the level of the political superstructure country through elections conducted once every five years. Institutionally, political parties are private legal entities established by a group of people with ideals and the same goal. However, political parties are functionally oriented public and become a place of struggle in the political aspirations of the democratic government.

Political parties currently in development, is an organization that always faced pluktuatif internal disputes which often lead to a split. Internal party disputes occur due to the institution failing to relocate the dispute by consolidating various interests are in line of sight of one another. Some of the disputes that have occurred in the internal party is a Group Party (Golkar), the United Development Party (PPP) and several other parties protracted settlement could not be resolved even in internal party itself. It should not happen, because the dispute is going on internally must be dealt with at the party itself and not just take him out of the party.

Disputes can be brought to a party outside the party to be resolved or settled by the court if there is no settlement in the party's internal means. As an alternative so that internal disputes in the party is not brought or resolved through the courts, the Article 32 paragraph (1) and (2) of Law No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment to Act No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties has been given the role of the court party to resolve internal party disputes. Therefore, every political party should be formed and have a party tribunal or other appropriate designation Statutes and Bylaws of the party as an alternative dispute resolution outside the court.

Keywords: Settlement, Political Parties, the Court Party



A. Introduction

Efforts to preserve and protect the political party of the threat of disintegration due to internal disputes in the party is changing Act No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties to Act No. 2 of 2011. The new legislation has set the dispute settlement mechanism or internal party disputes.

As it is known that a Political Party is essentially formed as a reflection of the rights of citizens to freedom of association, assembly and expression. Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia Year 1945 has provided guarantees that strict measures in this regard. A political party is one of the pillars of democracy.

However, what happened in Indonesia, where political parties as one of the pillars of democracy can not be truly realized. This is because many political parties are still in dispute in order to maintain and perpetuate their power (Riana Budi Mastuti: 2016), Political party disputes that occur are usually the political party's internal disputes, disputes between political parties and disputes between political parties and the government related to the State Administrative object on an administrative decision that a concrete, individual and final.

Party dispute is not positive and productive to continue to be maintained, it will be much harm to society and the state. Dispute party to rupture the party cadres would weaken the institutional party itself, weakening the party's functions which can disrupt the balance of the party.

The functions of the political parties are faced with important tasks related to the operations of State government, the task such as carrying out political aggregation function, the function of political aspirations, political education, political recruitment, mobilization politics to win elections and placed representatives in jabatan- political office administration (Firdaus: 2012). If this function is not running then the stability of democratic governance will be disrupted.

If you look story developments in Indonesia during this party, the political party is never separated from their internal party conflict or dispute. Since the time of the movement to reform era, political parties always conflict among fellow party members. During the movement, the conflict that hit the Indonesian National Party (PNI), hence the birth Parindra and Party of National Education. As well as SI (SI), which broke into SI (SI) Red and SI (SI) White (LiliRomli: 2007).

Post-independence Indonesia, some of the party's internal conflicts also occur in Masjumi. Proponents Masjumi out one by one, first PSII, followed by NU. Conflicts also occur among nationalists, then there are



two PIR PIRPIRHazarin and Wongsonegoro. In the New Order, the number of political parties only two, namely the United Development Party (PPP) and the Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI).

It turned out that both parties fusion product is always endless conflict. The conflict in the United Development Party (PPP) is generally caused due to differences between the supporting elements, especially between NU and MI. NU then out of the United Development Party (PPP) in 1984. While the Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI) as a result of the conflict led to Megawati and her supporters out of the Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI) by forming PDI (LiliRomli: 2007).

Conflicts political party that happened in the past happened in the present moment, the conflict continues to pose a longstanding internal disputes in the party. In general, the dispute is power at the time of the leadership succession in the conference or congress. Not looking for a solution, it is precisely any differences that exist always ends with a split, not the consensus built through a container formed to resolve the existing problems within the party.

Indeed, every political party has the institutional mechanisms internally, The institutions are expected to manage a wide range of issues and controversies that arise. All are designed to build the party autonomy in handling and resolving permasalahan. Tetapi autonomy of political parties as a fundamental principle of democracy is not infrequently faced with an internal mechanism that undemocratic and authoritarian.

Previously there was no alternative that can be done to resolve the Internal party disputes, for example by forming a political party tribunal. But after Law No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties amended by Act No. 2 of 2011, the court party as an alternative to a settlement out of court (non litigation) can be formed. Supreme political party formed as a realization of the statute of political parties must first resolve disputes that occur in the internal party does not claim in the court (litigation).

