Human Resources Management Strategy in the Military Justice Environment: Study of State Civil Apparatus Management at the High Court of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia

Zidny Taqiyya[1], Asropi[2], Ratri Istania[3]
[1,2]Politeknik STIA LAN, Jakarta, Indonesia
Email: zidny.taqiyya@mahkamahagung.go.id

Abstract

The Supreme Court is a judicial institution vested with authority to exercise judicial power in four separate branches of the judiciary, namely the General Courts, Religious Courts, Administrative Courts, and Military Courts. The Military Court, in particular, serves as the judicial body responsible for upholding the law and justice for members of the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI). Unlike the other three branches of the judiciary, the Military Court system consists of three appellate courts and one main court. The existence of these four courts is governed by Law Number 31 of 1997 on Military Judiciary and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Regulation Number 125 of 2009 on the Delegation of Authority to High-Ranking Officials and Chief Justices of Appellate Courts within the Supreme Court for Signing in the Field of Personnel. However, the implementation of these regulations has still resulted in varying interpretations and paradigm differences, especially in understanding the phrase "appellate court," which has been perceived as somewhat biased and not fully implemented. This is particularly evident in the coordination and management of Civil Servants (ASN), as the Supreme Court places the Main Military Court on par with the appellate courts, although in practice, the Main Military Court resembles a "court above the appellate courts." This research employs a qualitative approach with a specific Case Study research method, focusing on the differential treatment of ASN members who represent a minority within the Military Judiciary. Ultimately, the study recognizes the need to bring together perspectives and unify understandings regarding the implementation of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Regulation Number 125 of 2009, analyzed through the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) theory, in order to harmonize the management and governance of appellate courts. This would help eliminate disparities between the High Military Court and the Main Military Court, serving as a bridge of understanding within the Military Judiciary in Indonesia.

Keywords: *Pengadilan Militer, Disparitas, Peraturan, Mahkamah Agung.*

A. INTRODUCTION

Human Resources (HR) is an essential instrument within an organization, from the smallest to the largest aspects. In essence, it cannot be separated from how the organization manages HR as the subject responsible for carrying out the activities of the organization. This is because, in any case, an organization will not function optimally without the support of competent HR management. This principle applies to all institutions and government agencies, including the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court is the embodiment of the judicial institutions in Indonesia. The Supreme Court, which has the authority to exercise judicial power in four branches of the judiciary, namely the General Courts, Religious Courts, Administrative Courts, and Military Courts, continually strives to educate, nurture, and develop human resources wherever they are and wherever they are assigned.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court, as the oldest and largest judicial institution in Indonesia, is committed to ensuring that all members of the judiciary have equal rights and opportunities to develop themselves individually. However, various challenges arise when trying to fulfill this aspiration, which is not as straightforward as one might imagine and often makes it seem like a distant goal. This is especially true for the Military Judiciary, the last judicial institution to join the Supreme Court from the Indonesian National Armed Forces Legal Development Agency (Babinkum TNI). Now, the Supreme Court, alongside the General Courts, Religious Courts, and Administrative Courts, faces various new issues, one of which concerns the management of human resources in the Military Judiciary.

The management of human resources in the Military Judiciary is very different from other forms of judiciaries. In the military world, there exists a hierarchical command system from top to bottom. What is interesting is that in decision-making and policy-making, the Military Judiciary still places a strong emphasis on a person's rank and status. Even in the management of Civil Servants (ASN), which should ideally have established rules, there are still numerous experiences and policies that seem to disregard existing regulations. The phrase "policy is above rules" often serves as a justification for actions taken.

In fact, in Law Number 5 of 2014 concerning State Civil Apparatus (ASN), it is evident that the management of human resources is a matter of great importance and a concern within this regulation. In Law Number 5 of 2014 concerning State Civil Apparatus, Article 69 regarding Career Development stipulates that the career development of civil servants (PNS) is based on qualifications, competencies, performance assessments, and the needs of government agencies. Career development for PNS is carried out while considering integrity and morality, as well as technical competence, managerial competence, and socio-cultural competence. However, in reality, the regulations in place are a combination of management from the TNI headquarters and the Supreme Court, where in administrative matters, they follow the TNI pattern, while in matters of regulation, they adhere to the Supreme Court.

Take, for example, in simple decision-making, such as the policy to conduct a Morning Roll Call. The Main Military Court and the High Military Court, despite being within the same courthouse complex, have different policies in conducting the roll call. Apart from the differing timing of its execution, the two institutions also hold the roll call at different locations.

This is a small example that there are still differences in policy-making between two units with the same status as Appellate Courts, even though these units are located in the same place and still within the same judicial jurisdiction. However,

the policies they adopt already differ from each other, especially in matters of greater significance that can impact someone's life.

In more significant and urgent matters, the issues related to human resources management, such as problems regarding employee Promotions and Transfers, still face many challenges and issues. There are many factors that can explain why these issues persist, and one of the factors contributing to this is the high prevalence of a military culture. This is not surprising, considering the military background of the Military Court, which still highly upholds the honor of soldiers. At the same time, it is an institution that has transitioned from the Indonesian National Armed Forces Legal Development Agency (Babinkum TNI) to the Supreme Court, and this transition, often unconsciously, has developed into a culture that ultimately disadvantages personnel.

Based on the Decree of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Number 125, which states that the High Military Court and the Main Military Court have equal status, the implementation of this decision should ideally facilitate personnel in terms of both administration and the Promotion and Transfer policy. This should have been carried out since the enactment of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Regulation and the integration of the Military Courts into the Supreme Court. Automatically, all units should have a unified perspective and adapt to the changes, acknowledging that in Indonesia, the Military Courts consist of four Appellate Courts: the Main Military Court, High Military Court I in Medan, High Military Court II in Jakarta, and Military Court III in Surabaya. All of them have equal and equivalent status, with no one holding a higher position than the others.

Although it seems that the Main Military Court is still reluctant to accept this voluntarily, various policies and the implementation of existing regulations indicate a continued sense of ownership and empowerment by the Main Military Court, reminiscent of the past when it was still part of the Indonesian National Armed Forces Legal Development Agency (Babinkum TNI). In those times, they were the central authority for Military Court management across Indonesia. This is evident in how they express objections to the actions of High Military Court II in Jakarta by directly sending employee transfer documents to the Supreme Court.

