

History of Article

Submitted: November 2020

Revised: December 2020

Accepted: January 2021

How to cite:

Lestari, D. I. (2021). The Imposition of the Death Penalty for Drug Dealers in the Perspective of Human Rights. *Semarang State University Undergraduate Law and Society Review*, 1(1), 35-50. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lsr.v1i1.49838>

© 2021 Authors. This work is licensed under a [Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International \(CC BY-NC-SA 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/). All writings published in this journal are personal views of the authors and do not represent the views of this journal and the author's affiliated institutions.

The Imposition of the Death Penalty for Drug Dealers in the Perspective of Human Rights

Dewi Indah LESTARI 

Universitas Negeri Semarang

Jl. Kampus Timur, Sekaran, Gunungpati, Semarang, INDONESIA

✉ dewindah386@gmail.com

ABSTRACT. Law enforcement is doing efforts to the enforcement process or the functioning of legal norms significantly as a code of conduct in traffic or legal relationships in the life of society and state. One way to enforce fair laws is to give the maximum sanctions to perpetrators of serious criminal offenses such as the imposition of the death penalty for drug dealers as listed in Act No. 35 of 2009. However, there are many pros and cons about this death penalty. Highlights of the death penalty usually associated with injustice because it violates human rights, namely the right to life. This paper is to study it from the point of sociology of law, especially the theory of justice. In the perspective of sociology of law, a criminal prosecution device should include two things: first, it must accommodate public

aspirations repay as pondering on the basis of an error rate of the offender. Second, it should include the purpose of punishment, namely, to maintain and preserve the unity of the community. Thus, the law should represent the public sense of justice.

KEYWORDS. *Death Penalty; Capital Punishment; Drugs; Human Rights*

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the major problems being faced by Indonesia, as well as other nations in the world today is about the rampant drug abuse and harmful drugs (drugs), which is increasingly worrying. Today, millions of people have fallen into the black valley drug, thousands of lives have been cut because of drugs, has many families are destroyed thereby and not a few young people who have lost the future due to the impact of drugs. We know that the main proponent of the establishment of the foundation of this nation started from the family, when the family was destroyed, too fragile nation building in this country ([Dirjosisworo, 1990](#); [Saoutra & Santoso, 2019](#)). The increasing drug abuse in Indonesia, making the government continues to pursue action against the syndicates and traffickers by giving severe punishment, even the death penalty. As for the victims' users or addicts, the government has sought to reduce the detrimental effects of drug use, namely by providing rehabilitation facilities, both medically and socially ([Simanungkalit, 2012](#)).

In Law No. 35 Year 2009 Article 114 paragraph (2) which reads "In terms of action offering for sale, selling, buying, be an intermediary in the sale and purchase, exchange, deliver or receive the drug group 1 (one) as referred to in paragraph (1) which is in the form of plants weighing more than 1 (one) kilogram or exceeding 5 (five) trunk or in the form of non-plant weighs five (5) grams, the offender shall be punished by death, life imprisonment or imprisonment of at least 6 (six) years and a maximum of

20 (twenty) years and fined a maximum as referred to in paragraph (1) 1/3 (one third), "meaning a drug dealer can be sentenced to the death penalty for his actions in court ([Narcotics Law, 2009](#)).

The death penalty is part of the types of criminal applicable under Indonesian criminal law positive. This is a form of criminal punishment carried out by depriving the soul of someone who violates the provisions of the law. Criminal punishment is also the oldest and most controversial of the various forms of other crimes. The aim of enforcement and implementation of the death penalty so that people notice that the government does not want any interruption to peace is greatly feared by society ([Djamali, 2005](#); [Kurniawan, 2020](#)).

Seen from a criminal aspect, it is clear that drug dealers are a crime which will result in the law as stated in Article 114 paragraph 1 and 2 of Law No. 35 of 2009 on Narcotics. From the aspect of human rights, drug dealers can be said to have damaged the younger generation because of the drug's human rights would be deprived of the younger generation. If there is no one type of drug that have a positive impact on the wearer other than for medical purposes under a doctor's supervision ([Kolopita, 2013](#); [Rifai, 2017](#)).

The death penalty is a form of punishment since hundreds of years ago has reaped the pros and cons both among lawyers and the public. By leaning the death penalty by reason logically and rationally. Pros and cons are not only happening in Indonesia, but in nearly all countries that exist now.

