

Social Engineering and Policy Innovation in the Rehabilitation of Drug Addicts: Legislative Insights from the Restorative Justice Model in Indonesia

Siti Ngaisah¹, Wredha Danang Widoyoko², Ismail³, Diah Ayu Rahmawati⁴, Haryono⁵

¹ Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya and ngaisah@ubhara.ac.id

² Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya and danangfh@ubhara.ac.id

³ Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya and ismail@ubhara.ac.id

⁴ Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya and diahayu@ubhara.ac.id

⁵ Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya and haryono@ubhara.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study examines the integration of social engineering and policy innovation within Indonesia's legislative framework for drug rehabilitation, focusing on restorative justice principles. Through a juridical analysis of Law No. 35 of 2009 on Narcotics and related policies, the research highlights the shift from punitive measures to rehabilitation-focused approaches. Findings reveal that while legislative provisions align with restorative justice ideals, significant gaps in implementation—such as inadequate rehabilitation infrastructure, social stigma, and weak stakeholder coordination—hinder their effectiveness. Drawing insights from international best practices, the study proposes actionable reforms, including enhanced judicial guidelines, public awareness campaigns, and integrated policy frameworks, to promote a comprehensive and sustainable approach to drug rehabilitation in Indonesia. This research underscores the potential of restorative justice as a transformative tool for addressing drug addiction as a public health and social issue.

Keywords: Social Engineering, Policy Innovation, Restorative Justice, Drug Rehabilitation, Indonesia Legislation

1. INTRODUCTION

Drug addiction is a pervasive social issue that poses significant challenges to public health, societal stability, and economic development. In Indonesia, the drug crisis has reached alarming proportions, affecting individuals across all socioeconomic strata and fueling a cycle of crime, incarceration, and recidivism [1], [2]. Despite stringent anti-drug laws and punitive measures, the prevalence of drug abuse and addiction continues to rise, indicating a critical need for alternative approaches that address the root causes and broader implications of substance abuse [3]–[5].

The traditional punitive approach to drug offenses, heavily reliant on incarceration, has been increasingly criticized for its inability to rehabilitate offenders or reduce recidivism rates [6], [7]. This approach often exacerbates the problem by stigmatizing individuals and alienating them from societal reintegration [8]. In response, there has been a growing global shift toward restorative justice models that prioritize rehabilitation, reintegration, and the active involvement of communities in addressing the underlying causes of drug addiction [6], [9].

Restorative justice offers a paradigm shift by focusing on repairing harm, fostering accountability, and reintegrating individuals into society [10], [11]. This model aligns with social engineering principles, which advocate for systemic change through innovative policies and strategies designed to reshape societal attitudes and behaviors [8], [12]. In the context of drug rehabilitation, social engineering involves creating supportive ecosystems that integrate legal, social, and health-based interventions to enable sustainable recovery and reintegration [10], [12], [13]

In Indonesia, legislative frameworks have begun incorporating restorative justice elements into drug policies. Laws such as Law No. 35 of 2009 on Narcotics emphasize the dual objectives of prevention and rehabilitation, providing legal avenues for treatment and recovery for drug addicts. However, the implementation of these provisions remains inconsistent, hindered by a lack of coordination among stakeholders, inadequate resources, and persistent stigmatization of drug users.

Indonesia faces an escalating drug addiction crisis that not only undermines public health and social stability but also perpetuates a cycle of crime and incarceration. Despite the existence of Law No. 35 of 2009 on Narcotics, which incorporates rehabilitative measures aligned with restorative justice principles, the prevalence of drug abuse continues to rise. This persistent increase highlights the inefficiency of punitive measures and underscores the urgent need for systemic reforms [8], [9], [14]. Gaps in rehabilitation infrastructure, coupled with societal stigma and weak stakeholder coordination, severely limit the effectiveness of existing policies, leaving millions without access to meaningful recovery options.

The current legislative framework in Indonesia reflects an intent to prioritize rehabilitation over punitive actions in addressing drug addiction. However, the implementation of these vital justice principles is marred by significant challenges, including insufficient rehabilitation facilities, inconsistent judicial application, and inadequate coordination among key stakeholders. Social stigma further compounds the issue by marginalizing individuals in recovery, hindering their reintegration into society. Without addressing these systemic deficiencies, Indonesia risks perpetuating a reactive rather than proactive approach to drug addiction, failing to reduce recidivism and improve public health outcomes.

