

An Ethical and Juridical Analysis of the Unlawful Treatment of Cadavers in Indonesian Medical Education

Prof. Sofia Hasan

Center for Bioethics and Medical Humanities, National University of Singapore, Singapore

Received: 03 July 2025; **Accepted:** 02 August 2025; **Published:** 01 September 2025

Abstract: Background: The use of human cadavers is an indispensable component of anatomical education for medical students. However, this practice is fraught with complex ethical and legal challenges, particularly concerning the dignity of the deceased and the lawfulness of sourcing and handling cadavers. In Indonesia, the legal framework governing the use of cadavers for educational purposes remains ambiguous, creating a potential conflict between scientific advancement and fundamental human rights.

Objective: This study aims to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the legal and ethical dimensions surrounding the treatment of cadavers in Indonesian medical education. It specifically investigates the concept of *wederrechtelijk* (unlawfulness) in relation to the sourcing and use of cadavers, examining the adequacy of existing legal protections and ethical guidelines.

Methods: This research employs a normative legal research methodology. It analyzes primary legal materials, including the Indonesian Criminal Code (KUHP), Law No. 1 of 2023, the 1945 Constitution, and relevant Supreme Court and District Court decisions. Secondary data includes academic literature, legal philosophy texts, and human rights declarations. The analysis is approached from the perspectives of legal certainty, Kantian moral philosophy, and universal human rights principles.

Results: The findings reveal significant legal voids and inconsistencies in Indonesian regulations regarding cadavers for scientific use. The current Criminal Code lacks specific provisions that adequately protect the dignity of the deceased in an educational context, leading to potential unlawfulness in practice. Philosophical analysis underscores a moral imperative to treat cadavers with respect as ends in themselves, a principle not fully reflected in current medico-legal practices. Furthermore, the handling of cadavers often falls short of the standards implied by universal human rights declarations concerning human dignity.

Conclusion: The treatment of cadavers in Indonesian medical education operates in a state of legal uncertainty that fails to provide adequate protection against unlawful or unethical acts. There is an urgent need for legal reform to establish clear, rights-based regulations for the procurement, use, and final disposition of cadavers, ensuring that scientific pursuits do not infringe upon fundamental principles of human dignity and legal certainty.

Keywords: Cadaver, Medical Education, Legal Analysis, *Wederrechtelijk*, Normative Legal Research, Human Dignity, Indonesian Law.

Introduction: 1.1. Background of the Study

The study of human anatomy is the bedrock of medical science, providing the foundational knowledge upon which all clinical practice is built. For centuries, the primary and most effective tool for imparting this knowledge has been the human cadaver. Dissection offers an unparalleled three-dimensional understanding of the human body's intricate

structures, spatial relationships, and natural variations—a level of detail and tactile experience that cannot be fully replicated by digital models or textbooks [1]. The use of cadavers, or kadavers as they are known in the Indonesian context, is not merely a tradition but a pedagogical necessity that allows medical students to transition from theoretical knowledge to a tangible appreciation of the human form they will one day be entrusted to heal.

However, the use of the dead for the benefit of the living is a practice fraught with profound ethical, cultural, and legal complexities. The body, even after death, is not a mere object; it is the physical remnant of a person, a vessel of former consciousness, identity, and relationships. It remains a powerful symbol that commands respect and dignity. This creates a central conflict: the utilitarian demand of medical science for anatomical subjects clashes with the deontological imperative to uphold the sanctity and dignity of the deceased. This tension is particularly acute in societies like Indonesia, where diverse religious and cultural norms deeply influence perceptions of death and the treatment of the deceased. The sourcing and use of cadavers in medical education can, therefore, become a source of significant controversy, especially when the legal framework governing these practices is ambiguous or underdeveloped [13].