Human rights groups, for example, they protested the executions that are considered contrary to human rights. Hence, they demanded the Indonesian government to abolish the death penalty in Indonesia. A protest votes not only come from within the country, Indonesia, but also from neighbouring countries whose citizens exposed to the death penalty as Australia. Even the Kangaroo country threatened to prohibit its citizens to go to Indonesia if Indonesia continues to apply the death penalty. Diverse attitudes towards the death penalty happened a long time and in

several countries. In Indonesia, for example, the death penalty is legally still recognized and applied despite fluctuating intensity.

Similarly, the implementation of the death penalty in Indonesia is still applied. In the period of last 10 years, not less than 24 people have been sentenced to death for offenses vary. In addition to Indonesia, there are also some countries that still apply the death penalty, such as Iran, China, Saudi Arabia, and the United States. Overall, the attitude of countries against the death penalty are as follows: (a) 68 countries still applying the death penalty, including Indonesia; (B) 88 countries have abolished the death penalty for all categories of crimes; (C) 1 state have abolished the death penalty for ordinary crimes and devoted to specific crimes (exceptional); (D) 30 countries did not implement a moratorium on the death penalty and the United States. Overall, the attitude of countries against the death penalty are as follows: (a) 68 countries still applying the death penalty, including Indonesia; (B) 88 countries have abolished the death penalty for all categories of crimes; (C) 1 state have abolished the death penalty for ordinary crimes and devoted to specific crimes (exceptional); (D) 30 countries did not implement a moratorium on the death penalty and the United States. Overall, the attitude of countries against the death penalty are as follows: (a) 68 countries still applying the death penalty, including Indonesia; (B) 88 countries have abolished the death penalty for all categories of crimes; (C) 1 state have abolished the death penalty for ordinary crimes and devoted to specific crimes (exceptional); (D) 30 countries did not implement a moratorium on the death penalty (Lubis, 2012; Purba, Tanjung, Pramono, & Purwanto, 2020).

In addition, this group also argued that international law, in this case Universal Declaration of Human Rights prohibits the death penalty. Clearly, in article 3 of the Universal Declaration explained that "*everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person*". Therefore, every person is guaranteed the right to life, then it means that one should not take the life of another person (Siswanto, 2009). Based on the arguments put forward by each of the groups both pro and cons, hence the reason they can be

identified into three (3) types, namely formal juridical reasons, reasons of Human Rights, and the reasons of justice. The identification of this paper reviews the issue of the death penalty in terms of reasons of each party, particularly in terms of the theory of sociology of law. In detail, the issue focused on public dissent in response to the execution of the death penalty for drug crime and efforts to formulate an effective criminal penalty for drug crimes in Indonesia. In this context, it chooses the sociological theory of law in scrutinizing the legal issues are also strengthened by the fact that the law is not so orderly, logical, and rational (Fadjar, 2014; Nopriandi & Ardiansyah, 2020).

Drug dealers is the main enemy in the fight against narcotics in Indonesia, because of these drug dealers is very easy to get a way to make transactions in secret. Imposition of the death penalty against perpetrators of drug dealers is not without reason. These sanctions have been through some careful consideration. Because of drugs among people especially the young generation, drug abuse is increasing. The rise of these deviations can have an impact hazard to the survival of the nation in the future.

In Article 1, item 6 of Law No. 39 of 1999, is "*any act of a person or group of people including state officials both intentional and unintentional, or omission which unlawfully diminish, impede, restrict, or deprive human rights of a person or group of people is guaranteed by the law and do not get or worry about not getting a fair legal settlement and correct, based mechanism applicable law*" (Human Rights Law, 1999). In the application of the death penalty for drug traffickers legally have complied with the procedures as set out in the legislation in question, namely Law No. 35 of 2009 on Narcotics. When viewed from the human rights violations committed by drug dealers have a wide impact, many drug addicts are healed but recurred.

Therefore, the death penalty for the perpetrators of drug dealers is one sentence which is still applied in Indonesia in addition to some sort of punishment. Some previous studies emphasized that the application of death penalty was violated a fundamental human right (rights to life) (Sina, 2016; Butt, 2014; Kramer & Stoicescu, 2021; Primadianti & Suhro,

2018). Although controversial, the death penalty in this country is not a punishment that is prohibited. Therefore, the attitude and actions of Indonesian people who choose to apply the death penalty for drug criminals can be justified, even in other countries the death penalty has been abolished or eliminated (Husein, 2003).

