

Research Article

Effectiveness of the Death Penalty as an Instrument of Legal Strengthening Against Drug Dealers

Rizki Adi Pinandito* and Muhammad Rafly Putratama

Master of Law Program, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung (UNISSULA), Semarang, Indonesia

ORCID

Rizki Adi Pinandito: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8810-8013>

Abstract.

This study aims to examine and analyze the effectiveness of the application of the death penalty to drug dealers in the criminal law system in Indonesia and the obstacles and solutions in this topic. The method used is an empirical juridical legal approach which combines normative analysis of laws and regulations with the reality of their application in the field. Data were collected through document studies, interviews with law enforcement officers, and observations of a number of court decisions that imposed death penalty on drug offenders. The author uses the theories of law enforcement effectiveness and legal certainty to study this topic. Factors such as weak supervision systems, potential abuse of authority, and lack of consistency in law enforcement are the main obstacles. In addition, the death penalty also raises controversy in the context of human rights, especially the right to life. Therefore, an evaluation of the death penalty policy is needed, as well as strengthening a transparent and accountable justice system as part of a more effective drug control strategy. The government needs to reform the Narcotics Law to clarify the criteria for applying the death penalty so that it includes not only big dealers but also dealers involved in drug distribution networks at various levels, in order to provide legal clarity and ensure justice for all perpetrators. In addition, the effectiveness of its implementation must be supported by ongoing training and education for law enforcement officers to improve integrity and prevent errors in the sentencing process.

Keywords: death penalty, drug dealers, legal effectiveness

1. Introduction

Illegal drug trafficking is a serious threat to the survival of the nation and state. This crime not only damages individual health, but also destroys the future of the younger generation, increases crime rates, and has the potential to weaken national resilience. Therefore, Indonesia places drug crimes as extraordinary crimes that must be addressed with firm legal measures, including through the application of the death penalty.

In Indonesia there are two types of legal rules governing the death penalty, namely Islamic law and national law. Among them in national law is the Criminal Code which

Corresponding Author: Rizki Adi Pinandito; email: rizkyadi@unissula.ac.id

Published: 3 November 2025

Publishing services provided by Knowledge E

© Pinandito, Putratama. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the 8th Legal International Conference and Studies Conference Committee.



contains basic rules including the death penalty. This is clarified in CHAPTER II of the Criminal Code in article 10 point a concerning the main penalties, namely the death penalty, imprisonment, detention, and fines (Moeljatno, 2003).

The death penalty for drug dealers is regulated in Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics, which gives judges the opportunity to impose the maximum sentence on certain perpetrators. One of the main reasons for implementing the death penalty is to provide a deterrent effect and prevent the development of increasingly widespread narcotics networks.

The death penalty for drug dealers in Indonesia has a clear legal basis in various laws and regulations. Specifically, Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics gives judges the authority to impose the death penalty in certain cases. Article 114 paragraph (2) of the Narcotics Law states that anyone who offers for sale, sells, buys, acts as an intermediary in the sale and purchase, exchanges, delivers, or receives Class I narcotics weighing more than five grams can be sentenced to death. This provision shows that Indonesian law views drug dealers as perpetrators of serious crimes that endanger the lives of the community.

The death penalty is the most severe sanction of all the crimes that are threatened. The death penalty is imposed on one of the defendants who committed a serious and extraordinary crime. One of the most serious crimes is the illicit trafficking of drugs that can damage the ideals and future of the nation's next generation. Drugs are an abbreviation of narcotics and dangerous drugs which are often interpreted as NAZA (narcotics, alcohol, and other addictive substances) drugs can be defined into 3 groups, namely narcotics, psychotropics, and drugs or dangerous substances (Arief, 2018).

The death penalty for drug convicts is basically a protection of human rights for many people because drug cases are one of the extraordinary crimes that have harmed the nation in large amounts, both materially and immaterially. The judiciary in Indonesia should indeed be independent and impartial, meaning that it cannot be intervened by any party, including intervention from other countries.

