
Value Approach and Character Education in Reviewing Cohabitation Phenomenon

Ni Luh Gede Yogi Arthani
Faculty of Law, Mahasaraswati Denpasar University
*yogi_arthani@yahoo.com

Published: 20/08/2019

How to cite: Arthani, N, L, G, Y. 2019. *Value Approach and Character Education in Reviewing Cohabitation Phenomenon*. Sociological Jurisprudence Journal. Volume 2 Issue 2. Page 108 - 115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22225/scj.2.2.1236.108-115>

Abstract

Coexistence between two people who have a love affair without marriage ties is called cohabitation, or what is in Indonesian language termed "kumpul kebo." This cohabitation phenomenon is not only found in urban areas, but also in rural areas. Some people in Indonesia reject this behavior because it is considered contrary to the cultural values, while the others let the people around them take the decision to live together. The refusal by local community members was carried out by persecuting lovers who allegedly committed cohabitation. This certainly makes other legal problems. In this study, two issues will be discussed namely cohabitation behavior which is categorized as a criminal act and an attempt to criminalize cohabitation in the legal system in Indonesia. Not all cohabitation behaviors are categorized as criminal acts. Cohabitation as a criminal offense is if it is carried out by people who are already married to another person as stipulated in Article 284 of the Criminal Code. The efforts to criminalize cohabitation in the legal system in Indonesia are carried out by submitting applications in the Constitutional Court and cohabitation arrangements in the Draft of Penal Code.

Keywords: Character Education; Cohabitation; Criminal Act; Criminalization; Value.

I. INTRODUCTION

Kumpul kebo (a term in Indonesian) or better known as *samen leven*, cohabitation, conjugal union, domestic partnership, civil union, civil partnership, living in non-matrimonial union, registered partnership, or living together is a lifestyle that becomes a choice for couples who are not in a marriage bond. The act of cohabitation is defined as "living together without the bond of a marriage that occurs between a man and woman in which they are both unmarried (Arief, 2011). In a broader sense, cohabitation can also be done by homosexual couples.

Living together without marriage ties is a common thing in Western countries. The decision to live together for adults is understood as a matter of extreme privacy and should not be interfered with by others. For some people in the West, sleeping (having sex) a pair of men and women outside of marriage is not questioned. They may sleep together as long as they like it. Cohabiting is not just distributing sexual needs, but some are giving birth to children (Tanjung, 2007). Children born to parents who do not have a marriage still have legal status.

Talking about this cohabitation phenomenon, of course there are two sides: the pros and cons. In a number of regions in Indonesia, there are variety of cultures and measures of decency in relation to this phenomenon, so it will be difficult to determine the benchmark and limits. In Indonesia, there are three areas that allow cohabitation namely Bali, Minahasa, and Mentawai, it is likely that the people of these regions disagree with these provisions (Eddyono, Syahril, & Wiryawan, 2015). The response to cohabitation behavior is very dependent on the value approach adopted by the community. The values adopted by each family also greatly influence the acceptance or rejection of their children who have the decision to live with their partners before marriage, even though most people accept cohabitation behavior.

People who live in areas that are accustomed to this cohabitation lifestyle openly accept cohabitation couples to live together in a house that is fully rented by them, a boarding house, or even a room in their parent's house in which they live together with their parent. Cohabitation couples can be university students or working people. There are several reasons for both heterosexual and homosexual couples choose to live together with their partners such as the relationship that has been approved by both families, the want to share expenses together (more economically), the lack of supervision from parents (especially for the university students who study far from their home), the love, the want to know the partner more closely, the complicated marriage fees and administration, and so on. The local people do not reject the existence of couples who live together without marriage because they consider that this is a matter of privacy of each individual.