In this case the sanction of capital punishment in Law No. 35 of 2009 on narcotic crime, it is very quiet clear that the death penalty is the end of the road because in the application sanction of capital punishment is very frightening for anyone, with the aim of giving the deterrent effect on potential offenders in order to improve themselves if they do not want to suffer the same fate at the other death row inmates.

The method used in this study is a qualitative and quantitative approach. Qualitative research is a process that emphasizes analysis of inductive thinking process related to the dynamics of the relationship between the observed phenomena, and always use scientific logic. Qualitative research does not mean without using the support of the quantitative data, but more emphasis on the depth of the formal thinking of researchers in answering the problems faced (Gunawan, 2013). Quantitative research began with the activities exploring issues that will be the centre of attention of researchers. Then the researchers define and formulate the research problem clearly and so easily understood. After the research problem is formulated, then designed the study design is the design of the research model. Design is what will guide the implementation of the overall study from the beginning to the end of the study (Bungin, 2005).

II. THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DEATH PENALTY IN INDONESIA

The death penalty in Indonesia has long been underway, i.e., since the Dutch colonized the Indonesian nation, up until now is still applied even

though in the Netherlands has abolished capital punishment began in 1987. The Criminal Code (*Wetboek van Strafrecht*) was enacted on January 1, 1981. According to the expert's criminal at the time, the retention of the death penalty because of the special circumstances in Indonesia criminals' greatest demands that can be combated with the death penalty. With such a vast territory with a population of heterogeneous, appliance State Police could not guarantee security. Actions or criminal offenses punishable by death by the Criminal Code, including Article 104, Article 111 paragraph (2), Article 124 paragraph (3), Article 140 paragraph (3), Article 340, Article 365 paragraph (4), Article 368, Article 444 of the Criminal Code, Article 479 K of paragraph (2) and Article 479 o paragraph (2). In addition, the death penalty in Indonesia are also described in the legislation outside the Criminal Code, namely: a) Act No. 5 of 1997 on Psychotropic Article 59 paragraph (2); b) Article 36 of Law No. 26 of 2000 on Human Rights Court; c) Article 2 (2) of Law No. 20 of 2001 on Amendments to the Law No. 31 Year 1999 on Eradication of corruption; d) Article 6 of Law No. 15 of 2003 on Stipulation of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 1 of 2002 on the Eradication of Terrorism (Bangun, 2014).

In Indonesia, the imposition of the death penalty based on court decisions, never dropped in some cases, among others: (1) The murder plan in South Sumatra in 1992 on behalf of the convicted person Suryadi Swabhuana alias Adi Mustache aka Dodi bin Sukarno, (2) Murder and mutilation in South Sumatra 1997 on behalf of the convicted person Jurit bin Abdullah, (3) Murder and mutilation in South Sumatra in 1997 on behalf of Ibrahim bin Ujang, (4) The smuggling 100 grams of heroin on behalf Adami Wilson aka Adam alias Abu arrested in 2003 was executed March 14, 2014, (5) Brings 1050 grams of heroin on behalf of the convict Muhammad Abdul Hafeez was arrested in 2001 executed 17 November 2013), (6) Murder accompanied by sodomizing the children on behalf of the convicted person Baekuni disconnected on April 21, 2011,(7) The murder plan 11 by mutilation on behalf of the convicted person Verry Idham Henyansyah which terminated on July 5, 2012, (8) The killing of a

sadist and rapist on behalf of the convicted person Hennis Marbun who was sentenced on January 8, 2014, (9) The murder of his wife and 2 the children on behalf of convicted Herman Friday Masan who convicted on February 11, 2014, (10) the killing of planning and severe persecution on behalf of the convicted person Slamet Riyanto sentenced on September 17, 2014, (11) Theft with violence resulting in the loss of the lives of others at August 5, 2013 on behalf of the convict Henry(9) The murder of his wife and 2 children on behalf of convicted Herman Friday Masan who divonnis on February 11, 2014, (10) The killing of planning and severe persecution on behalf of the convicted person Slamet Riyanto sentenced on September 17, 2014, (11) Theft with violence which resulted in the loss of the lives of others on August 5, 2013 on behalf of the convict Henry(9) The murder of his wife and 2 children on behalf of convicted Herman Friday Masan who divonnis on February 11, 2014, (10) The killing of planning and severe persecution on behalf of the convicted person Slamet Riyanto sentenced on September 17, 2014, (11) Theft with violence which resulted in the loss of the lives of others on August 5, 2013 on behalf of the convict Henry ([Anjari, 2015](#)).