The application of the death penalty to drug dealers has raised various debates. On the one hand, there are views that support the death penalty as a symbol of legal firmness and a form of protection for society from the threat of narcotics (Muladi, 1997). There are many pros and cons regarding the death penalty also for drug dealers because of the issue of human rights, namely the right to life that the perpetrator has as a human being since birth, which basically cannot be revoked or reduced. This is

regulated in the 1945 Constitution Article 28a and 28i paragraph (1). However, in the decision of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia, it was stated that the death penalty in the Narcotics Law does not conflict with the right to life guaranteed by the 1945 Constitution.

The definition of narcotics based on Article 1 point 1 of Law Number 22 of 1997 is a substance or drug derived from plants or non-plants, either synthetic or semi-synthetic, which can cause a decrease or change in consciousness, loss of feeling, reduce or eliminate pain, and can cause dependency, which is divided into groups as attached to this Law or which is later determined by the Decree of the Minister of Health.

Achmad Ali stated that legal certainty must be accompanied by fair legal certainty. Regarding (Andi Hamzah, 2008) the death penalty for drug dealers, Achmad Ali warned about the potential for miscarriage of justice which could have fatal impacts on human rights, so its implementation must be truly selective and based on strong evidence.

According to Barda Nawawi Arief, the death penalty is a form of maximum legal protection that aims to maintain public order and prevent extraordinary crimes, including narcotics (Arief, *Masalah Penegakan Hukum dan Kebijakan Hukum Pidana dalam Penanggulangan Kejahatan*, 2010). Barda emphasized that legal certainty through the death penalty functions as a means of collective legal protection against serious threats that endanger people's lives.

Indonesia has consistently maintained the death penalty as a form of law enforcement, especially since the rise in major cases of cross-border drug trafficking. The government believes that without tough policies, Indonesia will become an easy target for international syndicates in the illicit drug trade (Narkotika, 2023). Various strategies have been implemented, ranging from preventive to repressive measures, including the application of the death penalty for perpetrators of drug crimes which is considered a firm step in providing a deterrent effect. However, the effectiveness of the application of the death penalty in suppressing the number of drug trafficking is still being debated. Some argue that this punishment can be a deterrent for perpetrators of drug crimes, while others question its impact on significantly reducing cases of drug trafficking.

As a firm step in providing a deterrent effect. An example of a case that has occurred in the court decision against AKP Andri Gustami, former Head of the South Lampung Police Narcotics Unit, is recorded in Number 827/Pid.Sus/2023/PN Tjk at the Tanjungkarang District Court. The verdict hearing took place on February 29, 2024, with a panel of judges led by Lingga Setiawan. In the verdict, AKP Andri Gustami was sentenced to

death after being proven legally and convincingly guilty of committing a crime “without rights or against the law to commit a criminal conspiracy to commit a crime of Narcotics and Narcotics Precursors as an intermediary in the sale and purchase of Class I Narcotics not plants weighing more than 5 (five) grams”. After the verdict at the first level, AKP Andri Gustami appealed to the Tanjungkarang High Court. However, the appeal was rejected, and the death sentence was upheld.

The effectiveness of the death penalty as an instrument of legal firmness against drug dealers is influenced by many factors: social, legal, political, even psychological. Although there is an argument that the death penalty can have a deterrent effect, the reality on the ground shows that drug networks continue to grow, even more complex.

This study aims to explore the various dimensions of this question, with the hope of providing deeper insights for policy makers and the public to formulate more effective strategies in dealing with the drug problem in Indonesia.

Research on the effectiveness of the death penalty is important to examine whether the threat of this severe punishment fulfills the objectives of criminal law, namely justice, benefit, and legal certainty (Sudarto, 1986). If the death penalty does not significantly reduce the rate of narcotics trafficking, then alternative legal policies that are more humanistic but still firm need to be considered.

2. Methods

This research method is an empirical legal approach, according to Mukti Fajar, this research aims to understand how the law is applied, executed, and felt by the community, as well as to assess the effectiveness and justice of the law in force in the community. This research is different from normative legal research which prioritizes analysis of legal theory or written law (Mukti Fajar dan Yulianto Achmad, 2010). In this study, the qualitative descriptive method, the data collected is qualitative, obtained through in-depth interviews, observations, and documentation which are then analyzed descriptively to obtain a comprehensive picture of the research object.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Effectiveness of the Implementation of the Death Penalty Against Drug Dealers in the Criminal Law System in Indonesia

The death penalty is one of the main criminal sanctions that has long been known in the Indonesian criminal law system. Provisions regarding this punishment are contained in Article 10 of the old Criminal Code (KUHP), and are applied to certain serious crimes. However, through the ratification of Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code, the concept of the death penalty has undergone normative and functional changes. In this latest law, the death penalty is no longer positioned as the main punishment, but rather as a special form of alternative punishment.