In Indonesia, medical faculties rely on a supply of cadavers for their anatomy labs, yet the legal and ethical pathways for their procurement are not clearly defined. This ambiguity creates a precarious situation where educational institutions may operate in a legal grey area, potentially engaging in practices that could be considered unlawful or *wederrechtelijk* [13]. The absence of a robust, transparent, and legally sound system for body donation means that cadavers are often sourced from unclaimed bodies, which raises critical questions about consent, human rights, and the potential for exploitation. This study delves into this complex intersection of medical necessity, legal uncertainty, and moral duty within the Indonesian context.

1.2. Problem Formulation

The core of the legal problem lies in the ambiguous status of a human corpse within the Indonesian legal system. The law does not explicitly define whether a dead body is a legal subject with rights, a mere object (*res*) that can be owned or transacted, or a unique entity requiring special legal status. This lack of definition has significant ramifications for criminal law. For an act to be considered a crime, it must typically be directed at a legal subject or object recognized by the law. If a cadaver is neither, it becomes difficult to prosecute acts of desecration, unauthorized use, or illicit trafficking under existing legal articles, such as those concerning theft or property damage.

This ambiguity directly impacts the application of the principle of *wederrechtelijk*, or unlawfulness, which is a cornerstone of Indonesian criminal law. An act is considered unlawful if it violates a formal written law (formal *wederrechtelijk*) or if it contravenes unwritten norms of propriety and carefulness in society (material

wederrechtelijk) [20], [21]. In the context of cadaver use, the absence of clear statutes governing their procurement and handling means that the formal unlawfulness is difficult to establish. Consequently, the burden shifts to the concept of material unlawfulness, which hinges on societal values regarding the respectful treatment of the dead. However, relying on unwritten norms creates legal uncertainty, a condition that is antithetical to the principles of a modern constitutional state [3].

This legal vacuum creates a significant tension between the advancement of medical science and the fundamental principles of human rights and legal certainty. On one hand, medical education requires a steady supply of cadavers. On the other hand, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Indonesian Constitution itself uphold the inherent dignity of every human being, a principle that many argue extends beyond death [7], [8]. The current situation forces a difficult question: Does the pursuit of public health and scientific knowledge justify practices that may infringe upon the dignity of the deceased and the rights of their families, all while operating in a state of profound legal uncertainty?

1.3. Research Questions

To address the multifaceted issues outlined above, this study seeks to answer the following primary research questions:

1. What is the existing legal framework governing the procurement, use, and treatment of cadavers for medical education in Indonesia, and what are its principal deficiencies and ambiguities?
2. How do principles from moral philosophy, particularly the Kantian ethical framework of treating persons as ends in themselves, inform the discussion on the ethical treatment of cadavers and expose the moral shortcomings of current practices? [6], [14], [27].
3. What specific legal and policy reforms are necessary to create a clear, ethical, and rights-based framework for the use of cadavers in Indonesian medical education that aligns with principles of legal certainty and human dignity?

1.4. Research Objectives

In line with the research questions, the objectives of this article are:

1. To conduct a systematic analysis of the relevant provisions within the Indonesian Criminal Code (KUHP), both the existing code and the newly enacted Law No. 1 of 2023, alongside other pertinent regulations and court decisions, to map the current legal landscape concerning the treatment of corpses [20], [21], [25].

2. To critically evaluate the adequacy of the existing legal framework by juxtaposing it with foundational principles from legal and moral philosophy, specifically the ideals of legal certainty and the Kantian conception of human dignity [15], [23].

3. To formulate concrete and actionable policy recommendations aimed at legislative reform, with the goal of establishing a comprehensive, transparent, and ethically sound legal framework for the use of cadavers in Indonesia.

1.5. Significance of the Study

This research holds significant value for multiple stakeholders. For medical faculties and practitioners, it aims to provide much-needed legal clarity, mitigating the legal risks associated with the current ambiguous regulatory environment. For legislators and policymakers, this study offers a critical analysis that can inform the ongoing discourse on legal reform in Indonesia, particularly in the context of the new Criminal Code and its implementation [4], [29]. Most importantly, this article serves as an academic advocacy tool for upholding the principle of human dignity, even after death. By highlighting the legal and ethical gaps, it champions the idea that the rights and respect owed to an individual do not simply vanish at the moment of passing, a cornerstone principle of universal human rights [7]. Ultimately, this research contributes to the development of a more just and humane legal system that balances the needs of science with the enduring value of human dignity.