III. PROS CONS DEAD CRIMINAL EXECUTION FOR CRIMINAL DRUG DEALERS

Although the death penalty is still ongoing and has not been abolished in Indonesia, people differ in responding as the number of countries that abolished the death penalty. On the one hand, there are groups of people expressed support that the death penalty is still needed in Indonesia moreover legally still recognized. Meanwhile, on the other hand there are groups of people who want the death penalty abolished. They argue that the provisions which apply the death penalty in Indonesia is not in accordance with the basic principles of the fundamentals of this country, namely 1945.

Differences of opinion about the death penalty also occurs in the members of the National Commission on Human Rights (KOMNASHAM). Their attitude towards the death penalty is also divided into two, there are pros and there is cons. The death penalty in Indonesia should be maintained or abolished. For the pros, the heaviest sentence handed down by the judges convict still required especially cruel criminal act. For cons, the death penalty was considered unconstitutional or in conflict with the Constitution or the 1945 Constitution, particularly the right to life for every citizen. For those who disagree, arguing that unconstitutional true whether or not the death penalty has been missed in the Constitutional Court ruling on the petition materially Act No. 22 of 1997 on Narcotics of the Constitution of 1945. The judicial review filed by the four (4) cases of death row inmates' narcotics through its legal counsel regarding the unconstitutionality of the death penalty contained in the Act No. 22 of 1997 on narcotics. Based on the decision of the Constitutional Court, expressly stated that the sentence of death in Act No. 22 of 1997 on Narcotics is not contrary to the Constitution. Thus, it can be concluded that, by analogy, the death penalty is not an act unconstitutional (Bangun, 2014).

Then, for those who do not agree, consider the policy of the death penalty for drug traffickers apart contrary to the values of Pancasila, is also contrary to the views of experts who uphold human rights in the hierarchy is formed based on the Constitution article 28 A 1945, which means that the need for legal relationship behind between the death penalty and the Pancasila and whether the legal consciousness of the Indonesian people still can allow or retain capital punishment. Penalty death penalty for drug traffickers less allowed for several reasons which include the improvement of the judge's decision that refers to the philosophy of Pancasila that the death penalty is contrary to humanity because the human right to life cannot be reduced under any circumstances (Sahetapy, 2015).

Law death penalty for drug dealers is closely associated with the purpose of justice. This criminal system was made based on the values of justice. The death penalty still represents a sense of justice that is

demanded by the public. As a democratic country, the applicable law should be able to reflect and represent the sense of justice that live in the community. Therefore, Indonesia believes that the death penalty law is still a part of the Indonesian criminal law for the Indonesian people still want the death penalty. Especially for acts violating the law levels the already heavy as narcotics trafficking. Thus, the death penalty is very suitable to be applied.

Currently concrete actions (effort repressive) the right is indeed streamline the existing criminal sanctions, in particular for drug dealers who are undergoing criminal process. If it is already intolerable crimes, the death penalty is indeed worthy to be downed. In Law No. 35 Year 2009 on Narcotics himself had arranged the death penalty sanctions in particular on Article 113 (1), 114 (1), 118 (1), 119 (1), 121 (1), 144 (1) ([Woro & Lukito, 2010](#)).

In addition to very concrete repressive measures and has been described above, government, law enforcement, and other interested parties such as BNN also ceaselessly perform preventive efforts among the public, especially those younger generations both in educational institutions as well as domestic agencies / private. The preventive efforts to create communities that are aware of the dangers of drug abuse and impact. preventive measures. This can be done through educational efforts as a form of prevention aspect. This extension is intended to those who have never consumed drugs in order not to consume narcotics. So BNN expects that no immunity from the public so that they know the dangers of narcotic medical, social, and legal basis for them. However, counseling is sometimes still reaping the constraints on the practice field. Such constraints due to very low understanding of the public about the dangers of drugs and sometimes people do not care about the environment, so that if in the environment are known to exist that use of narcotics does not want to report to the authorities. Conditions like this will foster illicit trafficking. And may be said rare reports from people who inform their drug trafficking activities in the environment. After the approach of why people

do not report it turns out there is an element of fear in it, people are scared when reporting they could become targets of a syndicate that (Afriastini, 2013).