On the other hand, there are also groups of people who reject the lifestyle of living together without marriage ties. The refusal was carried out by local residents by involving law enforcement officials. These conditions can be seen in the following examples of cases:

Cohabitation couple in Pocanan Village, Kediri City, East Java, was raided by a team of Civil Service Police Unit (Satpol PP). This couple was suspected of being involved in a case of infidelity because the man and woman involved in the cohabitation have not officially divorced yet from their partner. The raid was carried out after the officers got complaints from the public (Huda, 2018).

Cohabitation couple was raided by residents in a room at Pemuda Street, RT 18, Madurejo Village, South Arut District, West Kotawaringin Regency. The couple, one of whom was a female university student with initials, NF (23) and HFN (25) were secured by the head of RT 18 along with the local security officers. Based on the information, the couple had been troubling the citizens because they allegedly lived in a house without a legal marriage (cohabitation). This was strengthened when they were asked about identity, they could not show the proof that they had been tied to a marriage (Sulistyo, 2017). A joint team from Kotawaringin Barat Police, TNI, and Satpol PP, arrested four couples of cohabitation in a raid at a hotel in the Pasir Panjang Village area. The four cohabitation couples could not show the legal marriage documents (Jawa Pos, 2018).

The rejection by local residents of the cohabitation couples can cause legal problems, in which actually the local residents may not give sanction to the cohabitation couple. However, the recent phenomenon that often occur are that local residents make unilateral judgments to couples suspected of cohabitation. The unilateral judgments were carried out by dragging the perpetrator, persecuting, and stripping the couple and even forcing them to walk around the housing complex without wearing clothes. These actions are certainly very inhuman and violates human rights and morality.

In the legal perspective, not all cohabitation actions can be referred as a criminal act. Cohabitation behavior that can be said as a criminal act is if one or both of them have married with another person. Juridically, the current criminal law in Indonesia cannot threaten criminal sanctions against a person who has a legal relationship outside of marriage, if it is done by an adult or both parties are not bound by marriage with another person and carried out without coercion (Sudarto, 1983). In this study, two issues will be discussed namely cohabitation behavior which is categorized as a criminal act and an attempt to criminalize cohabitation in the legal system in Indonesia.

II. METHODS

The research method used is normative juridical research by comparing provisions regarding cohabitation in various countries. Legal materials originate from library study techniques by collecting primary legal materials (statutory regulations) and secondary legal materials (books, journals and electronic articles). The problem analysis in this study was carried out qualitatively.

III. DISCUSSION

Cohabitation Behavior Which is Categorized as a Criminal Act

In Indonesia, the practice of couples living together before marriage is called cohabitation. In general, it means that a couple who lives in a house but is not married. This is same if it is compared to the buffalos as animals that live in a cage but is not married. Cohabitation for some people is considered as a negative act because the lifestyle of living together between two people who are not married is very

synonymous with sex outside the marriage institution. Therefore, it is generally assumed that couples who live together are accused of having sexual relations outside of a marriage institution. In fact, the fulfillment of biological instincts should only be justified in husband and wife ties. Therefore, the thing that is rejected in particular the cohabitation is the sexual relationship, not things beyond that (Eddyono, 2015).

The problem of community acceptance or rejection of cohabitation behavior is very dependent on the perspective and the values adopted by the local community. The people who reject this cohabitation behavior see that this free sex behavior is a deviant sexual activity, which is done at a time and place that is mutually agreed. According to Kartono, generally, the sexual immorality in women is not driven by the motive of sexual desire satisfaction as in men. They are usually more driven by self-indulgence and compensation for mental lability caused by feelings of displeasure and dissatisfaction with the condition of themselves and their environmental situation. This immoral act committed by women is caused by:

Less controlled psychic brakes.

Weakening of the self-control system.

Not yet or lack of character formation in pre-puberty, puberty and adolence.