Formulation of the Problem

Based on the above background and to learn more about the court-party, then made the formulation of the problem as follows:

- a. What Is the Role and Function of the Party Court?
- b. How Internal Dispute settlement process through the Court Party Political Party?



B. Discussion

Role and Function of the Party Court

Previously not so well known role in the party court settlement of disputes, disputes or conflicts within political parties. However, after the District Court of Central Jakarta and West Jakarta District Court rejected the process sue-sue between the two camps are camps DPP Group Party (Golkar) version of the National Conference (National Conference) Bali and the version of National Conference (National Conference) Jakarta, the role of court-parties begin to be considered ,

In 2013 the Supreme Court through a cassation decision DimiyatiDahlan rejected the cassation in the case of a dispute the National Democratic Party (PDK). District Court judge appeal panel Madiun examine this case in the first instance rejected the lawsuit is appropriate, because of a dispute between DimiyatiDahlan as the plaintiff and administrators PDK has not been resolved internally Madiun advance through this partai.Hal court further strengthens the presence of the court party.

Article 32 paragraph (2) of Law No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment to Law No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties stated that political party's internal dispute resolution conducted by a court of a political party or other designation established by political parties based on the Articles of Association (AD) and Bylaws (ART) party.

Supreme court which political party is formed by the above rules, but in its present form is left entirely to the respective political parties. After the party tribunal established by each political party, then the results reported by the formation of the party leadership to the ministry of law and human rights.

Full Court ruling party against political party's internal dispute resolution and the task of weeks to settle the dispute no later than 60 (sixty) days to make a decision regarding the dispute. Ruling party tribunal are final and binding internally in matters related to the management problems of the party.

As the court of the United Development Party (PPP) in the Articles of Association (AD) party's duty and authority to resolve the dispute over the management of internal United Development Party (PPP), and the court Golkar Party (Golkar) or so-called Leadership Council as a implementing agency supreme party collective duty to resolve the dispute management.



Dispute in (internal) political party must have, according to Duverger (ArbiSanit, 1982: 47). There are three forms of disputes relating to or political power, namely:

- a. Disputes that have absolutely no basis of principle, the shape of this dispute relates to a practical problem is not with the ideology that carried either by individuals or class or group.
- b. Dispute focuses on individual and group differences related to the issue of political party or related to the interests of political parties, people who are supposed to represent the people.
- c. The dispute focuses on the problem of differences in ideology, respectively memeperjuangkan party ideology that everything felt right.

As Duverger opinion, a dispute that is in the political parties must be resolved by the parties, as political parties pursuant to Article 1 Law No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment to Act No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties is an organization which is national and is formed by a group of Indonesian citizens voluntarily on an equal basis will and ideals to fight for and defend the political interests of member , community, nation and state.

To promote and defend the political interests of the members, then one of the functions of political parties is as a means of regulating the conflict, namely resolving all forms of conflict (RumidanRabi'a, 2009: 29). As a control a conflict, political parties do ways to accommodate and integrate issues of both parties, a dialogue with the parties involved in the conflict, and accommodate and integrate as well as dialogue with the perpetrators of the conflict (RamlanSubakti, 1992: 117-121), then the issues discussed to determine or generate a decision. WhatWhen disputes, disputes or conflicts in his own body can not be resolved internally, how political parties will resolve conflicts in society and the State.

Therefore, the party cadres should manage disputes, disputes or internal conflicts and resolve them through the party's internal mechanism does not involve the court as a party outside the party. It is important to provide political education for cadres of the political parties to realize the tradition elegantly manage internal conflicts, and to respect the rules of his own household.

As a means or agency to resolve disputes that occur within (internal) a party, then the court of the party is the right choice. The Supreme Party container is actually not new in politics in Indonesia, it is already there in



4 (four) years ago. The existence of a recognized party in the court of Law No. 2 of 2011 on the amendment of Law No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties.

During this court as if the party was never heard and has not shown its performance in resolving disputes, disputes or internal conflicts in the party. Party cadres have not felt the importance of the existence of the institution. The role of the party began to feel important court lately, especially when some political parties such as the United Development Party (PPP) and the Functional Group Party (Golkar) suffered a very serious internal conflict.