In an emergency like this, when narcotics have damaged the young generation and depriving many human lives in Indonesia, it is fair that the death penalty is also applied to give a strong warning for drug crimes. The death penalty is only imposed on the shape of the vilest of drug crimes such as producing and drug dealers. But in its application does not run as expected, the number of offenders in particular the producers, the city and the dealer gets leniency as clemency, which relieve the judicial decision (Arief, 2011; Wahyudi, 2012; Arief, 2019).

One criminal law expert and prominent national criminal law reforms that Barda Nawawi Arief stated that the death penalty still need to be maintained in the context of the renewal of the National Penal Code. He argued that although the death penalty is maintained based primarily on an effort to protect the public (to be more focused or oriented in the public interest), but in its application is expected to be selective, cautious and well-oriented on the protection / interests of the individual (criminal) (Arief, 2011; Sumanto, 2017; Hapsari, 2019).

However, when viewed from the interests of the nation, a drug dealer has claimed millions of human rights, especially the younger generation which is the successor generation of the nation. Especially when viewed from the human rights violations committed by drug dealers have a wide impact, many drug addicts are healed but recurred. If you are addicted and do not have the money to encourage the addict to do evil, but it is for those students who become addicted resulting decline drastically consequently the spirit of learning lessons at school is undermined. Eventually become a generation that was broken and useless. If the situation continues like this, then this nation will fall apart and will eventually collapse because there is no future generation can be expected.

So, it is fair to impose the death penalty is applied for criminal suspects were drug dealers, because for their actions this nation was

destroyed because the younger generation which is expected to become the nation's next generation is now even become damaged both from outside and inside.

IV. CONCLUSION

Death penalty or capital punishment is carried by seizing the soul of a person who violates the provisions of the law. The death penalty has been in effect since hundreds of years ago and always reap the pros and cons among legal experts and communities in Indonesia and other countries. The aim of enforcement and implementation of the death penalty so that people notice that the government does not want a disturbance of peace that is feared by the public.

The imposition of the death penalty in essence the state took its people contrary to the right to life of Human Rights. However, their application can be justified along with the reasons for human rights of other citizens and legally positive state regulation on the trend towards the reduction and ultimately the abolition altogether. The application of the death penalty can only be carried out on criminal acts which exceed the limits of humanity, threatening the lives of many people, ruined the livelihood and human civilization, and damage the country's economy. The offenses can be sentenced to death include murder, terrorism, drugs for traffickers and airports, and corruption. In Act No. 35 of 2009 Article 114 paragraph (2) of the Narcotics explained that drug dealers' offenders could be sentenced to the death penalty. Imposition of the death penalty against drug dealers is unfair when compared with their deeds that constitute one of the felonies that could be fatal for the survival of the nation of Indonesia which is damaging the future generation.

On the other hand, the people of Indonesia require the application of the death penalty for the perpetrators of drug dealers. That's because the law must represent a sense of justice that is demanded by the public. Moreover, the death penalty law is still a part of the Indonesian criminal

law because people still want the death penalty. Thus, in view of the human rights perspective, attitude, and actions of the Indonesian government to continue to apply the death penalty for the perpetrators of drug dealers can be justified.