Immorality at home carried out by parents or a family member. The family member promotes abnormal sexual behavior to adolescents, which ultimately results in premature sexuality; namely sexuality that ripens too quickly before the actual age of psychic maturity. Then her immoral actions take place wildly and uncontrollably again (Kartono, 2005). Free sex is not only found in big cities, but also in rural areas. Kartono further revealed that free sex is influenced by:

The absence of regulation or setting regarding the implementation of sexual relations with certain regulations. Sex drive has a great influence on humans. Sex can build personality, but it can also destroy human nature.

Social change. The development of technology, science and communication led to such rapid social change in almost all human cultures. This social change affects the habits of human life, including influencing conventional sex patterns to be out of conventional cultural pathways, so that they are contrary to conventional sex regulation systems, and what is called free sex. The implementation of free sex is influenced by the causes of social change, such as: urbanization, mechanization, contraception, education, democratization of women's functions in society and modernization (Kartono, 2005).

Sue Titus Reid believes that cohabitation is an illegal sexual relationship between two people who are not married to each other. In some opinions, according to Reid, cohabitation is also applied to an unmarried person who has sexual relations with someone who is married to another person (Neng, 2010). Free sex does not always lead to the decision to live together with a partner. Free sex can be done only at any time, is temporary, and with different partners. Couples who take the decision to live together without marriage ties must face even greater consequences and responsibilities. Negative images are often attached to couples who decide to live together without marriage. Rejection from local residents is an indicator in Eastern culture. Some possibilities that can occur are for example unwanted pregnancies, children born without a clear legal status, lack of clarity about joint property, and lack of clarity about the rights and obligations of each party.

In Indonesian law, not all cohabitation behavior is a crime. This behavior cannot be referred as a crime if it is done by an adult who is not married to another person. Criminal sanctions can only be imposed if one or both of these people have married with another person. This condition is called "adultery (perzinahan)." In Indonesian Criminal Law, adultery is seen as a crime. The prohibited acts are regulated in Article 284 which states:

By a maximum imprisonment of nine months shall be punished:

any married man who knowing that Article 27 of the Civil Code is applicable to him, commits adultery.

any married woman who commits adultery.

any man who takes a direct part in the act knowing that the guilty co-partner is married.

any unmarried woman who takes a direct part in the act knowing that the guilty co-partner is married

and that Article 27 of the Civil code is applicable to him.

No prosecution shall be instituted unless by complaint of the insulted spouse, followed, if to the spouse Article 27 of the Civil Code is applicable, within the time of three months by a demand for divorce or severance from board and bed on the ground of the same act.

Article 72, 73 and 75 are not applicable to this complaint.

Complaints can be withdrawn as long as the examination in a court hearing has not yet begun.

If for the spouse Article 27 of the Civil Code is applicable, the complaint is not heeded as long as the marriage has not been decided because of divorce or before the verdict that states severance from board and bed becomes fixed.

According to Sahetapy and B. Mardjono Reksodiputro, seeing the provisions of Article 284 in such a way, the overspel that can be subject to criminal sanctions according to the Criminal Code is:

intercourse done by those who are married only. If the couple has not married, both the man and woman, then their copulation cannot be qualified as an overspel, which is different from the adultery understanding which considers intercourse between unmarried couples also included.

partners who are copulated, those who are not married are only considered as participants (medepleger). This means that if the intercourse partner is married too, the person concerned is considered not as a participant.

intercourse is not approved by the concerned husband or wife. In a *contrario*, it can be said that if the intercourse is agreed by the concerned husband or wife then it is not included as overspel (Sahetapy & Reksodiputro, 1989)

Article 284 of the Criminal Code requires an *overspel* to be deemed as adultery. According to Van Dale's Groot Woordenboek Nederlanche Taag, the word *overspel* means *echbreuk, schending ing der huwelijk strouw* which means a violation of marital loyalty. Noyon-Langemayer emphasizes that overspel can only be done by people who are married. In the *Hooge Raad* ruling on May 16, 1946, it more emphasis that the *overspel* is the intercourse outside the permission of husband / wife (Hukum Online, 2009). Article 27 of the Civil Code states "At the same time, a man may only be bound by a marriage with one woman; a woman with only one man."