This paper examines the intersection of social engineering, policy innovation, and restorative justice in the rehabilitation of drug addicts in Indonesia. Through a juridical analysis of existing legislation, it evaluates the extent to which current legal frameworks support the principles of restorative justice and identifies gaps and opportunities for reform. The study aims to contribute to the development of a comprehensive, humane, and effective approach to drug addiction that aligns with global best practices and Indonesia's unique socio-cultural context.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 *Social Engineering in Law and Policy*

Social engineering in law refers to the deliberate use of legal frameworks to shape societal behavior and address systemic issues, as Roscoe Pound articulated law as a tool for social control and societal progress [15], [16]. In the context of drug addiction, social engineering seeks to shift the focus from punishment to rehabilitation, fostering societal change through innovative legal and policy mechanisms. Research demonstrates that social engineering approaches can effectively address complex social problems, including drug addiction, by promoting behavioral change, reducing stigma, and encouraging community involvement [17], [18]. These approaches often emphasize preventive measures, public education, and the creation of supportive legal environments that facilitate recovery and reintegration [15], [17], [19].

2.2 *Policy Innovation in Drug Rehabilitation*

Policy innovation involves developing and implementing novel solutions to address pressing social issues, including the creation of legal and institutional frameworks that

integrate health, social, and legal interventions in drug rehabilitation [20], [21]. Global examples, such as Portugal's decriminalization of drug use and investment in rehabilitation services, highlight the transformative potential of innovative drug policies [22]. Studies indicate that policy innovations often encompass diversion programs, alternative sentencing, and integrated care models, aligning with restorative justice principles by prioritizing treatment and reintegration over incarceration [23], [24]. However, the successful implementation of these approaches necessitates strong political will, effective inter-agency coordination, and sufficient resources.

2.3 Restorative Justice and Its Principles

Restorative justice is a legal and social approach that seeks to repair harm, rebuild relationships, and reintegrate offenders into society by emphasizing accountability, and reconciliation, and addressing the needs of all parties involved, including victims, offenders, and communities, rather than focusing solely on punishment [12]. In the context of drug addiction, restorative justice provides a framework for addressing the root causes of substance abuse while fostering rehabilitation and social reintegration. Research [8], [25], [26] highlights its effectiveness in reducing recidivism and promoting long-term recovery through key principles such as accountability, which encourages offenders to take responsibility for their actions and the harm caused; community involvement, which engages families, communities, and support networks in the rehabilitation process; and holistic solutions, which integrate legal, social, and health-based interventions to address the multifaceted nature of addiction.

2.4 Drug Addiction and Rehabilitation in Indonesia

Indonesia faces a significant drug addiction problem, affecting millions and imposing substantial societal costs. Historically, the government has relied on punitive measures focused on strict enforcement and incarceration, but recent legislative developments signal a growing recognition of the need for rehabilitative approaches [8], [27]. Law No. 35 of 2009 on Narcotics establishes a legal basis for rehabilitation as an alternative to imprisonment, acknowledging addiction as a medical condition requiring treatment in alignment with restorative justice principles. However, implementation remains inconsistent, as many addicts continue to face punitive measures due to resource constraints, societal stigma, and inadequate coordination among stakeholders [9], [14], [28].

2.5 Challenges and Gaps in Existing Literature

While restorative justice and social engineering have been widely studied, their application in drug rehabilitation, particularly in Indonesia, remains underexplored. Existing studies often focus on global examples or general principles, with limited attention to the unique socio-legal context of Indonesia. Moreover, gaps in implementation, such as the lack of resources and societal stigmatization, require further investigation to develop effective policy solutions.

This study integrates the concepts of social engineering, policy innovation, and restorative justice to analyze Indonesia's legislative framework for drug rehabilitation. It builds on existing research to evaluate the effectiveness of current policies and propose innovative solutions that align with Indonesia's cultural and legal context.