All of these cases should ideally be resolved without prolonged disputes. The management and coordination between these two units indeed require policies and agreements so that the issues within the military courts can be addressed. This includes even the smallest matters, such as determining whether promotion documents should be sent to the High Military Court or the Main Military Court, as well as issues regarding correspondence to decide to whom these documents should be sent and which ones are considered as copies. Clarity in this regard should be achieved through well-organized and orderly human resources management policies, leading to a system of renovation and regularity in the management of the Military Courts.

This can be realized by starting with a fundamental analysis of which aspects need improvement in the Human Resources Management policy. It is also essential

to consider which strategies can be implemented in managing Human Resources within the Military Judiciary, whether it only requires adjustments or if a new strategy needs to be adopted to address the existing issues. One thing is certain: any improvements or changes made should be appropriate and geared towards something constructive rather than exacerbating the situation by offering an incompatible Human Resources Management model.

Military Courts are an area of research that is genuinely intriguing and warrants comprehensive exploration. There aren't many studies that delve into Military Courts as a research subject. Most discussions regarding Military Judiciary revolve around military careers or military judges who, despite their roles as government officials, still prioritize their military duties. Unlike judges in other judicial jurisdictions, military judges have limited service ages, typically up to 58 years, whereas judges in other jurisdictions can serve until 65 years at the first-instance court level and 67 years at the appellate court level. Discussions about Military Courts, it must be acknowledged, are not very common as research subjects, especially for personnel within Military Courts who are not members of the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI) but rather Civil Servants working in an institution originally established to uphold justice for TNI personnel.

This can be seen from an interview conducted by the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI) Commander for the years 2021-2022, General TNI Andika Perkasa, during an interview with Andy F. Noya on the "Kick Andy" program. In the interview, General TNI Andika Perkasa stated that all personnel in the Military Courts are part of the military, although there are actually Civil Servants among them. The number of Civil Servants is limited and not as numerous as Non-Commissioned Officers, Enlisted personnel, or TNI officers. This is because the number of cases involving the TNI is relatively small compared to the other three branches of the judiciary, so not many people are aware of this fact. Furthermore, very few members of the general public enter the military court buildings directly, unless they receive an invitation to appear as witnesses in a case.

This, of course, contradicts the "obligation" of transparency in today's era. Although not widely known, it cannot be denied that the Military Courts are something intriguing and important to discuss. This is evident from the existence of the Case Search Information System (SIPP), which uploads the verdicts of military courts, making them accessible to the public anytime and anywhere. This means that Military Courts are inherently open and not concealed.

Therefore, it is crucial for all Civil Servants, both from the executive and judicial domains, to understand that research on military courts is interesting for further investigation, especially regarding human resources management, which is not widely known and differs from other judicial environments. Although this research is not the first to study military courts, it is hoped that this research can be the first to be applied by the Military Appellate Courts, with a significant impact and benefits for both the Supreme Court and military courts in particular.

Building on this thought, the research aims to study human resources management, particularly in the Military Judiciary, through the concept of equal opportunity, even when not in a majority position or holding specific ranks. This will be achieved by making Civil Servant (ASN) policy the primary instrument, conducting a comprehensive study while still focusing on the main objective of creating an ideal and constructive policy model through research, which can be applied in the future.

This concept is crucial due to the current hypothesis that there is still a deeply rooted paradigm suggesting that the Main Military Court is superior to the High Military Court, even though both have the status of appellate courts. If this paradigm is still followed, this research will not lead to an agreement that can usher in a new paradigm, and the research will merely end with recommendations. However, this research aims for more; it seeks to make this thesis a turning point for the institution, adding to the knowledge base in the field of Human Resources Management.

In the course of this research, the Main Military Court and High Military Court II in Jakarta, as the appellate courts, will be the focal points of this study. The critical point of this study revolves around how to perceive the coordination and policy-making of the Main Military Court while positioning itself as part of High Military Court II in Jakarta, which is also an appellate court. By doing so, the research's perspective can be more flexible and, based on the legal framework, specifically the State Civil Apparatus Law and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Regulation Number 125 of 2009, elaborate on the equality in appellate courts and how ideal Civil Servant (ASN) management should be carried out and applied. This should not remain at the discourse level but become practical through in-depth analysis. Ultimately, this research is expected to provide asymmetrical answers and solutions to address various issues in the Military Courts, making them better in the future.

The answers and solutions will be formulated into a strategy that is expected to become a suitable formula for improvement and change in the Military Judiciary environment, which has the intriguing characteristics described at the beginning. Various literature and theories are used in this research and will be comprehensively detailed based on the scientific knowledge strategically applied to the maximum extent at the end of this study.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Public Administration

Before further defining what public administration is, this research attempts to define Public Administration in terms of what it means. "Administration" comes from the Latin words "Ad" and "Ministrate," which means the provision of service or assistance, and in English, it is referred to as "Administration," which means "To Serve." Therefore, administration can be understood as the effort to serve to the best of one's ability.

Furthermore, as stated by Soewarno Handayaningrat (1988), who interprets Administration as a Dutch translation, it has a narrow origin from the Dutch word "Administratie," which means record-keeping, correspondence, light bookkeeping, typing, agenda, and other technical administrative activities. In other words, administration is limited to organizational management activities that include record-keeping, correspondence, bookkeeping, document archiving, and other tasks aimed at providing information and facilitating its retrieval when needed.

Public Administration, in a simple sense, can be defined as the science that studies cooperative activities in public institutions or organizations. Several scholars have attempted to define what is meant by Public Administration. For instance, according to Wijana (1986), Public Administration is a collection of all state organs, both lower and higher, responsible for governing, executing, and policing. While, according to J. Wajong (1961), Public Administration is the activity carried out to control the efforts of government agencies to achieve their goals.

In this research, the goal is to achieve the implementation of policy controls in the management of human resources for civil servants in the Military Judiciary environment.

2. Military Justice

Writings about the history of Military Judiciary have been documented. Military judiciary has been known since the Dutch and Japanese occupations and continues to this day. The history of military judiciary can be accessed through the official website of High Military Court II Jakarta via the domain: www.dilmilti-jakarta.go.id/main/index.php/sejarah-peradilan-militer-di-indonesia.html. This subsection will elaborate and provide insights into the characteristics of Military Judiciary policies in Indonesia over the years. It will be summarized and adjusted to the course of military judiciary, especially in the aspects of court management and personnel management, making it clearer to understand the dynamics and reforms that have taken place.