Dispute is happening is completed outside the party, each party filed a lawsuit to gain legitimacy stewardship. Seeing this, it seems that the courts became the main choice of the parties to the dispute. This shows that the court has yet to become an alternative party first considered more effective to resolve the dispute.

Political parties still stuttering with the court where the party, it dikareakan political parties have not had a clear design on the functions and role of the court in resolving disputes and internal party politics partai. Partai still searching for a model of how the court works and how the ruling party and the implementation of the decision. Some rules multi (many) interpretation complicate the execution of the court ruling party.

Changes in legislation made has strengthened the position and authority of the party mahakamah, composition and membership of the charging party court set objectively and strictly regulate the flow of internal dispute resolution by the court of the party to court involvement in resolving internal party disputes.

Indeed, the court functions of political parties is to resolve internal party conflict. It is seen in Article 32 of Law No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment of Act No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties as follows:

- 1) Political party disputes settled by internal political party as stipulated in the Constitution and.
- 2) The composition of the court of the political party or other designation as referred to in paragraph (2) shall be submitted by the political parties to the ministry.
- 3) Internal party dispute settlement referred to in paragraph (2) shall be completed no later than 60 (sixty) days.
- 4) Court ruling political party or other designations are final and binding internally in case of disputes relating to the management board.



Court party function as the engine of dispute resolution, dispute or conflicts that occur in connection with management, violations of the rights of members of political parties, dismissal without apparent reason, abuse of authority, financial accountability, and objected to the decision of political parties.

If the function has been executed properly and did not achieve good resolution anyway, then the last way the dispute settlement conducted through the district court. The district court is the last option after completion through the court the party has done for 60 (sixty) days but did not get the desired completion of the parties.

A grace period of 60 (sixty) days of the court issued a ruling party should have related to the dispute filed by the parties. Court ruling a political party shall be final and binding internal disputes relating to the management of political parties, while the district court ruling is the first and final decision and can only be appealed to the Supreme Court.

The existence of political parties is deemed tribunal is important to ensure there is no interference by other parties (external parties), so that sovereignty can be maintained by either party. Political parties are very instrumental Court as an institution that would oversee the honor of the highest authority in the party political exclusion and ensure all the processes of the party in accordance with applicable regulations.

1. Internal Dispute Resolution Process Party Political Parties Through Court

As stated in Article 1 of Law-Undang Nomor 2 of 2011 on the Amendment of Act No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties, that a political party is an organization which is national and is formed by a group of Indonesian citizens voluntarily on an equal basis will and ideals to promote and defend the interests of members of political, community, nation, and state and maintain the integrity of the Unitary Republic of Indonesia iv and the Constitution of the state tHE REPUBLIC Year 1945. Untuk achieve these objectives the political parties have the Statutes and Bylaws, which must be adhered to each each member of the political party as a rule together.

Currently political parties are very instrumental in the life of the nation. The role was so huge and strategic for example in the case of election of members of the House of Representatives (DPR), the Regional Representatives Council (DPRD), Head of State and Provincial, until the election Presiden. Tentunya big role, political parties would gain authority



and material great anyway. Therefore, competition or fights among the members and officials of political parties is becoming increasingly hard.

Political party's internal strife often happens, there is a dispute that can be resolved internally, but not a bit too protracted. Even cause divisions within the party politik. Salah one cause of division it is unclear regulation of political parties, both in laws, government regulations, or the Articles of Association (AD) / Bylaws (ART) political parties (Anwar M. Rachman, 2015).

In addition, the rules concerning the management of organizations recruiting party members, management, reward and punishment of members, and the party does not consent expressly regulated, clear, and detailed in the Articles of Association (AD)/ Bylaws (ART) party. As well as decision-making, conflict resolution, as well as the duties and authority of party leaders do not set out clearly and unambiguously pattern internal party dispute resolution.

As the running time, the dynamic development of national and state tidaktertutup the possibility of members of political parties who were previously part of the same container disagree tapered so that there is a dispute (WasisPriyanto, 2016). In general, disputes will happen regarding the management, violations of the rights of members of political parties, dismissal without apparent reason, abuse of authority, financial accountability, and objected to the decision of political parties.

a. Outside the Court (Non-Litigation) through Supreme Party

The first alternative to resolve the dispute management, violations of the rights of members of political parties, dismissal without apparent reason, abuse of authority, financial accountability, and objected to the decision of political parties, must be made out of court.