The application of the death penalty to drug dealers in Indonesia is a form of legal protection for society from serious threats caused by the illicit trafficking of narcotics. The death penalty in this context is considered as a last resort (*ultimum remedium*) which is extraordinary (extraordinary crime), considering its very damaging impact on the nation's generation and national stability.

The death penalty is not explicitly prohibited by the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Article 28I paragraph (1) states that “The right to life is a human right that cannot be reduced under any circumstances”. However, the Constitutional Court in several decisions, such as Decision Number 2-3/PUU-V/2007, has emphasized that the death penalty can still be imposed for extraordinary crimes, including narcotics, as long as its application is carried out proportionally and through a fair legal process.

In Indonesia's positive legal system, the death penalty for perpetrators of narcotics crimes is regulated in Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics, specifically in Articles 113, 114, 118 and 119. For example, Article 114 paragraph (2) states that perpetrators who distribute class I narcotics in certain quantities can be sentenced to death or life imprisonment.

The death penalty is also listed in the Criminal Code (KUHP) as one of the main types of punishment. Although the new Criminal Code which was ratified through Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code regulates the death penalty more restrictively, including with a probationary period of 10 years (Article 100), this provision shows a paradigm shift from the death penalty as a final punishment to a conditional and alternative punishment.

The effectiveness of the application of the death penalty to drug dealers is still a matter of debate among academics and legal practitioners. On the one hand, the death penalty is believed to have a deterrent effect and prevent repeated crimes. However, data from the National Narcotics Agency (BNN) shows that drug trafficking remains high despite the death sentence against a number of dealers. This raises questions about the effectiveness of the death penalty as a deterrent.

Based on an interview via Melky Salahudin's mobile phone, according to him, when viewed from the legal certainty side, the death penalty is effective, in the sense that the actions of the defendant sentenced to death have shown that the actions have been given a criminal sentence that is commensurate with their actions, but from the deterrent effect side, it is not effective because it is widely known that several death row convicts have been executed but the same narcotics crimes still occur, meaning that other perpetrators are not afraid of the threat of the death penalty, from the execution side, we both know that the implementation of the death penalty is not immediately carried out once a case is inkrah/has permanent legal force, but also waiting for the death row convict to file a judicial review so that it takes years (Judge of the Meulaboh High Court , 2025).

In the case of drug trafficking crimes, the perpetrator can be sentenced to the heaviest possible punishment because every perpetrator of a crime must be held accountable for his actions in accordance with the principle of criminal responsibility. The actions carried out by the perpetrator of drug trafficking contain elements of error, namely the existence of evil intent (*mens rea*) and unlawful acts (*actus reus*). These elements are the basis for imposing severe criminal sanctions, including the death penalty under certain conditions (Oksidelfa Yanto, 2017).

Freddy Budiman is one of the death row convicts who was found guilty of violating Article 114 of Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics, which regulates the prohibition on distributing class I narcotics in large quantities. In addition to him, there are a number of similar cases that show the consistency of the application of the death penalty by the courts. For example, Haji Dawang was sentenced to death by the Pinrang District Court, and Tri Diah received a similar verdict from the Surabaya District Court. Another case involved Jusman and Rubiyanti Hasyim, who were each also sentenced to death, one of them by the North Jakarta District Court, for violating the same article ("Court Imposes Death Sentence for Drug Dealer", 2025). Based on the case examples above, the death penalty has been applied to a number of drug dealers, in reality the

number of drug dealers in Indonesia is still high. This shows that even the maximum sentence has not fully provided the expected deterrent effect.

The application of the death penalty in various cases is not only based on violations of the narcotics law, but also because the actions of the defendants are considered as actions that oppose state policy in efforts to eradicate drugs. In addition, large-scale drug trafficking is considered a serious threat to national resilience and the joints of national life.