Phase 1: Dutch and Japanese Occupation Period

As part of Indonesia's colonial history in the past, Indonesia was under Dutch and Japanese occupation initially before the outbreak of World War II. During the time when Indonesia was still under the control of the Dutch East Indies government, the Dutch East Indies Military Judiciary in Indonesia also had Military Judiciary institutions known as "Krijgsraad" and "Hoog Militair Gerechtshof."

This judiciary encompassed military criminal acts and its members consisted of the Dutch Army in Indonesia (Dutch East Indies), namely KNIL, and members of the Dutch Navy. Members of the Dutch East Indies Army (KNIL) were examined and tried by the "Krijgsraad" at the first level and "Hoog Militair Gerechtshof" at the appellate level if they wanted to appeal. Meanwhile, members of the Dutch Navy were examined and tried by the "Zeekrijgsraad" and "Hoog Militair Gerechtshof." The "Krijgsraad" was located in the cities of Cimahi, Padang, Ujung Pandang, each with its designated jurisdiction as regulated by the Dutch East Indies government.

On the other hand, the Dutch rulers in Java-Madura and outside regions established the "Temporaire Krijgsraad," which was the Military Court responsible for trying criminal acts by individuals who were neither military personnel nor classified as Indonesians. The panel of judges consisted of 3 (three) individuals, with the Oditur serving as the Public Prosecutor.

The Temporary Military Court (Dutch East Indies) held sessions with a panel of judges. The Indonesian Supreme Court, in its history, continued from the "Het Hooggerechtshof Van Indonesie" (Supreme Court of the Dutch East Indies government in Indonesia), which was established based on R.O. year 1842. Het Hooggerechtshof (HGH) served as the court of cassation for the decisions of Raad Van Justitie (RV), which were the daily courts for Europeans and those equivalent to them. Het Hooggerechtshof was located in Jakarta.

All of these courts were under the control of the Dutch East Indies government, with a hierarchical system that was strongly felt. Moreover, at that time, the courts' treatment was vastly different, especially when the defendant was a native Indonesian. As for KNIL soldiers sent from the Netherlands or its allied countries, the court decisions often felt grossly unfair to the native population, and it was not uncommon for defendants to be acquitted of all charges.

Phase 2: The Period After the Independence of the Republic of Indonesia (1945-1970)

The aspirations of the Indonesian nation, namely the Independence of the Republic of Indonesia, were finally achieved on August 17, 1945. This marked the beginning of the legal journey by the Indonesian people. On August 18, 1945, Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution were ratified as the State Foundation of the Republic of Indonesia, which contained fundamental values and principles based on the rule of law, not power. After the establishment of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, the government retained the judicial bodies and regulations from the Dutch and Japanese occupations, with modifications and additions based on the 1945 Constitution. In this regard, to avoid legal vacuums in the 1945 Constitution, a Transitional Provision (Article II) was introduced, stating that "All State Bodies and Regulations in existence shall continue to apply until replaced by new ones in accordance with this Constitution."

This provision is the most important legal basis for the practice of the judiciary in Indonesia in the period after the Proclamation. With this provision, the courts (especially the General Courts and Religious Courts) that existed during the Japanese occupation continued to operate as before. The same should apply to the Military Courts. Based on this transitional provision, the Indonesian government also inherited the Military Courts that existed during the Japanese occupation.

However, in practice, during that time, the RI Government did not continue the practice of the Military Courts from the previous period. Even after the establishment of the Indonesian Armed Forces on October 5, 1945, Military Courts had not been established. Military Courts were only established after the issuance of Law No. 7 of 1946 on June 8, 1946. Nevertheless, it does not mean that there was no

law and justice within the Armed Forces between October 5, 1945, and June 8, 1946.

There is an understanding or doctrine that has become a principle, especially for the TNI leaders, that justice must always be upheld under any circumstances. At that time, because Military Courts had not been established, it did not mean that no actions were taken against violations of the law. As it is known, there was always a system of military discipline in place within the military environment. This was applied during that time, and violations within the ABRI were addressed, and justice was upheld.

That the Disciplinary Courts served as a means to uphold justice, but within the ABRI, it was felt that they were still insufficient to meet the needs. This can be evidenced by the issuance of Law No. 7 of 1946 concerning Regulations Establishing Military Courts in addition to Civil Courts. At that time, Military Courts consisted of 2 (two) levels: the Military Court and the Supreme Military Court.

However, if necessary due to the circumstances, it is also possible to establish an ad hoc Military Court called the Extraordinary Military Court, based on Government Regulation No. 37 of 1948, which consists of the Military Court, the High Military Court, and the Supreme Military Court.

Since the issuance of Emergency Law No. 16 of 1950, the regulations regarding the structure and authority within the Military Judiciary in Indonesia can be said to be firmly established, similar to Government Regulation No. 37 of 1948. The provisions of Article 2 of Law No. 5 of 1950 regarding judicial authority in the Military Judiciary are carried out by: the Military Court, the High Military Court, and the Supreme Military Court.

In terms of law enforcement, it can be seen in the Soekarno government, which was known for its authoritarianism, that it consistently made systematic efforts and used various methods to influence the power of the judiciary, both through legal knowledge and direct intervention by the executive branch in the judicial process. The implementation of independent judicial authority began when President Soekarno proclaimed the Presidential Decree on July 5, 1959.

Soekarno then intervened in the execution of the independent judicial authority through Law No. 19 of 1964, regarding the basic provisions of judicial authority. The rhetoric of the Revolutionary Politics had entered Law No. 19 of 1964, which granted the President the power to intervene in the judiciary in the case of national interests or revolutionary interests being threatened. President Soekarno conferred ministerial status on the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. This meant that the President made the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court a government power entity that assisted the President (1945 Constitution Article 17). This policy was highly contradictory to the concepts of the 1945 Constitution.

The Executive's intervention in the implementation of judicial power did not stop during the Old Order era but continued into the New Order government under President Soeharto. The Soeharto administration hindered the execution of an independent judicial authority through Law No. 14 of 1970, concerning the fundamental principles of judicial power. The independent judicial power could not

be fully realized because the administrative, organizational, and financial regulations of the judicial institutions were placed under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Justice. This can be seen in the provisions of Article 11 of the law, which created dualism in the implementation of judicial power, with the technical aspect of the judiciary under the Supreme Court and administrative, organizational, and financial aspects under the control of the Ministry of Justice. During the New Order era, it was nominally reorganizing judicial authority as outlined in Law No. 14 of 1970 and various legal regulations in the field of the judiciary that affirmed the independent judicial authority free from the influence of the government and other extrajudicial parties.