Disputes submitted to the court to be resolved without first going through an internal party would be rejected by the court. As the District Court of Central Jakarta and West Jakarta District Court rejected the process sue-sue the fastness DPP Group Party (Golkar) version of the National Conference (National Conference) Bali and the version of National Conference (National Conference) Jakarta and rejected the cassation DimiyatiDahlan by the Supreme Court in the dispute the National Democratic Party (PDK).

For dispute resolution outside the court, Law No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment of the Law on Political Parties Nomor 2 Tahun 2008 requires that disputes be resolved internally political party in court the party



beforehand. If not reached an agreement or a bright spot in the settlement, the dispute is resolved in court or submitted to the District Court.

Court dispute resolution process through the party in Act No. 2 of 2011 to shift the existing processes are stipulated in Act 2 of 2008. The process Undang Nomor earlier stated that the political party dispute resolution conducted by deliberation and consensus. If deliberation and consensus is not reached then there are two options settlement through the courts or out of court.

Comparison between Law No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties to Act No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment of Act No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties are as follows:

- 1) Article 32 paragraph (1) of Law No. 2 of 2008 stated that political party disputes resolved by consensus. While in Law No. 2 of 2011 describes the disputes of political parties be settled by internal political party as stipulated in the Articles of Association (AD) and Bylaws (ART) which is carried out by a Court of Political Parties or other designations established by the Parties.
- 2) Law No. 2 of 2008 when the consensus is not reached, the dispute resolution process of political parties pursued through the courts or out of court, the settlement of disputes out of court can be done through reconciliation, mediation, or arbitration mechanism is set in the Articles of Association (AD) and Bylaws (ART). Law No. 2 of 2011 in terms of dispute resolution if the court is not achieved through the political parties, the dispute settlement is done through the District Court.
- 3) Term Examination First Level In Law No. 2 of 2008 is not clear how long to resolve internal disputes of political parties by way of consensus, while in Act No. 2 of 2011 explained that the completion of the internal party conflict through the courts, political parties must diselesaikan no later than 60 (sixty) days.

Settlement of disputes conducted in Outside the court can be reached in three ways, namely reconciliation, mediation and arbitration. Three ways have also set in the Bylaws (ART) each political party. Regarding settlement mechanisms or procedures can be adapted by Act No. 30 of 1999 on Arbitration and Alternative Dispute completion.

How to settlement through the courts of different parties by way of settlement reconciliation, mediation and aritrase that relies on the agreement of the parties to the dispute. Even the court of political parties can be considered as an institution pedestal in order to ensure the integrity of a political party.



How to settlement through the court party was coercion, like it or not parties to the dispute must go through the court party. While three of the following ways (ReflyHarun, 2015):

- 1) Reconciliation is a way of solving that relies on the awareness of the disputants to glue back the difference tibul to regroup. This method is not easy because of solely relying partiesberpekara consciousness. That is why, also known as a way of mediation.
- 2) Settlement by way of mediation relying on the role of a mediator (mediator). Mediator as well as a negotiator to negotiate a solution to the way the two sides. The final decision remains with each of the parties without the acceptance of both parties a settlement offered teradap way, not akanada reconciliation.
- 3) How to arbitration is the agreement of the parties are at the beginning, ie when it agreed to appoint an arbitrator (the court) after being appointed on agreement between both conflicting parties, the arbitrator will act as judges to process and decide the case. Whatever the arbitrator seyogiyanya obeyed because the arbitrator appointed under the agreement both parties.

Under the provisions of Article 32 of Law No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment of Act No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties clearly referred to the procedure if there is a dispute or disagreement in internal political party, then the party court has the authority to resolve disputes or conflicts.

The authority of the party tribunal is attributive and functionally running quasi-judicial functions. The nature of the authority of the court party attributive indirectly and functionally put the court party as a delegate in the state that the formation of political parties and its contents handed over to each partai.Oleh therefore the Court rulings Party is a legal product that must be obeyed by all functionaries and members internally and externally must be respected by all parties, including the State (Eden, 2016).

To mention a party court term, in the respective political parties can be different, but the same essence to resolve the dispute or disputes in political parties before it settled out (external) party. The task of the court is the party receiving the complaint or lawsuit of cadres of political parties to the dispute and resolve it while maintaining the honor of the party.