The circulation of narcotics is seen as a serious threat to society because it not only has the potential to cause death for users, but is also a trigger for various other crimes that occur due to the influence of these addictive substances (Hafifi, 2015). Cesare Lombroso and Raffaele Garofalo stated that the death penalty is a form of punishment that needs to exist in a country to deal with extraordinary criminals who are considered irreparable. This punishment is considered an effective way to protect society from ongoing threats by individuals who have proven to be very dangerous (Wibowo, 2018).

Barda Nawawi Arief stated that criminal law is essentially a tool or means to achieve certain goals, which are based on two basic things, namely community protection and guidance for perpetrators of criminal acts. In recent developments, the application of criminal law has become increasingly complex because it must consider the dimension of protection of human rights, including the rights of the perpetrators of the crime themselves. Suhariyono stated that the determination of criminal sanctions in laws and regulations must consider the balance between aspects of justice, benefit, and legal certainty, so as not to conflict with the principles of human rights (Suhariyono, 2009).

Law enforcement theory, Soerjono Soekanto explains that the effectiveness of law enforcement does not only depend on legal norms alone, but also on the interaction between three main components, namely: legal substance, legal structure, and the legal culture of society. If one of these three elements does not function optimally, then law enforcement will not run effectively.

According to Soerjono Soekanto, the law will be effective if the norms created can truly be implemented in the life of society and accepted as something that should be obeyed. If the death penalty for drug dealers is not accompanied by improvements in the structure and culture of law, then its existence will only be symbolic. For this reason, a comprehensive approach through preventive, educational, and rehabilitative efforts needs to be put forward along with repressive sanctions.

The application of the death penalty to drug dealers in Indonesia is still not fully effective according to Soerjono Soekanto's theory. The imbalance between strict legal norms and weak implementation and a legal culture that has not supported it makes the effectiveness of this policy at a problematic point.

The application of the death penalty to drug dealers in Indonesia is often in the spotlight in the realm of criminal law, especially in the context of its effectiveness as an instrument for eradicating extraordinary crimes. In assessing the effectiveness of the application of this punishment, one relevant approach is the theory of legal certainty as put forward by Satjipto Rahardjo.

According to Satjipto Rahardjo, legal certainty is not merely interpreted as certainty in written texts or norms, but must be understood as a tool that is able to present justice and legal benefits in society. In his view, law is not only rigid normative logic, but must also pay attention to the social reality that underlies the birth of a legal rule (Rahardjo, 2008).

Based on the case example of AKP Andri Gustami, former Head of the South Lampung Police Narcotics Unit, sentenced to death in case Number 827/Pid.Sus/2023/PN Tjk by the Tanjungkarang District Court on February 29, 2024. The panel of judges led by Lingga Setiawan decided that Andri was proven guilty of conspiracy related to narcotics, as well as acting as an intermediary in the sale and purchase of class I narcotics weighing more than 5 grams. After being sentenced to death by the Tanjungkarang District Court, AKP Andri Gustami filed an appeal to the Tanjungkarang High Court. However, the application was rejected, and the panel of judges at the appellate level decided to uphold the death sentence that had been handed down at the first instance.

This case reflects the firm action of law enforcement officers in dealing with the involvement of certain officers, especially police officers, in the drug trafficking network. The death penalty verdict against AKP Andri Gustami shows that law enforcement is impartial and that the involvement of law enforcement officers in drug crimes is considered a serious violation that betrays the trust of the institution.

Satjipto Rahardjo reminded that the law should not stop at certainty alone, but must lead to justice and benefit. In practice, even though the death penalty has been imposed, the level of drug trafficking is still high, even tending to increase. This shows that legal certainty in the form of the threat of the death penalty is not necessarily effective in reducing drug crimes, if not accompanied by other approaches such as prevention, education, and rehabilitation.