According to Article 6 of Law No. 19 of 1948, within the Republic of Indonesia, there are three judicial domains: the General Judiciary, the Administrative Judiciary, and the Military Administrative Judiciary.

When Indonesia was a federal state, the provisions for the judiciary within the RIS constitution were broader compared to the 1945 Constitution. As a guarantee of proper judicial functioning, the Constitution of the United States of Indonesia (RIS) was no longer used, and instead, the Temporary Constitution (UUDS) was employed.

This change naturally affected the judicial institutions because UUDS no longer recognized regions or states, which meant that regional courts were also no longer recognized. As a realization of the UUDS, in 1951, Emergency Law No. 1 of 1951 was enacted. This emergency law became the basis for eliminating several courts that were not in line with the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. This included gradually eliminating the Swapraja Courts in certain regions and all customary courts.

The return to the 1945 Constitution has not been fully realized, especially regarding the independence of Indonesian judicial institutions as stipulated in Articles 24 and 25 of the 1945 Constitution. In its explanation, the judicial power should be independent, meaning free from the influence of the government. However, in its implementation, it deviated from the 1945 Constitution, including the enactment of Law No. 19 of 1964, which allowed presidential intervention in the judiciary. Even in the explanation, it was stated that the judiciary is not free from the influence of the Executive branch and the legislative power.

The influence of an Authoritarian government on the implementation of an independent judicial institution occurs from the judicial process to the organization, administration, and financial regulations. All forms of executive influence on the judiciary should be viewed as obstructing the operation of an independent judicial institution. The Authoritarian government always strives systematically and in various ways to influence the power of the judicial institutions. This is done through legislative regulations and direct intervention by the Executive in the judicial process. Against the backdrop of the political system during the era of the great revolution leaders, Law No. 10 of 1985 regarding the judiciary in the General Judiciary and the Supreme Court was born. In that era, even the Chief Justice

became one of the ministers assisting the president. The provisions of Law No. 19 of 1964 clearly contradict Articles 24 and 25 of the 1945 Constitution along with its explanations.

Based on the above, it is clear that the power of the judiciary during the era of guided democracy/the old order was not an independent judicial power. Institutionally, the power of the judiciary at that time was not free from the influence of the Executive and Legislative powers, including the power of the President himself. This happened because the judiciary was not yet independent and was often interfered with by various parties. Nevertheless, improvements in the judiciary have continued because achieving an excellent judiciary is not a quick process but a gradual one over time. Such a process is aimed at positive outcomes, starting from the reform of the judiciary's power, which began in Indonesia in 1970.

Phase 3: Period of Reform of the Power of Judicial Institutions (1970-1998)

Based on the dynamic political background as mentioned above, Law No. 14 of 1970 was enacted to address the basic provisions of judicial power, replacing Law No. 19 of 1964. Law No. 14 of 1970 resulted from the differences in opinion between the components of the New Order and the Military forces, which did not want the judicial authority of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia to be separated from government control or bureaucracy. The compromise between these conflicting views led to the revocation of Article 19, and the meaning of Articles 24 and 25, along with their explanations, were incorporated into the new law on judicial power. However, the administration, organization, and finances of the General Courts and Administrative Courts, whose director-general is from the Supreme Court, remained in place.

In accordance with the evolving terminology in the field of the Judiciary, as found in various laws and regulations, including Law No. 14 of 1970 concerning the Basic Provisions of Judicial Power, adjustments need to be made to the names of Military Courts, which will now be referred to as follows: Military Court (Mahkamah Militer or Mahmil), High Military Court (Mahkamah Militer Tinggi or Mahmilti), and Supreme Military Court (Mahkamah Militer Agung or Mahmilgung).

The independence of the judiciary has been mentioned in Article 11, paragraph 1 of the Decree of the People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia No. 111/MPR/1978, which states: "The Supreme Court is the body that exercises judicial power, and in carrying out its duties, it is independent of extrajudicial influence." Although the institutional idea has been established, in reality, from the 1970s until the fall of the New Order regime, the independence of the judiciary could not be realized as expected. The laws regulating judicial power that were in effect at that time include:

a. Law No. 14 of 1970 on the Basic Provisions of Judicial Power
b. Law No. 14 of 1985 on the Supreme Court
c. Law No. 2 of 1986 on General Courts
d. Law No. 5 of 1986 on Administrative Courts
e. Law No. 7 of 1989 on Religious Courts

f. Law No. 31 of 1997 on Military Courts

According to the various laws mentioned above, there are four organizational domains of judicial authority, namely: the General Court Judicial Authority, the Religious Court Judicial Authority, the Military Court Judicial Authority, and the Administrative Court Judicial Authority.

These judicial domains are based on the Supreme Court as the highest authority for all these domains. The Military Court Judicial Authority has a different structure even though it ultimately leads to the Supreme Court. Based on Law Number 31 of 1997 to the present day, the Military Court is organized into three levels of jurisdiction, as described below:

a. The Military Court serves as the first-level court for individuals seeking justice, with the Defendants holding a rank equivalent to Captain or lower.
b. The High Military Court functions as:

   1. The first-level court for Defendants holding a rank of Major or higher.
   2. The first-level court for military administrative disputes.
   3. The appellate court for decisions made by the Military Court.

   The High Military Court, along with the Military Court, resolves disagreements between the Case Presenting Officer and the Prosecutor regarding whether a case should be presented before the Military Court or the General Court.

c. The Supreme Military Court serves as:
   1). The appellate court for military administrative disputes previously decided by the High Military Court.
   2). The first and final-level adjudicator of jurisdictional disputes and cases between different Military Courts within different jurisdictions of the High Military Court.

The judiciary within the Military Court encompasses an executive body for judicial authority within the Armed Forces. It is tasked with the authority to adjudicate criminal acts committed by an individual during the commission of a criminal act, which are:

a. Soldiers, who are deemed equivalent to soldiers based on the law.
b. Members, a group or position or entity that is considered or deemed as soldiers based on the law.
c. To examine, adjudicate, and resolve disputes related to the Military Administration of the Armed Forces concerned, upon the request of the aggrieved party due to the consequences arising from the Criminal Act that forms the basis of the indictment, and simultaneously decide both cases in a single verdict.