Regarding Article 284 of the Criminal Code, R. Soesilo in his book the Indonesian Criminal Code (KUHP) and his Full Comments on Article by Article, explains that what is meant by adultery is intercourse committed by a married man or woman with a woman or a man who is not his wife or husband. In order to enter this article, the sexual intercourse must be carried out because of love each other and, there should be no coercion from either party (Soesilo, 1991). Juridically, the current criminal law in Indonesia cannot threaten criminal sanctions against a person who has intercourse outside of the legal marriage, if it is done by an adult or both parties are not bound by marriage with another person and carried out without coercion (Sudarto, 1983).

Criminalization of cohabitation in various countries is indeed adjusted to the values and objectives of criminalization itself. Some countries have actually regulated criminal acts of cohabitation in the Criminal Code, but the main objectives included in the elements of their crimes in the regulation of several countries are very different. First, cohabitation which is considered as a criminal offense if it is done with a child. (Yugoslav Criminal Code 1951 Article 193, Norway and Poland). Second, cohabitation which is categorized as criminal in terms of cohabitation practices in which a woman who believes that she has been legally married to a male party (Singapore, Malaysia, Brunei Darussalam, India, Iceland and Fiji). Third, the cohabitation that is categorized as criminal in terms of cohabitation with a wife or husband of an active member of the armed forces (China). Fourth, cohabitation which is categorized as criminal in the case of polygamy (conjugal union) in which living together as husband and wife with more than one person at the same time. (Canada). Fifth, the prohibition of total cohabitation as a prohibited behavior of adultery (arabic, and Islamic adherents) (Eddyono, 2016).

Countries in Southeast Asia that criminalize cohabitation are Singapore and Malaysia. Provisions regarding the criminalization of cohabitation can be seen in the following provisions:

Article 493 of the Singapore Criminal Code states "Every man who by deceit causes any woman who

is not lawfully married to him to believe that she is lawfully married to him and to cohabit or have sexual intercourse with him in that belief, shall be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extent to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine.

Article 493 of the Malaysian Kanun Keseksaan (KUHP) states: “*Sasaorang lelaki yang dengan jalan perdayaan menyebabkan sasaorang perempuan yang tidak berkahwin dengannya dengan sah disisi undang-undang supaya memperchayai bahawa perempuan itu telah berkahwin dengannya dengan sah disisi undang-undang dan supaya bersekududukan atau bersetuboh dengannya atas keperchayaan itu, hendaklah diseksa dengan penjara selama tempoh yang boleh sampai duapuluh (sic.) tahun, dan bolehlah juga dikenakan denda*”. (A man who deceives a woman who is not bound in a legal marriage with him according to the law, so that she believes that she has been legally married to the man, and lives together or has intercourse with him for that belief, threatened with imprisonment for not more than 20 (sic. 10 years) and also a fine).

The South Korean government is formulating a policy so that the community no longer highlights negatively to the couples of cohabitation and single parents due to divorce. The move was taken to increase the birth rate in South Korea. The South Korean Ministry of Finance fears that the country is experiencing a demographic slowdown like in Japan in the 1990s, which has had an impact. One of the solutions is to encourage cohabitation couples to have children, without having to be afraid of social criticism. The campaign for the public to be willing to accept various types of families is important to encourage the birth rate, although of course it takes time to be accepted. The current South Korean birth rate is 1.2 children per woman per year. It is the lowest rate among the other developed countries. South Korea's population is also getting older, because the young workers do not increase as fast as expected (Mohamad, 2015).