3. METHODS

3.1 Research Approach

The study adopts a qualitative approach to explore the nuanced relationship between legal frameworks and restorative justice principles. By focusing on Indonesia's legal and policy provisions related to drug addiction rehabilitation, this research aims to identify gaps, challenges, and opportunities for legislative reform. The juridical analysis involves interpreting existing laws, regulations, and policies to assess their alignment with restorative justice principles.

3.2 Data Collection

Data collection for this study primarily relies on secondary sources, including legislation and policy documents such as Law No. 35 of 2009 on Narcotics, relevant government regulations, ministerial decrees, and court rulings. Academic literature, including peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and conference proceedings on social engineering, policy innovation, and restorative justice, also forms a critical component. Additionally, reports and statistics from government agencies like the National Narcotics Agency (BNN) and the Ministry of Health, as well as international organizations such as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the World Health Organization (WHO), provide valuable insights. Comparative case studies further enrich the analysis by examining policies and practices from other countries, such as Portugal and Switzerland, that have successfully employed restorative justice in drug rehabilitation.

3.3 Data Analysis

The collected data are analyzed using several methods, starting with juridical analysis, which examines the text, intent, and implementation of relevant laws to evaluate their effectiveness in supporting restorative justice while assessing the legal consistency, adequacy, and enforceability of current policies. Content analysis is employed to identify recurring themes, principles, and gaps in legislative and policy documents, categorizing data based on key concepts such as rehabilitation, accountability, and community involvement. Comparative analysis is conducted to evaluate Indonesia's legislative framework against international best practices in restorative justice and drug rehabilitation, drawing lessons from countries that have successfully implemented such approaches. Finally, gap analysis identifies discrepancies between legislative intent and practical implementation, highlighting barriers such as resource constraints, stigmatization, and lack of inter-agency coordination.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Legal Framework for Drug Rehabilitation in Indonesia

The cornerstone of Indonesia's legal framework for drug rehabilitation is Law No. 35/2009 on Narcotics, which recognizes drug addiction as a medical condition requiring treatment and rehabilitation. Key provisions include Article 54, which mandates rehabilitation for individuals identified as drug addicts or victims of drug abuse; Article 55, which encourages families or communities to report drug addicts for treatment without risk of criminal prosecution; and Article 103, which allows judges to order rehabilitation instead of imprisonment for drug addicts and abusers. While these provisions reflect a legislative shift towards restorative justice, implementation remains inconsistent, with rehabilitation often not prioritized in favour of punitive measures due to resource constraints and existing societal stigma.

In addition, some studies have also criticized this, Article 54 of the law requires rehabilitation for drug addicts, while Article 55 encourages reporting by the public without criminal sanctions [9]. In addition, Article 103 gives judges discretion to choose rehabilitation over imprisonment, reflecting a shift towards restorative justice [29]. However, the application of this policy is often inconsistent, with rehabilitation rarely prioritized and many addicts remain

imprisoned [30]. In addition, the limitations of adequate rehabilitation facilities and the lack of trained professionals are major obstacles in running effective rehabilitation programs [31]. Social factors such as stigmatization of drug addicts also exacerbate recidivism, as former prisoners experience difficulties in the process of reintegrating into society [31].

4.2 Restorative Justice in Drug Policy

Indonesia's legislative provisions incorporate several restorative justice principles, such as prioritizing rehabilitation over retribution by offering rehabilitation as an alternative to imprisonment, thereby emphasizing recovery and reintegration. In addition, the encouragement of family and community involvement in supporting rehabilitation reflects the collaborative nature of restorative justice, fostering a supportive environment for individuals undergoing treatment and reintegration into society.

However, there are still significant gaps in realizing the full potential of restorative justice in Indonesia. Despite existing legal provisions, many drug offenders remain imprisoned due to limited access to rehabilitation facilities. Social stigma against people who use drugs further undermines efforts to reintegrate them into society, creating barriers to acceptance and support. In addition, resource limitations, including insufficient funding, lack of trained personnel, and inadequate infrastructure, hamper the expansion and effectiveness of rehabilitation programs, limiting their reach and impact.