The Military Justice System, according to Law No. 31 of 1997, consists of: Military Courts, Military High Courts, the Supreme Military Court, and Battle Military Courts.

The location of the Supreme Military Court is in the capital of the Republic of Indonesia. The names, locations, and jurisdictions of other Military Courts are determined by the decision of the Commander, and if necessary, Military Courts and Military High Courts may hold sessions outside their designated locations. Furthermore, if necessary, Military Courts and Military High Courts may hold sessions outside their jurisdiction area with the permission of the Chief of the Supreme Military Commander. The highest level of Military Courts in the Cassation Level falls under the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia.

However, the management of human resources is still entrusted to the Headquarters.

The TNI, where Military Court Personnel who are not members of the TNI are part of the Civil Servants at the TNI Headquarters.

Phase 4: One-Stop Justice System in Indonesia

The political developments following the fall of the New Order Government brought demands for comprehensive reform in various aspects of the nation, including the legal sector in general and the judiciary in particular. The legal and judiciary reforms are intended to strengthen the independence of the judicial authority.

Reformative thinking in the legal field concerns the role of judicial authority that emerged during the reform era in the mid to late 1990s. It emphasizes that the organization, administration, and finances of the judicial authority should be managed by the judicial authority itself, specifically by the judiciary. When the executive branch handles the organization, administration, and finances of the judiciary, it results in the judiciary not standing independently and being influenced by the executive authority.

In the Reform policy for legal development, two fundamental aspects are established: firstly, addressing the legal crisis with the goal of a clear separation of roles and authorities of law enforcement officials to achieve proportionality, professionalism, and overall integrity. Secondly, implementing reforms in the legal field, which includes a clear separation of the judicial functions from the executive and realizing the National Legal System through a comprehensive national legislative program. This is done to uphold the rule of law in the life of society, nation, and state in order to create a harmonious society in the Indonesian homeland, which is a shared aspiration.

3. Reform

Reform is a process of change that seeks adaptation to the demands of the times while preserving or changing without destruction, known as the Sarundajang Reform (2000). This reform suggests that change should occur gradually and sustainably, without involving radical or revolutionary processes or actions.

Reform actually emerged from the spirit of making changes that had long been dominated by leaders who held the highest power for 32 years during their rule known as the New Order era. The New Order government inherited economic, social, and political damage. The New Order government had to take the right actions and steps to overcome the crisis because if they could handle the crisis well, they would become stronger and more accepted by the public. Adam (2009) mentioned that national and regional security stability is needed for economic progress. Economic development should be entrusted to technocrats because domestic security must be guaranteed so that foreign investors, which are important, are not disrupted.

Usman (2008) added that in reality, during the reform era, the leaders stabilized politics, but the military handled politics after the economy became stable. Because ABRI (the Indonesian National Armed Forces) was a product of the 1945 revolution that still existed, it had to be involved in politics to protect the Indonesian nation and state. Although the leadership of the New Order had to disregard democracy and human rights, its success depended on economic growth, political stability, and security.

Disappointment with the New Order leadership emerged within the community, especially as Indonesia experienced an economic crisis, which made people increasingly dissatisfied with the government. This crisis began in Thailand in early July 1997, affecting the weakening of the rupiah exchange rate. Indonesia sought assistance from the International Monetary Fund to help stabilize its economy. The International Monetary Fund claimed that Indonesia's government's failure to improve its economy was the cause of the crisis. To stabilize the economy, Indonesia took various measures, although not all of them were successful, as stated by Luhulima (2006). The economy that had been built for about 32 years by the New Order began to crumble, and public trust began to decline. Prices of goods started to rise, many job relationships were severed, and corruption became widespread in Indonesia.

That's why the power of the New Order collapsed. Nevertheless, the spirit of change that occurred was not as easy as turning the palm of your hand, the remnants of the New Order's power that still had a strong influence meant that reform had to be carried out gradually and couldn't be done abruptly.

Only in 2004 did Indonesia enter a new century in terms of the country's governance related to the organization of the judicial power. Law on Judicial Power No. 4 of 2004 Article 13 Paragraph (1) stipulates: "The organization, administration, and finances of the Supreme Court and the judicial bodies under it are under the authority of the Supreme Court."

The transfer of authority in the areas of organization, administration, and finance of the Judicial Bodies from the executive to the judiciary, as stipulated in Law No. 4 of 2004, means that the development of the Technical and Non-Technical Judicial fields of the Judicial Bodies is now under the authority of the Supreme Court. The transfer of authority in the field of organization includes positions, tasks, functions, authority, and organizational structure related to:

a. Directorate General of General Court and State Administrative Court Judiciary of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights
b. Directorate for the Development of Religious Judiciary of the Ministry of

Religious Affairs
c. High Court
d. State Administrative High Court
e. Religious High Court / Sharia Court
f. District Court
g. State Administrative Court
h. Religious Court / Sharia Court.

The transfer of authority in the field of administration covers personnel matters, state property, finances, archives, and documents at the Directorate General of General Court and State Administrative Court Judiciary of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, the Directorate for the Development of Religious Judiciary of the Ministry of Religious Affairs, High Courts, State Administrative High Courts, Religious High Courts / Sharia Courts, District Courts, State Administrative Courts, and Religious Courts / Sharia Courts, which have all been consolidated under the authority of the Supreme Court.

The transfer in the financial field concerns the ongoing budgets of the Directorate General of General Court and State Administrative Court Judiciary of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, the Directorate for the Development of Religious Judiciary of the Ministry of Religious Affairs, High Courts, State Administrative High Courts, Religious High Courts / Sharia Courts, District Courts, State Administrative Courts, and Religious Courts / Sharia Courts, which have all been consolidated under the authority of the Supreme Court.