Criminalization of Cohabitation in the Legal System in Indonesia

The behavior of living together without marriage ties (although between two people who are not married to anyone) is still seen as a social deviation that must be regulated and subject to legal sanctions. In connection with this, there are several efforts made to criminalize cohabitation. Criminalization is an act or stipulation of a ruler concerning certain actions which by the community or groups of society are considered acts that can be punished as criminal acts (Soekanto, 1981). Criminalization is a process of determining a person's actions as a convicted act. This process ends with the establishment of a law in which the act is threatened with a sanction in the form of a criminal. The problem of criminalization raises two questions, whether the measure of the legislator determines an act to be a criminal act and whether the criteria for the legislator to establish a criminal threat against a crime that is higher than the criminal threat of another criminal act.

Hullsmann mentions some absolute criteria that need to be considered in the criminalization process, namely as follows:

Criminalization should not be determined solely for the desire to carry out a certain moral attitude towards a certain form of behavior.

The main reason for establishing an act as a criminal act should never have established a framework for the protection or treatment of a potential perpetrator in his own interests.

Criminalization must not result in exceeding the ability of criminal justice equipment.

Criminalization should not be used as a veil for just a real solution to a problem (Saleh, 1988).

Regarding the problem of criminalization, Sudarto says that criminalization must pay attention to the following matters:

The use of criminal law must pay attention to national development goals, namely to create a just and prosperous society that is materially and spiritually equitable based on Pancasila.

The acts that are attempted to be prevented or overcome by criminal law must be undesirable actions, namely actions that bring harm both materially and spiritually to the citizens.

The use of criminal law must take into account the principle of costs and results.

The use of criminal law must also pay attention to the capacity and ability of the work force of law

enforcement agencies, namely that there should be no oversight of duties (Sudarto, 1977).

Efforts to understand cohabitation behavior in Indonesia are carried out using a value approach. This approach is used in defining cohabitation behavior. According to Moh. Suardi, behavior is the result of experience. Cohabitation also occurs as a result of deviant behavior where the perpetrators of cohabitation clearly violate norms, ethics and religion (Suardi, 2015). In line with what Bagja Waluya said, cohabitation is a deviant behavior, which is any behavior that is expressed as a violation of the norms of the group or society. This shows that behavior is directly related to all aspects of a person's life, namely psychological, religious, social, and economic aspects, in which all these aspects are related to the behaviors carried out (Waluya, 2007). Cohabitation for most Indonesians is seen as deviant behavior and in accordance with Indonesian cultural values. This rationale is used as a basis for criminalizing the behavior of cohabitation.

Criminalization of cohabitation is carried out in two ways, with a petition for judicial review in the Constitutional Court and through the Draft of Penal Code. An application to make cohabitation as a criminal offense is carried out by a judicial review of Article 284 of the Criminal Code to be extended to unmarried couples. These efforts can be seen in the Constitutional Court Decision Number 46 / PUU-XIV / 2016. In the ruling, the Constitutional Court judge rejected the application because five judges argued that the substance of the petition was related to the formulation of an offense or a new crime that fundamentally changed the subject that could be convicted, the act that could be punished, the nature of the act against the law, or the sanctions or threats of the crime. Therefore, it actually has entered the 'criminal policy' area whose authority is in the legislator, namely the DPR and the President.

However, there are different opinions, one of them is from Arief Hidayat, the Head of the Constitutional Court. According to Arief Hidayat, the narrowing meaning of "adultery" which only covers adultery according to Article 284 of the Criminal Code is clearly a law despiritualization. Because, according to religious teachings and public order, which is indeed used by the constitution as one of the signs or guidelines that must be adhered in forming the norms of law, sexual intercourse between men and women can only be justified through means of marriage institutions (Saputra, 2017).