The composition of the membership of the court or the party will perform the tasks of political parties resolve internal dispute mechanism formed by the respective parties, because the law does not explain it. After the composition or membership of the court party was formed, leaders of



political parties submit it to the Ministry of Law and Human Rights (Kemenkum HAM), as the mandate of Article 32 paragraph (3) of Law No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment of Act No. 2 of 2008 party membership Politik. Tentunya court on political parties should have a neutral or unfavorable to one party to the dispute and does not have an interest in the dispute or disputes.

Regarding the object of dispute or disagreement that the authority of the court of the party is a dispute relating to the management, a violation of the rights of members of political parties, dismissal without apparent reason, abuse of authority, financial accountability, and objected to the decision of political parties. Therefore, the decision of the court party should certainly include such objects as long as it is submitted by the parties who have legal status (legal standing) to sue.

Legal status (legal standing) of the parties are subject to the law which meets the requirements under the laws and Articles of Association (AD)- Anggaran Household (ART) for the political party may file a lawsuit in the dispute or a political party's internal strife. Legal subjects who have legal standing to file a lawsuit against the dispute or political party's internal disputes are those in this case members of political parties who feel aggrieved legal interest due to deeds and actions taken by the board of political parties.

To be drawn and positioned as a defendant, the subject of law (naturlijk or rechtsperson) must be ensured the legal position of the defendant with deeds and actions that lead to the interests of the plaintiff violated. Placing the defendant in the case of the party's internal disputes can not be separated from the position of the defendant as a party functionary who has the authority to make decisions on behalf of the party and other actions in running the functions, duties and authority of the party. Therefore, the legal position of the defendant can not be sued in his personal capacity but in the capacity of the post of party functionaries.

All over the deeds and actions of the board unauthorized never seen no legal or illegal. So that the legal position of the defendant either party litigant before the Court as well as before the court is a party official lawful and legislation (Firdaus, 2016), While litigants in a dispute management under the Act Governing Political Party is composed of the highest decision-making forum of political parties dealing with the lower 2/3 of the participants of the forum.

Regarding the court ruling party is pleased with the management dispute or disagreement is the last (final) and binding (binding) internally. Therefore, internally the parties to the dispute is not possible to take legal



action to sue the party court decision to the district court. Whatever the decision of the court disputes related party management, in a normative logic and binding ruling last law that must be obeyed by all officials and party members, especially the parties to the dispute.

The provision is aimed at encouraging the institutionalization of the party, maintain the autonomy and solidity of the party as a pillar of democracy, giving assurance that fast on the management of recognized parties or other settlement way that is fair to all parties, and support the efficiency and effectiveness of the state government.

The Court ruling party that is final and binding internally means is not possible or not there are remedies that can be taken by members and officials, especially the parties against the ruling. Article 33 paragraph (1) indirectly exclude Article 32 paragraph (5) as long as the party reached the court decision.

At the time of making the decision, the court party did not only examine and rule on the dispute or disagreement stewardship of political parties alone but included putting a legal framework in settling disputes or disputes related to the concrete situation faced by political parties.

Therefore, the decision which was taken out of the petitioned parties related to dispute management that considers all aspects of the answer and finish the concrete situation all related to the dispute settlement is fair is something that might be done and decided by the court party (pragmatic legal realism) (SoetandyoWignjosoebroto, 2002). On that basis, it is not uncommon assemblies take other steps are progressive and out of legal formalism to achieve substantive justice (Ahmad Rifai, 2011) by ruling *ultra petita* sake of certainty and fairness crowds.

Court merupakan alternatif the party is actually the main option in settling disputes or disputes in political parties. Court settlement of disputes through political parties is expected to resolve the dispute with the good, fast, straightforward, cost is relatively mild and have binding legal force of the parties including the party through its decision in the form of specific agreements without memihakpada one of the parties.

b. Settlement through the Courts

In connection with the political party dispute or disputes are resolved through the courts, it is the court's discretion negeri. Pasal 33 of Law No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment of Act No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties explained that the state court has the authority to resolve disputes or political party disputes as mediation or dispute conducted in internal political party can not be reached.



Earlier, in the Circular of the Supreme Court (MA) No. 4 of 2003 on the Case of Civil Regarding Elections and Circular of the Supreme Court (MA) No. 5 of 2003 on Lawsuit Relating to Political Parties do not seem to want justice agencies serve as a public space for the benefit of antarkader political struggle of political parties.