On March 1, 2004, the Minister of Law and Human Rights handed over the organization, administration, and finances within the General Court and State Administrative Court Judiciary to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and on June 30, 2004, the Minister of Religious Affairs also transferred the organization, administration, and finances of the Religious Judiciary to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Furthermore, due to various technical constraints, there was a slight delay from the date of June 30, 2004, as stipulated in the law. On September 1, 2004, the Commander of the Indonesian National Armed Forces (ABRI) also transferred the organization, administration, and finances of the Military Judiciary to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. In accordance with Article 43 of Law No. 4 of 2004 on judicial authority, since the transfer of organization, administration, and finances as referred to in Article 42, paragraph 1, then:

a. All Employees of the Directorate General of General Courts and State Administrative Courts of the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights, High Courts, State Administrative High Courts, District Courts, and Administrative Courts become employees of the Supreme Court.
b. All Employees holding structural positions in the Directorate General of General Courts and State Administrative Courts of the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights, High Courts, State Administrative High Courts, District Courts, and Administrative Courts, remain in their positions and continue to receive their

position allowances from the Supreme Court.

c. All assets/inventory owned by the District Courts and High Courts as well as the Administrative Courts and Administrative High Courts are transferred to the Supreme Court.

According to Article 44 of Law No. 4 of 2004 on Judicial Power, since the transfer of organization, administration, and finance as referred to in Article 42 Paragraph (2), then:

a. All employees of the Directorate of Religious Court Development of the Ministry of Religious Affairs become employees of the Directorate General of Religious Courts at the Supreme Court, and employees of Religious Courts and High Religious Courts become employees of the Supreme Court.
b. All employees holding structural positions in the Directorate of Religious Court Development of the Ministry of Religious Affairs will hold positions at the Directorate General of Religious Courts at the Supreme Court in accordance with prevailing regulations.
c. All assets/inventory owned by Religious Courts and High Religious Courts are transferred to the Supreme Court.

According to Article 45 of Law No. 4 of 2004 on Judicial Power, since the transfer of organization, administration, and finance as referred to in Article 42 Paragraph (3), then:

a. The development of military personnel in the Military Court Environment is carried out in accordance with laws and regulations that govern military personnel.
b. All Civil Servants (PNS) in the Military Court Environment become Civil Servants at the Supreme Court.

However, not all of these transitions went smoothly. Various problems were encountered, and one of them was the prevailing feudalism and hierarchy within the military, which persisted from the time of the transfer until today. One of the most noticeable issues is the institutional disparity between the TNI Headquarters and the Supreme Court. In the Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia, "disparitas" is defined as meaning a difference or gap (Alwi, 2002, p. 270). According to Black's Law Dictionary, "disparitas" refers to a form of inequality or dissimilarity in quantity or quality between two or more things (Garner, 1999, p. 482). Therefore, the institutional disparity from the TNI Headquarters to the Supreme Court is evident in the presence of the Supreme Military Court and the High Military Court, making it institutionally distinct from the other three judicial bodies. For a clearer understanding, please refer to the image below:



Figure 1: Judicial Organizational Structure

This is the hierarchy within the Military Court. It is quite different from the other three judicial bodies, namely General, Religious, and Administrative Courts. This is the entry point for the institutional disparity that has been discussed in the previous paragraph.

To address this disparity issue, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court at that time, Dr. Harifin A. Tumpa, established specific regulations governing the division of authority. This included an explanation about the Court of Appeal, as stated in the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Decision No. 125 of 2009 regarding the Delegation of Certain Authorities to Officials at Echelon I and the Chief Justices of the Courts of Appeal within the Supreme Court for Personnel Matters. However, the implementation of this decision, No. 125 of 2009, still faced issues because it was not fully executed. This was due to the prevailing feudalistic culture and hierarchy, which was evident in the behavior of the Supreme Military Court, still regarding itself as the highest appellate body despite the regulations to the contrary, causing administrative delays. Additionally, the human resources management within the military judiciary had not fully fulfilled its responsibilities as required in personnel management.

C. METHOD

This research employs a qualitative approach throughout its journey. The research method used in this study is a Case Study specifically within-case study, which utilizes a qualitative approach where the researcher focuses on the causal path within a case and controlled comparison (cross-case), which is used to analyze variables in several cases, sharpened by the variable congruence method, meaning to simply understand the alignment of regulations with what happens in the field.

The data collection techniques employed in this research involve in-depth interviews, observations, document studies, and data collection triangulation. The research approach method not only focuses on a small research locus but also considers a broader perspective, and there is a possibility that these authority patterns may occur in other institutions besides the Military Judiciary within the Supreme Court, which includes the TNI and ASN working together in the same government agency, despite the existing patterns.

D. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This research seriously conducted interviews with all structural officials of the Second Military High Court in Jakarta and the Military Supreme Court, starting from the implementers to officials of echelon III and echelon IV. In the Supreme Court environment, echelons III and IV still exist and have not undergone organizational restructuring for various reasons. Therefore, this research conducted interviews with all structural officials who have authority in the field of personnel.

Various sources have interesting opinions and paradigms about how this institutional disparity is, in fact, a problem that has long been a concern for the thoughts of the implementers and structural officials in carrying out their respective duties. However, they differ in their responses and search for solutions to this issue. The following are views from Structural Officials and Implementers in the Military Judiciary Environment:

a. The Head of the Planning and Personnel Section of the Military High Court, Ericson Bangun, believes that there is a difference in paradigms in interpreting Supreme Court Chief Regulation No. 125 of 2009, which still exists in the military judiciary environment. Therefore, the regulation should have been implemented to the fullest, and the Military Supreme Court and Military High Court II in Jakarta should fully apply this regulation.
b. The Head of the Planning and Personnel Section of Military High Court II Jakarta, Sri Rahayu, believes that, in essence, Supreme Court Chief Regulation No. 125 of 2009 is already in effect but has not been maximally implemented. Therefore, the Military Supreme Court and Military High Court should sit together and discuss the implementation of this regulation, resulting in the creation of technical guidelines (Juknis) for this regulation. This would help prevent discrepancies between the rights and obligations of the two appellate courts.
c. The Head of the Personnel and Information Technology Subsection of the Military Supreme Court, Fairuz Lazwardi, believes that the implementation of Supreme Court Chief Regulation No. 125 of 2009 is a decision that has been established by the Supreme Court. Therefore, the regulation should be implemented fully and maximally by both the Military Supreme Court and Military High Court II Jakarta.
d. The Head of the Personnel and Information Technology Subsection of Military High Court II Jakarta, Cahyani Nurpriyanti, has the view that Military High Court II Jakarta and Military Supreme Court are two equivalent appellate units. However, their implementation has been done half-heartedly. They should sit together to reach an understanding and agreement on how to implement this regulation maximally.
e. The Head of the Functional Section and Credit Points at the Supreme Court, Sunyoto, believes that in its history, before merging with the Supreme Court,

the Military Supreme Court was indeed the highest institution in the military justice system. Therefore, it is understandable if the Military Supreme Court feels it has authority. However, after merging with the Supreme Court, both the Military Supreme Court and Military High Court II Jakarta are actually equal and on par with each other.