The effectiveness of the application of the death penalty to drug dealers in the criminal law system in Indonesia cannot be separated from the five factors that influence the implementation of the law according to Soerjono Soekanto. Each factor makes a significant contribution in assessing whether the death penalty policy is truly capable of causing a deterrent effect or merely being a legal symbol. The correlation of the theory of legal effectiveness to the application of the death penalty to drug dealers in Indonesia, the five factors that influence the implementation of the law according to Soerjono Soekanto, namely:

a) Legal Substance: Laws that regulate the death penalty for drug dealers already exist, especially in Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics. However, the effectiveness of this law is highly dependent on the clarity of norms, consistency of rules, and their conformity to the values of social justice. If these norms are too rigid or unable to answer the complexity of the drug problem, then their effectiveness will be low even though the threat of punishment is severe.

b) Law Enforcement Factors: Law enforcers such as the police, prosecutors, judges, and correctional officers play a vital role in the implementation of the death penalty. If their integrity, professionalism, and consistency are low or they are exposed to corrupt and nepotistic practices, then the implementation of the death penalty will cause injustice and weaken public trust in the legal system. The many narcotics cases involving certain officers also reflect the weakness of fair and effective law enforcement.

c) Facilities and Infrastructure Factors: Law enforcement cannot be effective without the support of adequate facilities, such as forensic laboratories, narcotics detection technology, intelligence systems, and adequate rehabilitation institutions. The unpreparedness of these facilities can hinder the fair legal evidence process, or even lead to wrongful arrests and abuse of authority.

d) Community Factors: Community response to the implementation of the death penalty also affects the effectiveness of the law. If the community supports the death penalty as a form of justice for perpetrators of drug crimes, then the implementation of the law will gain social legitimacy. However, if the community considers the death penalty to be inhumane or does not touch the root of the problem of drug trafficking, then this can give rise to resistance or distrust of the legal system.

e) Legal Culture Factors: Legal culture reflects the legal awareness of society and law enforcement. In Indonesia, there are still many views that the law is only enforced on certain groups and does not touch the main actors (big dealers). Society is still

permissive towards the use or trade of narcotics due to economic factors or social pressures, so the application of the death penalty will not have a major impact on prevention.

However, when viewed from Satjipto Rahardjo's perspective, the law should not be trapped in rigid certainty without considering social reality and humanitarian aspects. That repressive approaches such as the death penalty need to be reviewed for their effectiveness. Reliance on the death penalty as the main solution can actually obscure the principle of substantive justice. Therefore, according to the author, drug eradication must be comprehensive and progressive. The effectiveness of the law is not only measured by the existence of firm norms, but by its ability to resolve social problems fairly, humanely, and with real impact.

3.2. Obstacles and Solutions in the Implementation of the Death Penalty against Drug Crime Offenders in Indonesia

3.2.1. Obstacles in the Implementation of the Death Penalty Against Drug Crime Offenders in Indonesia

The death penalty has long been accommodated in the Indonesian criminal law system as the highest form of punishment, its application to perpetrators of drug crimes is inseparable from various complex obstacles. These obstacles include legal, social, political aspects, as well as moral and human rights considerations, which overall reflect the dilemma between the demands of strict law enforcement and the principles of humane justice.

The application of the death penalty in drug crime cases in Indonesia faces various obstacles that are normative, practical, and philosophical. The following are some of the main obstacles:

a) Contrary to the Principles of Human Rights (HAM)

The death penalty is considered to violate the right to life guaranteed by the constitution and various human rights instruments, both national and international. Article 28I paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia states that the right to life is a human right that cannot be reduced under any circumstances. This is a very strong normative challenge in the implementation of the death penalty, because it can be considered to be contrary to the constitution itself.

b) A Long and Uncertain Legal Process

Death row convicts often undergo a very long legal process because there is still an opportunity to file for clemency, cassation, or judicial review (PK). This process can last for years, creating legal uncertainty and a high psychological burden, both for the convict and the victim.

The theory of legal certainty, to achieve a fairer and more efficient justice system, reform is needed in legal procedures related to the death penalty. Clearer and more orderly procedures, with definite time limits for each stage, will provide legal certainty for both convicts and the community. This will increase public confidence in the Indonesian justice system, and ensure that the death penalty as a form of punishment can be applied fairly and in a timely manner (Kusumah, 2020).

c) Inconsistency of Law Enforcement

Not all drug traffickers who are proven guilty are sentenced to death, even though they use the same article. This creates an impression of inconsistency in law enforcement, which can reduce the deterrent effect of the death penalty itself.