Therefore, the District Court only has the authority to investigate and adjudicate disputes relating to violation of the rights of members of political parties, dismissal without apparent reason, abuse of authority, responsibility keuangan / or objections against the decision of the Political Parties. In conjunction with the management of political parties do not dispute the authority of the court.

Article 33 paragraph (3) of Law No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment of Act No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties explained that disputes relating to violation of the rights of members of political parties, dismissal without apparent reason, abuse of authority, financial accountability and / or objections against the decision of the Political Parties resolved by the district court no later than 60 (sixty) days after the lawsuit is listed in state court clerkships.

Then the district court under the provisions mentioned above within 60 (sixty) days (days: weekdays based on the Guidelines for Duties and Court Administration in four Courts BOOK II 2007 edition published by the Supreme Court in 2009) since the suit case was registered at the secretariat must be disconnected.

The court's ruling in the country as stipulated in Article 33 paragraph (2) of Law No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment of Act No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties is the decision of the first and final level, and can only be appealed to the Supreme Court.

The purpose of the Article is that the court ruling on the dispute a political party can not be an appeal to a higher court but the efforts of cassation in factiejudex examination by the supreme court. The Supreme Court must make a decision no later than 30 (thirty) days after the cassation registered in the Supreme Court clerkships.

Filing disputes unresolved political party in advance by the party's internal mechanisms or through the court the lawsuit premature parties and the court was not authorized to try the case. Therefore, the court must declare the suit can not be accepted (nietontvankelijkverklaard).

The existence of the internal settlement of political parties through the court a political party can actually be interpreted as an attempt alternative dispute resolution through internal party forums, before stepping away to make efforts to the general court of law.



C. Conclusion

The role of political parties courts are now starting to be taken into account and is needed by political parties to maintain the stability of the party cadres and minimize outside interference to the problems that occur in partai. Untuk function as internal party dispute settlement institution, where the court recognized party in Article 32 paragraph (2) of Law No. 2 of 2011, the position was further strengthened by court ruling that rejected the lawsuit filed by a political party cadres dispute or disputes related to the party to the court before the dispute is resolved in an internal party.

Internal party dispute resolution process can be done in two ways, namely through court-party (non-litigation) and the courts (litigation). Settlement of disputes through the courts will do if the court of first parties settle the dispute, but no agreement was reached. Disputes submitted to the court the party will be completed no later than 60 days with a decision which is final and binding.

Blibigraphy

- Asshidduqie, Jimly 2006, the Criminal Procedure Act Testing, Jakarta: Constitutional Press.
- Firdaus, 2012, Implications of Political Parties Against Stability System Administration Indonesian constitutional system before and after the amendment of the 1945 Constitution, Law Science Doctoral Dissertation, Bandung: Padjadjaran University.
- Paradise, "Internal Dispute Resolution Mechanism According to the Political Parties Act No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment Act No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties", <http://www.firdauslaw70.blogspot.co.id>, Accessed July 2, 2016.
- Aaron, Refly, chaos Conflict political party, Detiknews, March 24, 2015.
- Mastuti, Riana Budi "Settlement Parties: A Case Study of Dispute Against Political Parties After the elections in 2004 ", <http://lib.ui.ac.id/opac/ui/detail.jsp?id=88719&lokasi=lokal>, Accessed June 11, 2016.
- Priyanto, Wasis, "Settlement of Political Parties", <http://www.waktuterindah.blogspot.co.id>, accessed July 2, 2016.
- Rabi'a, Rumidan 2009, Closer to Election in Indonesia, Jakarta, PT. King GrafindoPersada.
- Rachman, M. Anwar, *Internal Dispute Settlement Parties*, JawaPos, 14 November, 2015.



- Republic of Indonesia, Law No. 2 of 2011 on the Amendment of Act No. 2 of 2008 on Political Parties.
- Rifai Ahmad, 2011, *discovery of the Law by Judge In Perspective Progressive Law*, Jakarta: SinarGrafika.
- Romli, Lili, *Conflict Resolution Mechanism Party*, National Journal, Political Research Center LIPI, September 28, 2007.
- Sanit, Arbi, 1982, *the Indonesian Political System: Stability, Strength Map Politics and Development*, Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Subakti, Ramlan, 1992, *Understanding Political Science*, Jakarta: PT. GramediaWidiasarana Indonesia.
- Wignjosoebroto, Soetandyo, 2002, *the Law; Paradigm, Method and Dynamics problem*, Jakarta: ELSAM.