Another effort taken to punish cohabitation perpetrators is to expand the meaning of "adultery" in the Draft of Penal Code. The provisions regarding adultery also experienced a very drastic change when compared to the provisions of the old Criminal Code. In which there is an extended meaning of the zina criminal act in the formulation of the 2015 Criminal Code article. In the 2015 Draft of Criminal Code, this crime is regulated in Article 484 numbers (1) to (4). The sound of Article itself is:

Article 484 2015 Draft of Criminal Code

(1) Sentenced to adultery, with a maximum imprisonment of 5 (five) years:

a man who is in a marital bond has intercourse with a woman who is not his wife;

a woman who is in a marital bond commits intercourse with a man who is not her husband;

a man who is not in a marital bond commits sexual intercourse with a woman, even though it is known that the woman is in a marriage bond;

a woman who is not in a marital bond commits sexual intercourse with a man, even though it is known that the man is in a marital bond; or

a man and a women who are not bound in a legal marriage to have intercourse.

(2) Criminal acts as referred to in paragraph (1) are not prosecuted except for complaints from husbands, wives, or third parties who are tainted.

(3) Regarding complaints as referred to in paragraph (2), the provisions of Article 26, Article 27 and Article 29 are not applicable.

(4) Complaints can be withdrawn during an examination at a court hearing has not yet begun.

The Draft of Penal Code that includes the criminal act in Article 488, namely "Anyone who lives together as a husband and wife outside a legal marriage, is subject to a maximum imprisonment of 1 (one) year or a maximum fine of Category II." Elucidation: Article 488. This provision in the community is known as "kumpul kebo". The draft of Criminal Code year 2015 actually takes several

regulations from several countries, for example eliminating complaints and replacing them as formal offenses like in Canada and Malaysia. However, it forgets that in these countries the concept of cohabitation as an act is very limited, namely cohabitation as a crime if carried out on children, done to women who believe that they are legally married to the men, or done to members of the active armed forces (Eddyono, Syahrial, & Wiryawan, *Meninjau Kebijakan Kriminalisasi Dalam RKUHP 2015, 2015*).

Specifically in Indonesia, the biggest implication is not to unmarried couples, but precisely to married couples, but unregistered marriages (customarily) and not recorded by State administration provisions. In Indonesia, there are still many marriages that have not been formally touched by the state administration, and this may be the target for this crime. In fact, it is very difficult to bring a case of cohabitation because the element of criminal action states that "living together as a husband and wife outside of legal marriage". However, there is no indicator of living together as husband and wife, there is no explanation that can be used as a standard in the Draft of Penal Code. This is very difficult in the verification. The act criticized actually in the practice of cohabitation is the sexual relationship. If the drafters of the Criminal Code want to regulate criminal acts, cohabitation should actually imitate the formulation of cohabitation carried out by several countries (included in marital crimes) above, for example cohabitation with children, by polygamy, by fraud and with the wife / husband of the active armed forces members or members of the police force are active. Precisely, the regulations of cohabitation in this context are very needed in Indonesia (Eddyono, Syahrial, & Wiryawan, *Meninjau Kebijakan Kriminalisasi Dalam RKUHP 2015, 2015*).

The criminalization of cohabitation on the one hand is in accordance with the religious and cultural values embraced by the people in Indonesia, but on the other hand, the state must not interfere too much in the personal affairs of its citizens. Criminalization of cohabitation will only increase the workload of the law enforcement against cases that are not really important. Indonesia as a cultured nation is a country that upholds noble character, noble values, wisdom, and manners. In order to realize a cultured nation through strengthening religious values, honesty, tolerance, discipline, hard work, creative, independent, democratic, curiosity, national spirit, patriotism, respect for achievement, communicative, peaceful love, fond of reading, caring for the environment, caring socially, and being responsible, need to strengthen character education.

To reduce cohabitation behavior, what should be done is with character education. Strengthening Character Education is an education movement under the responsibility of an education unit to strengthen the character of students through harmonization of the process of heart, taste, thought processing, and sports with involvement and cooperation between education, family and community units as part of the National Revolution Movement Mentality.