4.3 Challenges in Implementing Restorative Justice

Several challenges impede the effective implementation of restorative justice in Indonesia's drug rehabilitation framework. One of the main issues is judicial discretion, where judges often lack clear guidelines for ordering rehabilitation, resulting in inconsistent application of restorative justice principles. In some cases, offenders are not given access to rehabilitation due to bias or lack of awareness among law enforcement officials. In addition, inadequate rehabilitation infrastructure is also a significant barrier, with rehabilitation centers being limited in number, unevenly distributed, and often lacking the resources to provide comprehensive medical, psychological, and vocational support. This makes it difficult for individuals in remote or underserved areas to access necessary treatment.

Another important challenge is poor coordination among stakeholders, including law enforcement, health authorities, and rehabilitation centers, which undermines the effectiveness of rehabilitation efforts. Overlapping institutional responsibilities also lead to inefficiencies and delays in policy implementation. In addition, policy gaps persist as existing regulations do not adequately address post-rehabilitation and reintegration services, leaving rehabilitated individuals vulnerable to relapse. The absence of a robust mechanism to monitor and evaluate the outcomes of rehabilitation programs exacerbates this problem, highlighting the need for a more cohesive and comprehensive approach.

The findings of this study are in line with some of the views of previous research. Judicial discretion often lacks clear guidelines, resulting in inconsistent application of restorative justice principles, while bias and lack of awareness among law enforcement can prevent offenders' access to rehabilitation services [14]. In addition, inadequate rehabilitation infrastructure, such as limited resources for medical, psychological, and vocational support, especially in remote areas, as well as uneven distribution of facilities, exacerbates accessibility (Pulungan et al., 2024; Muslim et al., 2024). Coordination between stakeholders is also an issue, with ineffective collaboration between law enforcement, health authorities, and rehabilitation centers, coupled with overlapping responsibilities between agencies, reducing the efficiency and effectiveness of rehabilitation programs [9], [31]. Furthermore, policy gaps, such as the lack of adequate regulations for post-rehabilitation services, increase the risk of relapse, while the absence of robust monitoring mechanisms to assess rehabilitation outcomes further exacerbates the situation [11], [31].

4.4 Comparative Analysis with International Practices

Successful models from other countries, such as Portugal and Switzerland, provide valuable lessons for Indonesia in addressing drug addiction through restorative justice principles. Portugal's decriminalization model offers a progressive approach by decriminalizing private drug use and directing offenders to rehabilitation instead of imprisonment. This strategy is supported by an integrated treatment system that provides comprehensive medical, psychological, and social support, resulting in significant reductions in drug harms and recidivism. By treating addiction as a health rather than a criminal issue, Portugal has demonstrated effectiveness in combining legal reform with a strong healthcare framework.

Switzerland's harm reduction approach also emphasizes health and social reintegration through a combination of harm reduction policies and strong rehabilitation services. Community-based programs in Switzerland play an important role in fostering collaboration between stakeholders, reducing stigma, and ensuring sustainable recovery for individuals. These international examples highlight strategies that Indonesia can adopt, such as decriminalization of drug use for personal consumption, increased investment in integrated treatment systems, and the development of community-based programs to improve rehabilitation efforts and promote long-term recovery.

4.5 Opportunities for Policy Innovation

To address the challenges and gaps identified in Indonesia's drug rehabilitation framework, several policy innovations are recommended. Standard guidelines for court decision-making should be developed to ensure consistency and fairness, accompanied by a training program for judicial authorities on restorative justice principles and their application. Expanding rehabilitation facilities through increased investment, especially in underserved areas, and partnerships with private and non-governmental organizations can improve service availability and quality. Comprehensive aftercare and reintegration programs are essential to support rehabilitated individuals in maintaining sobriety and reintegrating into society, with vocational training and employment opportunities playing an important role in reducing the risk of relapse. Public awareness campaigns should be launched to combat stigma and promote understanding of addiction as a medical condition, while encouraging community participation in rehabilitation efforts. Finally, a robust monitoring and evaluation framework should be established to assess program effectiveness, identify areas for improvement, and use a data-driven approach to guide policy decisions and resource allocation.

4.6 Alignment with Social Engineering Principles

The integration of social engineering into drug rehabilitation policy requires a systemic approach to reshaping community attitudes and behaviors. By prioritizing prevention, education and community engagement, Indonesia can create an ecosystem that supports recovery and reintegration. Legislative reforms should focus on removing barriers to rehabilitation and encouraging collaboration among stakeholders.