V. REFERENCES

- Afriastini, Y. W. (2013). Upaya Badan Narkotika Nasional Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta Dalam Penanggulangan Peredaran Gelap Narkotika Di Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 1-16.
- Anjari, W. (2018). Penjatuhan Pidana Mati di Indonesia dalam Perspektif Hak Asasi Manusia. *E-Journal Widya Yustisia*, 1(2), 107-115.
- Arief, A. (2019). Problematika Penjatuhan Hukuman Pidana Mati Dalam Perspektif Hak Asasi Manusia dan Hukum Pidana. *Kosmik Hukum*, 19(1).
- Arief, B. N. (2011). *Bunga Rampai Kebijakan Hukum Pidana*. Bandung: PT. Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Bangun, N. S. (2014). *Eksistensi Pidana Mati dalam Sistem Hukum Indonesia*, Paper, unpublished work.
- Bungin, B. M. (2005). *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Butt, S. (2014). Asia-pacific: Judicial responses to the death penalty in Indonesia. *Alternative Law Journal*, 39(2), 134-135.
- Dirjosisworo, S. (1990). *Hukum Narkotika Indonesia*. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bhakti.
- Djamali, R. A. (2005). *Pengantar Hukum Indonesia*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Fadjar, A. M. (2014). *Teori-Teori Hukum Kontemporer*. Malang: Setara Press.
- Gunawan, I. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Teori dan Praktik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Hapsari, I. P. (2019). Efektivitas Penerapan Pidana Mati Terhadap Tindak Pidana Narkotika di Indonesia. *Jurnal Justiciabelen*, 1(2), 241-251.
- Husein, S. (2003). *Pidana Mati Menurut Pidana Indonesia*. Sumatra Utara: Tiara Press.

- Kolopita, S. (2013). Penegakan Hukum Atas Pidana Mati Terhadap Pelaku Tindak Pidana Narkotika. *Lex Crimen*, 2(4).
- Kramer, E., & Stoicescu, C. (2021). An uphill battle: a case example of government policy and activist dissent on the death penalty for drug-related offences in Indonesia. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 103265.
- Kurniawan, S. D. (2020). The Capital Punishment for Narcotic Crime: Pros and Cons in Indonesian Legal System. *The Indonesian Journal of International Clinical Legal Education*, 2(4), 393-406.
- Law No. 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics (Narcotics Law).
- Law No. 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights (Human Rights Law)
- Lubis, E. I. (2012). Perkembangan Isu Hukuman Mati di Indonesia. *Jurnal Opinio Juris*, 3(1).
- Marzuki, P. M. (2011). *Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Nopriandi, T., & Ardhiansyah, R. F. (2020). Paradigm of Death Penalty (Comparative Study in Indonesia, Saudi Arabia and China). *Lampung Journal of International Law*, 2(1), 57-68.
- Primadianti, H., & Zuhro, F. (2018). A Gap Between Right to Live Protection and Death Penalty in Indonesia (Judges Decision on Cases Threatened Death Penalty). In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 54, p. 02005). EDP Sciences.
- Purba, N., Tanjung, A. M., Pramono, R., & Purwanto, A. (2020). Death Penalty and Human Rights in Indonesia. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 9, 1356-1362.
- Rifai, E. (2017). An Analysis of the Death Penalty in Indonesia Criminal Law. *Sriwijaya Law Review*, 1(2), 190-199.
- Sahetapy, J. E. (2015). *Pisau Analisis Kriminologis*. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Saputra, A., & Santoso, F. J. (2019). Death Penalty, Right to Life, and Various Controversies in Human Rights. *Unnes Law Journal: Jurnal Hukum Universitas Negeri Semarang*, 5(1).

- Simanungkalit, P. (2012). Model Pemidanaan yang ideal bagi korban pengguna narkoba di Indonesia. *Yustisia Jurnal Hukum*, 1(3).
- Sina, L. (2016). Implementation of the Death Penalty in the Perspective of Human Rights in Indonesia. *Hasanuddin Law Review*, 2(3), 385-397.
- Siswanto, A. (2009). Pidana Mati dalam Perspektif Hukum Internasional. *Refleksi Hukum*, 13(1).
- Sumanto, A. (2017). Efektifitas Pidana Mati Dalam Proses Penegakan Hukum Tindak Pidana Narkotika. *Perspektif: Kajian Masalah Hukum dan Pembangunan*, 22(1), 21-31.
- Wahyudi, S. T. (2012). Problematika Penerapan Pidana Mati Dalam Konteks Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 1(2), 207-234.
- Winandi, W., & Lukito, I. R. (2010). Penjatuhan Pidana Mati dalam Tindak Pidana Narkotika. *Jurnal Hukum*, 19(19), 49-62.

Conflicting Interest Statement


All authors declared that there is no potential conflict of interest on publishing this article.

Funding

None

Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement

All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.



The death penalty is not about whether people deserve to die for the crimes they commit. The real question of capital punishment in this country is, Do we deserve to kill?

Bryan Stevenson

Just Mercy: A Story of Justice and Redemption