The results of a mobile interview with former drug dealer Mr.X (pseudonym) according to him explained that although the law in Indonesia provides the threat of the death penalty for drug dealers, many perpetrators feel that the punishment is not always applied consistently. Only a few people are sentenced to death, even though many are involved in large-scale drug trafficking. Some are only couriers or small dealers, and they can get lighter sentences, even though they violate the same article. However, those who are considered the main perpetrators or part of an international network are often sentenced to death (X, 2025).

According to effectiveness theory, uncertainty in law enforcement can reduce the deterrence effect of a sanction. If the death penalty is not applied consistently, criminals may feel that there is a possibility of escaping severe punishment, so they are less likely to feel threatened to stop operating.

The theory of effectiveness, one of the goals of punishment is to provide a deterrent effect to both perpetrators of crimes and the general public. If the perpetrators know that the punishment given can vary depending on factors such as cooperation with authorities or their role in the drug network, then the threat of the death penalty becomes less frightening. The uncertainty in the imposition of this sentence makes the sanction less effective as a tool to prevent drug crimes.

According to Melky Salahudin, based on interviews, the obstacles to the application of the death penalty during the time the source was a judge were that there were still

differences of opinion among judges regarding the imposition of the death penalty, some were in favor and some were against, secondly, for the time being, the threat of the death penalty in the article in the Narcotics Law only outlines the criteria in the form of the amount of evidence and corporations, only those two, thus opening up the opportunity for interpretation by each Public Prosecutor and Judge regarding what actions can be sentenced to death (Melky Salahudin S. , 2025)

3.2.2. Solutions in the Implementation of the Death Penalty for Drug Crime Offenders in Indonesia

The application of the death penalty in drug cases is an issue that often triggers global human rights debates. Several countries maintain the death penalty as a form of deterrent effect against extraordinary crimes, especially in drug cases. Indonesia is one of the countries that still maintains the death penalty for perpetrators of drug crimes. However, the approach, legal basis, and practice of implementing the death penalty differ from one country to another.

Solutions to overcome obstacles in implementing the death penalty against perpetrators of drug crimes in Indonesia so that this policy remains relevant and just include:

a) Consistent and Transparent Law Enforcement

Consistent and transparent law enforcement is a basic principle in a state of law that upholds justice. In the context of narcotics crimes, this is very important considering the broad impact of these crimes on national security and the future of the younger generation. Inconsistent law enforcement will create legal uncertainty and reduce public trust in the criminal justice system.

b) Evaluation of the Criminal Justice System

The government needs to review the effectiveness of the death penalty, and provide an alternative in the form of life imprisonment without remission for perpetrators who are not proven to be part of a large network. Evaluation of legal justice needs to be carried out with a focus on transparency, accountability, and protection of human rights, so that the justice system can provide substantive justice for all parties. Integration of data-based risk assessment methods can help judges impose proportionate and effective sentences, and prevent high-risk perpetrators from repeating crimes.

c) Improving the Quality of Law Enforcement Officers

The quality of law enforcement greatly determines the fairness in sentencing. The death penalty should not be imposed if the legal process is still vulnerable to errors or abuse of authority. Professionalism, integrity, and technical capacity of the apparatus determine the success of the legal process. Regular training, improving welfare, and improving the internal monitoring system are priorities (Romli Atmasasmita, 2011).

d) Reform of Legislation

Evaluating and revising ambiguous or overlapping laws and regulations can help create a clearer and more certain legal framework. This reform must involve public participation to ensure that the resulting laws reflect the values of social justice.

The results of the interview with Melky Salahudin provide interesting insights related to the need for adjustments in the criminal law system in Indonesia. According to him, one solution that can be taken to improve justice in sentencing is through a revision of the existing Law, or by issuing more detailed implementing regulations. The issuance of these implementing regulations can provide clear guidelines and detailed criteria for judges or other law enforcement officers in determining sentences, so as to minimize uncertainty in legal decisions and avoid injustice (Melky Salahudi, 2025).