Discussion

1. Legislative Framework as a Social Engineering Tool

Law No. 35/2009 on Narcotics is an attempt to implement social engineering by recognizing drug addiction as a health problem that requires rehabilitation rather than punishment. Provisions such as court-ordered rehabilitation, family reporting mechanisms, and prioritizing treatment over imprisonment reflect a shift in society's attitude towards addiction. However, the law's potential as a tool for social engineering is undermined by inconsistent implementation and the absence of strong mechanisms to uniformly enforce its provisions [8], [14]. To fully utilize social engineering principles, legislative reforms should improve clarity by providing clear guidelines for judicial and

law enforcement authorities and ensure accessibility so that rehabilitation options are available to all individuals, regardless of socioeconomic status or geographical location.

2. Social Stigma and Public Perception

Social engineering also targets the transformation of public perception to reduce stigma and foster an environment that supports recovery. In Indonesia, stigma remains a significant barrier, as drug addicts are often perceived as criminals and not as individuals in need of medical and psychological intervention. Public awareness campaigns can play an important role in challenging this perception by promoting education about addiction as a treatable condition and encouraging community engagement. Educational campaigns should focus on building an understanding of the medical nature of addiction, while community engagement can build support systems to aid rehabilitation and reintegration [32]–[34].

3. Resource Allocation and Systemic Support

Effective social engineering requires systemic change supported by adequate resources. Currently, rehabilitation infrastructure in Indonesia remains inadequate, with limited facilities, trained professionals, and integrated services. Addressing this gap involves prioritizing resource allocation for infrastructure development, such as expanding rehabilitation centers in underserved areas, and capacity building, which includes professional training in restorative justice practices and addiction treatment. Investments in these areas ensure that the legislative goals behind drug rehabilitation are translated into practical and accessible solutions that address the root causes of addiction [35], [36].

4. Collaboration, Monitoring and Restorative Justice in Social Engineering

Social engineering thrives on collaboration between sectors such as law enforcement, healthcare, education, and community organizations. Successful restorative justice models in other countries, such as Portugal, highlight the importance of coordinated efforts. In Indonesia, collaboration is often hampered by overlapping responsibilities and unclear accountability. Improving collaboration requires an integrated policy framework that facilitates coordination among stakeholders and public-private partnerships to leverage resources and expertise. In addition, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are essential to assess the effectiveness of interventions, identify successful strategies, and adapt policies to emerging challenges. Finally, the principles of restorative justice naturally align with social engineering objectives by emphasizing accountability, community involvement, and rehabilitation. To integrate restorative justice into its legal framework, Indonesia should expand its focus to include community-based aftercare, reintegration and restorative practices, creating a holistic recovery environment for rehabilitated individuals.

CONCLUSION

Indonesia's legislative framework for drug rehabilitation demonstrates an initial alignment with restorative justice principles, offering a progressive alternative to punitive approaches. However, significant barriers, such as inconsistent judicial application, limited infrastructure, social stigma, and inadequate stakeholder collaboration, hinder its effective implementation. Drawing lessons from international models like Portugal's decriminalization and integrated care systems, this study emphasizes the urgency of innovative reforms. Key recommendations include standardizing judicial guidelines for consistent application, expanding rehabilitation infrastructure in underserved areas, developing aftercare programs to support reintegration and prevent relapse, launching public awareness campaigns to reduce stigma and promote addiction as a medical condition, and strengthening stakeholder collaboration through integrated policy frameworks and partnerships. By addressing these challenges, Indonesia can establish a more effective, humane, and sustainable