1. Implementation Paradigm

If Structural Officials have opinions that lean toward the implementation of Supreme Court Chief Decision No. 125, in this research section, we will attempt to describe how Civil Servants who do not have structural positions, namely Functional Officers in Personnel Analysis and the Executives in these two units in the Military Judiciary have more interesting and constructive opinions. This may be because these executives are relatively younger and have more intriguing perspectives to be further examined, including:

a. The First Expert Personnel Analyst of the Military Judiciary, Avian Septiandhanu, believes that the Military Judiciary and Military High Court II Jakarta have long been confused about the division of authority in the Military Judiciary, which part belongs to the Military Judiciary and which part belongs to the Military High Court. Therefore, this confusion must be resolved promptly by gathering together and inviting the Directorate General of Military and Administrative Judiciary (Dirjen Badilmiltun) to mediate in this meeting.
b. The Administrative Analyst of the Military Judiciary, Ashhab Triono, also agrees with what Avian has conveyed. According to him, the Military Judiciary seems to have no jurisdiction over the courts beneath it because each court has its own appellate levels, such as Military High Court I in Medan, Military High Court II in Jakarta, and Military High Court III in Surabaya. Therefore, he concurs that changes are needed through a collaborative effort, or even on a broader scale, by changing the institutional status to the Judiciary Personnel, similar to the Judiciary Personnel in the Supreme Court. Furthermore, Ashhab even considers the possibility of revising Law No. 31 of 1997 on Military Judiciary, as it has been recommended by the Constitutional Court.
c. Winda Permatasari, an HR Analyst for the Civil Servant Apparatus of the Military High Court II Jakarta, also believes that the authority of the Military High Court I is essentially similar to that of the Military High Court II Jakarta. This is because it is not impossible for the regulation of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to be fully applied by bringing together the relevant parties.
d. Annas Haq Anwar, an Analyst in the Execution Division of the Military High Court I, added that if the authority between the Military High Court I and the Military High Court II Jakarta is already equal, then institutionally there would be no confusion regarding the tasks and functions of these two work units, resulting in optimization of the personnel management in both institutions.

2. Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO)

After successfully finding a common perspective on the need for improvement and change to address this issue, a solution is required to realize change with a strategy. The strategy proposed in this research is the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) concept. Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) refers to equal rights for all citizens to access employment opportunities regardless of their gender, age, race, national origin, religion, and disabilities (George and Jones, 2006). The main principle of EEO is "a fair chance for everyone at work," where everyone should have equal access and equal employment opportunities for training, promotion, and fair working conditions (Dwipayana, 2011). According to Wilson (2012), EEO is a government effort to ensure that every individual has equal job opportunities without discrimination based on race, age, gender, religion, or ethnicity.

Equal opportunity and treatment in employment can also be interpreted as equal access to jobs and benefits and services for all employees and job applicants in the workplace. EEO is a broad concept that signifies that everyone should receive the same treatment in all employment-related actions (Mathis and Jackson, 2001). EEO is issued by the International Labor Organization (ILO) and is regulated in each country with the aim of eliminating discrimination in employment.

The implementation of EEO can be seen from various aspects such as recruitment and selection, wages, social security for labor, and career or job development. The Indonesian government has ratified two basic ILO conventions. First, ILO Convention No. 100 of 1951 concerning Equal Remuneration for Men and Women Workers for Work of Equal Value, ratified by Law No. 80 of 1957; and ILO Convention No. 111 of 1958 concerning Discrimination in Respect of Employment and Occupation, ratified by Law No. 21 of 1999. These two conventions serve as the primary guidelines for the implementation of equal employment opportunities and treatment in Indonesia. As one of the member countries of the ILO, Indonesia is obligated to uphold the principles contained in these conventions.

Equal Employment Opportunity does not assume that everyone has the same abilities, qualifications, and experience, but it aims to provide everyone with an equal chance to use and showcase their full talents and abilities. Both of these conventions also became one of the considerations in the enactment of Law No. 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower.

According to the EEO Task Force of the Indonesian Ministry of Manpower and Transmigration (2005), EEO includes:

a. Fair treatment, meaning EEO is an instrument for every worker and job seeker.
b. Performance-based, meaning EEO is implemented based on an individual's work performance, ensuring that employers obtain the required workforce.
c. An instrument for achieving efficiency, with the implementation of EEO expected to lead to work efficiency and effectiveness, thus enhancing productivity and work ethics for competition.

d. Actively involving workers, which is a condition where the success prerequisites for corporate planning to achieve quality management.
e. The best way to plan a business, where alignment with EEO goals will eliminate workplace barriers to reaching the pinnacle of one's career.
f. Relating to all aspects in the world of work, including labor recruitment, wage and compensation, career development, and working conditions.

Furthermore, the EEO Task Force of the Indonesian Ministry of Manpower and Transmigration (2005) states that EEO is not:

a. Quotas, meaning it's not about fulfilling a specific percentage that companies must achieve. Equality does not necessarily mean an equal number of men and women. While quotas may be established, for instance, for training, recruitment, or organizational representation, they still need to adhere to normative and administrative requirements (through healthy competition) and should not force the fulfillment of such quotas.
b. Pity, meaning it does not involve placing women in jobs out of pity with the expectation that it will benefit men.
c. Avoiding accusations of discrimination, meaning EEO will not replace one form of injustice in the eyes of the law, as these actions are based on work performance and are part of human resources functions in the workplace that apply to all employees.
d. Not the only thing considered good and trusted (too good to be true), such as the benefits expected by workers and management with the existence of a good management system.
e. Charity, meaning EEO is not intended as a demand, contribution, or charity for women.

Based on data processed from interviews and thoughts of all the sources, similarities in the emerging patterns can be seen, including the shared understanding that today's organizational dynamics are indeed full of challenges, and it would be better if there were changes and improvements in the implementation of Supreme Court Chief's Decree No. 125 of 2009. It is acknowledged that, up to now, it has not been carried out to the maximum extent, even though this regulation has been in effect for quite some time. However, the changes and improvements offered by each source differ. Some sources believe that a clear reaffirmation of existing rules is sufficient, so it can be directly implemented. On the other hand, some sources feel that a platform is needed to gather and reach an output together.