4. Conclusion

The effectiveness of the application of the death penalty to drug dealers in the criminal law system in Indonesia is still being debated, considering the challenges in terms of consistency of law enforcement, potential legal errors, and human rights issues. Its application must be accompanied by a more transparent and consistent system in order to achieve substantive justice. Evaluation of the criteria for the application of the death penalty, improvement of the justice system, and improvement of the quality of law enforcement officers are very necessary so that this policy can provide a more effective deterrent effect without sacrificing the principles of justice and human rights. The application of the death penalty to drug offenders in Indonesia faces a number of obstacles, such as legal uncertainty, inconsistency in law enforcement, and potential human rights violations. To overcome these obstacles, more consistent and transparent law enforcement is needed, an evaluation of the criminal justice system by considering alternative punishments, and improving the quality of law enforcement officers. In addition, reform of laws and regulations, especially the revision of the Narcotics Law, is very important to emphasize the criteria for the application of the death penalty that is

fair and comprehensive. The wider application of the death penalty to all drug dealers, while still paying attention to justice and human rights, can be a more effective step in eradicating drug crimes in Indonesia.

References

- [1] Hafifi, MN. Violent Theft Crimes Committed by Drug Addicts Reviewed from a Criminological Perspective in Pontianak City. *Tanjungpura University Law Journal*, 3(4); 2015.
- [2] Kusumah S. Reform of the Death Penalty Justice System in Indonesia. *Journal of Law and Justice*. 2020;12(4).
- [3] Suhariyono. Determination of Criminal Sanctions in a Law. *Journal of Law*, 6(4); 2009.
- [4] Yanto O. Imposition of Death Penalty on Corruption Offenders in Certain Circumstances. *Journal of Law*. 2017;14(1).
- [5] Apandi Y. Katakan Tidak pada Narkoba. Bandung: Simbiosis; 2015.
- [6] Arief BN. Masalah Penegakan Hukum dan Kebijakan Hukum Pidana dalam Penanggulangan Kejahatan. Jakarta: Kencana; 2010.
- [7] Arief BN. Bunga Rampai Kebijakan Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group; 2018.
- [8] Atmasasmita R. *Reformasi Hukum, Hak Asasi Manusia dan Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia*. Bandung: Refika Aditama; 2011.
- [9] Fajar M, Achmad Y. Dualisme Penelitian Hukum: Normatif dan Empiris. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar; 2010.
- [10] Hamzah A. Pengantar Hukum Pidana Indonesia. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia; 2008.
- [11] Moeljatno. *Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara; 2003.
- [12] Muladi. *Hak Asasi Manusia, Politik, dan Sistem Peradilan Pidana*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro; 1997.
- [13] Rahardjo S. Hukum Progresif: Hukum yang Membebaskan. Jakarta: Kompas; 2008.
- [14] Sudarto. *Hukum dan Hukum Pidana*. Bandung: Alumni; 1986.
- [15] Tim Anti Narkotika. *Strategi Nasional Pemberantasan Narkoba*. Jakarta: Kementerian Koordinator Politik, Hukum, dan Keamanan; 2023.
- [16] Wibowo W. (2018). *Kriminologi dan Tindak Pidana dalam Perspektif Teori Klasik dan Modern*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. Interview with Melky Salahudin, SH, Judge of the Meulaboh High Court, April 28, 2025. Interview with Mr. X, Former Drug Dealer in Semarang, May 5, 2025.

- [17] Anugrahdwi. “Sejarah Dan Metode Hukuman Mati Di Indonesia.” <https://pascasarjana.umsu.ac.id/sejarah-dan-metode-hukuman-mati-diindonesia/#:~:text=Sanksi%20hukuman%20mati%20pertama%20kali,Willem%20Daendels%20pada%20tahun%201808;2023>. 2023.
- [18] Baren Sipayung, Sardjana Orba Manullang, and Henry Kristian Siburian. “Penerapan Hukuman Mati Menurut Hukum Positif Di Indonesia Ditinjau Dari Perspektif Hak Asasi Manusia,.” *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan* 7, no. 1; 2023: 134–42.
- [19] Bernadetha Aurelia Oktavira. “Dasar Hukum Dan Pelaksanaan Hukuman Mati Di Indonesia,.” https://www.hukumonline.com/klinik/a/tata-cara-pelaksanaanpidana-mati-di-indonesia-cl441/#_ftn1, 2024. Vol. 1. No. 1. May; 2025.
- [20] Hamzah, Andi. *Perbandingan Hukum Pidana Beberapa Negara*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika; 2008.