approach to drug rehabilitation, reinforcing restorative justice as a cornerstone of long-term recovery and social reintegration. This transformation aligns with global best practices while reflecting Indonesia's commitment to fostering a healthier and more inclusive society.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. A. Wijaya and K. A. K. Dewi, "Analysis Of Drug Trends And Problems Through The Program For Prevention, Eradication, Abuse, And Circulation Of Illegal Drugs (P4gn)".
- [2] I. N. Sutarsa, "Policy for Drug Users in Indonesia: A Critical Policy Analysis of Jail Punishment and an Alternate Rehabilitation Policy," *Public Heal. Prev. Med. Arch.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 88–91, 2014.
- [3] W. Dewabharta, A. Ahsan, A. Bella, N. Amalia, D. Kusuma, and Y. B. A. Pertiwi, "Mental Health, Environmental, and Socioeconomic Geographic Factors of Severe Drug Addiction: Analysis of Rehabilitation Center Data in Indonesia," *Subst. Abus. Res. Treat.*, vol. 17, p. 11782218231203688, 2023.
- [4] P. Y. C. B. Berutu *et al.*, "Upaya Berteologi Kontekstual Dalam Memerangi Penyalahgunaan Narkoba," *J. Silih Asah*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 115–130, 2024.
- [5] L. Manurung, "The Impact of Drug Abuse on Families and Society (Literature Review)," *MSJ Major. Sci. J.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 239–244, 2024.
- [6] D. Prayoga, F. Firganefi, and S. Riski, "Penerapan Restorative Justice Terhadap Penyalahguna Narkotika Pada Tingkat Penuntutan Berdasarkan Asesmen Terpadu: Studi Di Kejaksaan Negeri Lampung Selatan," *Birokrasi J. ILMU Huk. DAN TATA NEGARA*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 35–41, 2024.
- [7] A. Hambali, N. Mappaselleng, and S. Wata, "Law Enforcement Against Drug Abusers Through Medical Rehabilitation and Social Rehabilitation," *Int. J. Relig.*, vol. 5, pp. 5226–5240, Aug. 2024, doi: 10.61707/ravxc229.
- [8] M. J. H. Hermawan and C. D. Wulansari, "Sociological Analysis Of Restorative Justice In Rehabilitative Law Enforcement For Drug Abuse Cases," *Ius Poenale*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2024.
- [9] S. Pulungan, E. Soponyono, and S. Purnomo, "Reforming Indonesia's Approach to Narcotics Offenses: A Call for Rehabilitation over Incarceration," *South East. Eur. J. Public Heal.*, pp. 249–253, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.70135/seejph.vi.1473.
- [10] A. Info, "LEGAL REFORM ON THE CONCEPT OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IN THE," vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 264–281, 2024.
- [11] M. Febriana, M. H. Y. Albar, and A. L. Hakim, "The Enigma of Humanistic Justice in Addressing Narcotics Abuse," *Mimb. Keadilan*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 193–209, 2024.
- [12] O. T. Cao and T. Van Vu, "PROPOSING RESTORATIVE JUSTICE MODELS AS ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO ADDRESSING CRIMINAL MATTERS: A CASE STUDY OF JUDICIAL SYSTEMS IN CIVIL AND COMMON LAW COUNTRIES," *DENIAL Aggress. AGAINST Ukr. OR Occup. ITS Territ. A NEW CASE AMONG DENIAL CRIMES*, p. 93, 2024.
- [13] E. Shachaf-Friedman and E. Elisha, "Signifiers of desistance from a positive criminology perspective: The case of responsibility taking in restorative proceedings," *Criminol. Crim. Justice*, p. 17488958241283948, 2024.
- [14] D. Muslim, N. Darwis, and S. Sudarto, "Legal Study Analysis of Criminal Law Policy in the Implementation of Integrated Assessment for Drug Abusers based on Law Number 35 of 2009 Concerning Narcotics," 2024.
- [15] L. M. Solivetti, "Drug diffusion and social change: the illusion about a formal social control," *Howard J. Crim. Justice*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 41–61, 1994.
- [16] V. P. Singh, "An engineering approach to analysis and synthesis of social systems," *J. Int. Comp. Soc. Welf.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 76–89, 1998.
- [17] E. Otieno Owade, "The Law as a Tool Of Social Engineering: A Jurisprudential Perspective From Kenyan Courts," *Available SSRN 4628709*, 2023.
- [18] S. A. Gochhayat, "'Social Engineering by Roscoe Pound': Issues in Legal and Political Philosophy," *Available SSRN 1742165*, 2010.
- [19] A.-M. Kennedy and A. Parsons, "Social engineering and social marketing: why is one 'good' and the other 'bad'?" *J. Soc. Mark.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 198–209, 2014.
- [20] A. Ritter, G. Bammer, M. Hamilton, L. Mazerolle, and T. D. Team, "Effective drug policy: a new approach demonstrated in the Drug Policy Modelling Program," *Drug Alcohol Rev.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 265–271, 2007.
- [21] A. Unlu, T. Tammi, and P. Hakkarainen, "Drug decriminalization policy: literature review: models, implementation and outcomes," 2020.
- [22] K. K. Dineen and E. Pendo, "Ending the war on people with substance use disorders in health care," *Am. J. Bioeth.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 20–22, 2021.
- [23] Z. Aliyeva, "Innovation in healthcare management: drug decriminalization for reducing the health damage from crime," *Mark. i menedžment innovacij*, no. 1, pp. 37–57, 2022.
- [24] C. Moury and M. Escada, "Understanding successful policy innovation: The case of Portuguese drug policy," *Addiction*, vol. 118, no. 5, pp. 967–978, 2023.
- [25] Suardi Suardi, Ramlan Ramlan, Erniyanti Erniyanti, M. Soerya Respationo, and Nicha Suwalla, "Implementation Of Restorative Justice Approach In The Settlement Of Narcotics Crime Cases," *Int. J. Educ. Lang. Lit. Arts, Cult. Soc. Humanit.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 107–120, 2024, doi: 10.59024/ijellacush.v2i3.938.