IV. CONCLUSION

Cohabitation behavior which is categorized as a criminal offense if carried out by people who have married with another person. The criminal act is regulated in Article 284 of the Criminal Code. The provisions in Article 284 of the Criminal Code cannot reach cohabitation perpetrators who are not married to anyone. Efforts to criminalize cohabitation in the legal system in Indonesia are carried out by a judicial review of Article 284 of the Criminal Code as stated in the Constitutional Court Decision Number 46 / PUU-XIV / 2016 and by expanding the meaning of adultery in the Draft of Penal Code. Criminalization of cohabitation should only be done with cohabitation with children, by polygamy, by fraud and with certain people. Criminalization of cohabitation should be used as a complaint offense. Criminal imposition of cohabitation perpetrators should only be based on complaints.

REFERENCES

- Arief, B. N. (2011). *Bunga Rampai Kebijakan Hukum Pidana (Perkembangan Penyusunan Konsep KUHP Baru)*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Eddyono, S. W. (2015). *Pengantar Pasal Kumpul Kebo dalam KUHP*. Jakarta: ICJR-Aliansi Nasional Reformasi KUHP.
- Eddyono, S. W. (2016). *Aliansi Nasional Reformasi KUHP*. Retrieved from <http://reformasikuhp.org/masalah-tindak-pidana-kumpul-kebo-cohabitation-dalam-r-kuhp>
- Eddyono, S. W., Syahrial, A., & Wiryawan, M. (2015). *Meninjau Kebijakan Kriminalisasi Dalam RKUHP 2015*.

- Jakarta: Institute for Criminal Justice Reform.
- Huda, M. N. (2018). Retrieved from <http://jateng.tribunnews.com/2018/09/17/pasangan-kumpul-kebo-digerebek-dini-hari-tadi-di-sebuah-rumah-oleh-satpol-pp-dan-lurah>
- Hukum Online. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.hukumonline.com/klinik/detail/cl6787/sudah-cukupkah-bukti-untuk-delik-aduan-perzinahan>
- Jawa Pos. (2018). Retrieved from [jpnn.com](https://www.jpnn.com/news/digerebek-polisi-pasangan-kumpul-kebo-kabur-lewat-jendela): <https://www.jpnn.com/news/digerebek-polisi-pasangan-kumpul-kebo-kabur-lewat-jendela>
- Kartono. (2005). *Patologi Sosial 2 Kenakalan Remaja*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Mohamad, A. (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.merdeka.com/dunia/pemerintah-korsel-dukung-kumpul-kebo-agar-angka-kelahiran-naik.html>
- Neng, D. (2010). *Perzinaan dalam Peraturan Perundang-undangan di Indonesia ditinjau dari Hukum Islam*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Sahetapy, & Reksodiputro, B. M. (1989). *Paradoks dalam Kriminologi*. Jakarta: Rajawali.
- Saleh, R. (1988). *Dari Lembar Kepustakaan Hukum Pidana*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Saputra, A. (2017). Retrieved from <https://news.detik.com/berita/3769886/ketua-mk-soal-kumpul-kebo-tak-bisa-dipidana-despiritualisasi-hukum>
- Soekanto, S. (1981). *Kriminologi: Suatu Pengantar*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Soesilo, R. (1991). *Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP) Serta Komentar-Komentarnya Lengkap Pasal Demi Pasal*. Bogor: Politeia.
- Suardi, M. (2015). *Belajar dan Pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Deepublis.
- Sudarto. (1977). *Hukum dan Hukum Pidana*. Bandung: Alumni.
- Sudarto. (1983). *Hukum Pidana dan Perkembangan Masyarakat*. Bandung: Sinar Baru.
- Sulistyo, K. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.borneonews.co.id/berita/71755-pasangan-kumpul-kebo-digerebek-warga-di-barakan-jalan-pemuda>
- Tanjung, A. (2007). *Free Sex No! Nikah Yes!* Jakarta: Amzah.
- Waluya, B. (2007). *Sosiologi: Menyelami Fenomena Sosial di Masyarakat untuk Kelas X Sekolah Menengah Atas/ Madrasah Aliyah*. Bandung: PT Setia Purna Inves