Through the theory of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO), the future output can be in the form of a draft memorandum of understanding (MoU) between the two appellate courts within the Military Court environment. The MoU would confirm that both of them are equal and no different from other judicial environments. This way, equality can be achieved, and all differences, paradigm disparities, and the sense of supremacy over each other can be eliminated, and they can start applying regulations and rules carefully and wisely.

E. CONCLUSION

The history of the military judiciary cannot be denied, as it is a long journey of learning, starting from the colonial era until today. However, one thing is for sure, the dynamics and changes are not something unfamiliar to the military judiciary. Therefore, what happens today is a learning from what happened in the past. This research shows that there are still issues within the Military Judiciary Environment, especially in relation to human resource management, as outlined in the current regulations. It appears that these regulations have not been fully implemented, resulting in institutional disparities that hinder promotion and transfer patterns and administrative correspondence within the military judiciary.

Of course, all these issues should not remain unresolved. The research results show that all interviewees and respondents agree and believe that there are problems and obstacles in implementing the Supreme Court Chief's Decision No. 125 of 2009 on the Delegation of Some Authority to Echelon I Officials and the Chief of the Court of Appeal in the Supreme Court Environment for Signing in the Human Resources Field. Interestingly, all respondents and interviewees from both units, the Supreme Military Court and the High Military Court II Jakarta, believe that this implementation is not yet clear. In fact, they all believe that the current implementation of this regulation is still half-hearted. Therefore, it should be rectified by bringing together the two parties who, as it turns out, share the same view. This way, in the future, the Supreme Court Chief's Decision No. 125 of 2009 can be implemented comprehensively, and there can be changes/improvements in the management of human resources, especially civil servants in the military judiciary.

REFERENCES

1. Adam, A. W. (2009). *Membongkar manipulasi Sejarah*. Jakarta: Kompas Alexander L. George dan Andrew Bennett. (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in The Social Science*. Cambridge: BCSIA.
2. Amir, H. (2019). *Metode Penelitian dan Pengembangan (Research and Development) Uji Produk Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif Proses dan Hasil.* Malang: Literasi Nusantara Abadi.
3. Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik. Asdi Mahasatya.Jakarta.*
4. Bryan Garner. (1999). *Black's Law Dictionary*, Minnesota: St Paul Minn.
5. Creswell, J, W. (2012). *Research Design Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif dan Mixed. Cetakan Kedua. Yogyakarta. Pustaka Pelajar*.
6. Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Keterampilan Esensial Untuk Peneliti Kualitatif. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.*
7. Danim, S. (2012). *Motivasi kepemimpinan & efektivitas kelompok.*Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Competing paradigms in qualitative research. Handbook of qualitative research, 2(163-194), 105.*

8. Gulo, W. (2013). *Metodologi Penelitian. Jakarta: PT. Grasindo. Suwati, Yuli. 2013. Pengaruh kompensasi dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Tunas hijau Samarinda. Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Bisnis, 1(1), 41-55.*
9. Hasan Alwi et. al. (2002). *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Balas Pustaka.
10. Herdiansyah, H. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif untuk Ilmu-ilmu Sosial.Jakarta:Salemba Humanika*.
11. Kreitner. Robert & Angelo Kinicki. (2014). *Organizational Behavioral. Ed. 5.Boston: McGraw-Hill*.
12. Kusmarni, Y. (2012). *Studi kasus. UGM Jurnal Edu UGM Press, 2.*
13. Luhulima. (2006). *Hari-Hari Terpanjang Mundurnya Presiden Soeharto dan Beberapa Peristiwa Terkait*. Jakarta.
14. Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook. 3rd.*
15. Moleong, L. J. (2014). *Metode penelitian kualitatif edisi revisi. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.*
16. Mulyana, D. & S. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Komunikas:contoh-contoh penelitian kualitatif dengan pendekatan praktis. Cetakan ke 3. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya,.*
17. Panalar, A (2020) *Analisis Strategi Pengelolaan Ambidexterity Antara Rasionalitas dan Kreativitas (Studi Kasus 3 UKM Studio Video Game)* (Tesis Magister, Universitas Islam Indonesia). Diakses dari: https://dspace.uii.ac.id/bitstream/handle/123456789/20398/01%20cover.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
18. Prihatsanti, U., Suryanto, S., & Hendriani, W. (2018). *Menggunakan studi kasus sebagai metode ilmiah dalam Psikologi. Buletin Psikologi, 26(2), 126-136.*
19. Ratnawati, S. (2020). *Analisis SWOT dalam menentukan strategi pemasaran (studi kasus di kantor pos Kota Magelang 56100). Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen, 17(2), 58-70. 17*, 58–70.
20. Rukajat, A. (2018). *Pendekatan penelitian kualitatif (Qualitative research approach). Deepublish.*
21. Sugiyono. (2017). Metode Kuantitatif Sugiyono. (2017). Metode Kuantitatif. In Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D (pp. 13–19). In *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*.
22. Sutopo, A., & Setya Budi, T. (2016). *Model Penilaian Kualitas Terjemahan Karya Sastra.*
23. Sarundajang, S.H. (2000). A*rus Balik Kekuasaan Pusat ke Daerah.* Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
24. Usman, S. (2008). *Mengapa Rakyat Indonesia Mendukung Presiden Suharto?*. Jakarta: Djakarta.
25. Wajong, J. (1961). *Fungsi Administrasi Publik.* Djakarta: Djambatan.
26. Yona, S. (2006). *Penyusunan studi kasus. Jurnal Keperawatan Indonesia, 10(2), 76-80.*
27. Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945
28. Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1997 tentang Peradilan Militer

29. Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 2014 tentang Aparatur Sipil Negara
30. Peraturan Ketua Mahkamah Agung Nomor 125 Tahun 2009 tentang Pendelegasian sebagian Wewenang kepada Pejabat Eselon I dan Ketua Pengadilan Tingkat Banding di Lingkungan Mahkamah Agung untuk Penandatanganan di Bidang Kepegawaian
31. *Jejak Kasus Aung San Suu Kyi hingga Vonis 4 Tahun Penjara (cnnindonesia.com) (diakses pada 28 September 2023 pukul 10.00 WIB)*
32. *Sejarah Peradilan Militer di Indonesia (dilmilti-jakarta.go.id) (diakses pada 28 September 2023 Pukul 14.00)*