- [26] I. M. G. Wijaya, I. M. M. Subawa, and N. K. Wiratny, "Restorative Justice Settlement of Fraud Crime Case (A Case Study in The North Kuta Badung Police Sector)," *Int. J. Contemp. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 10, pp. 605–622, 2024.
- [27] J. Sembiring and Y. M. Saragih, "Legal Analysis of the Provision of Rehabilitation to Narcotics Abuse in Tanjung Pura Class IIB Detention Center," vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 124–135, 2024.
- [28] A. W. Laksana and B. Sobirov, "Comparative Study of Criminal Law Enforcement Against Drug Addicts Through Religious Rehabilitation Between Indonesia and Uzbekistan," *MADANIA J. Kaji. Keislam.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 159–166, 2024.
- [29] A. Renata and W. S. Myharto, "The Application of Rehabilitation Sentences for Narcotics Addicts (Case Study of North Jakarta District Court Decision Number 115/Pid. Sus/2023/PN Jkt. Utr)," 2024.
- [30] A. A. H. El Thamrin and N. E. Baskoro, "-Penerapan Sanksi Rehabilitasi Terhadap Pelaku Tindak Pidana Penyalahgunaan Narkotika Golongan I (Putusan Nomor 1016/Pid. Sus/2022/PN. Jkt. Brt): The Application of Rehabilitation Penalty to the Perpetrators of Class I Narcotics Abuse Crime (Verdict Numbe," *Reformasi Huk. Trisakti*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 997–1008, 2024.
- [31] M. A. Putra, E. Erniyanti, R. Ramlan, and S. Respationo, "Juridical Analysis Of The Factors That Encourage Recidivism Of Narcotics Crimes: Research Study In Batam Class Iia Prison," *Int. J. Soc. Sci. Humanit.*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 82–94, 2024.
- [32] E. E. McGinty and C. L. Barry, "Stigma reduction to combat the addiction crisis – developing an evidence base," *N. Engl. J. Med.*, vol. 382, no. 14, pp. 1291–1292, 2020.
- [33] S. Aronowitz and Z. F. Meisel, "Addressing stigma to provide quality care to people who use drugs," *JAMA Netw. Open*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. e2146980–e2146980, 2022.
- [34] M. B. Kleinman *et al.*, "Reduction in substance use stigma following a peer-recovery specialist behavioral activation intervention," *Int. J. Drug Policy*, vol. 130, p. 104511, 2024.
- [35] A. Sjafari and K. Nugroho, "Social Engineering Model for Empowering the Poor in the Border Areas of Pandeglang Regency and Serang Regency," in *International Conference on Democratisation in Southeast Asia (ICDeSA 2019)*, Atlantis Press, 2019, pp. 154–160.
- [36] N. Paca, N. Pratiwi, and S. Saman, "APLIKASI ARSITEKTUR HEALING ENVIRONMENT PADA RANCANGAN PUSAT REHABILITASI SOSIAL TERPADU PROVINSI GORONTALO," *JAMBURA J. Archit.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 12–18, 2024.