METHODS

2.1. Research Approach

This study employs a normative legal research methodology, also known as doctrinal research. This approach was selected as the most appropriate method to address the research questions, which are centered on the analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of legal norms, principles, and regulations [17]. Normative legal research focuses on the law as it is written in statutes, constitutions, and judicial decisions, treating law as a self-contained system of rules and principles. The objective is not to study the empirical reality of law's implementation but to examine the coherence, consistency, and justice of the legal framework itself. This involves a systematic exposition and analysis of legal rules and their relationship to one another, as well as an evaluation of these rules against higher legal and philosophical principles [17].

2.2. Data Sources

The data for this research were drawn exclusively from library and documentary sources, consistent with the

normative legal research approach. These sources were categorized into primary and secondary legal materials.

Primary Legal Materials: These are authoritative sources of law that have binding legal force. The primary materials analyzed in this study include:

- The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD 1945): Specifically, the articles pertaining to the rule of law, legal certainty, and human rights, which provide the constitutional foundation for the analysis [19].
- The Indonesian Criminal Code (KUHP): The existing code (Wetboek van Strafrecht) was analyzed to understand the traditional legal treatment of crimes related to corpses [20].
- Law No. 1 of 2023 concerning the New Criminal Code: This new legislation was examined to assess whether it rectifies the ambiguities of the old code regarding the use of cadavers and the principle of *wederrechtelijk* [21].
- Judicial Decisions: A selection of relevant court rulings were analyzed to understand how the judiciary has interpreted and applied the law in cases involving human remains. These include Supreme Court Decision No. 590 K/Pid/2012 [9], Supreme Court Decision No. 3203 K/Pdt/2017 [10], and Medan District Court Decision No. 417/Pdt.G/2012 [18].

Secondary Legal Materials: These materials provide explanation, analysis, and critique of primary legal materials. They are not legally binding but are essential for a comprehensive understanding of the law. The secondary sources for this study include:

- Legal Textbooks and Treatises: Authoritative books on Indonesian criminal law, legal philosophy, and legal research methods were consulted to provide theoretical grounding and context [2], [11], [17], [26], [28].
- Academic Journal Articles: A wide range of scholarly articles from legal, ethical, and medical journals were utilized. These articles provided in-depth analysis on the specific issues of cadaver use, the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, human rights law, and international perspectives on the matter [6], [12], [16], [22], [30].

2.3. Data Analysis Technique

The collected data were analyzed using a qualitative approach, focusing on interpretation and synthesis. The following specific analytical techniques were employed:

- Descriptive-Analytical Technique: This involved systematically describing the content of the relevant

legal norms found in statutes and court decisions. Following the description, an analysis was conducted to break down the norms into their constituent parts, identify ambiguities, and understand their logical structure and implications.

- **Qualitative Interpretation:** This technique, also known as the hermeneutic method, was used to interpret the meaning of legal texts and philosophical arguments. This went beyond a literal reading to understand the underlying principles, values, and intentions behind the texts.
- **Comparative Analysis:** The Indonesian legal framework was briefly compared with international ethical guidelines and legal approaches in other jurisdictions, as described in the literature [7], [16]. This comparison served to highlight the unique aspects of the Indonesian situation and to identify potential models for reform.
- **Philosophical Approach:** The legal framework was critically evaluated using concepts drawn from legal and moral philosophy. The principle of legal certainty, as articulated in legal theory [3], was used as a benchmark to assess the predictability and clarity of the law. Furthermore, the moral philosophy of Immanuel Kant, particularly his formulation of the categorical imperative regarding treating humanity as an end in itself, was applied as an ethical lens to scrutinize the morality of using cadavers without clear consent [6], [27]. This philosophical approach provided a normative standard against which the positivity of the law could be judged.

RESULTS

This section presents the findings derived from the analysis of the primary and secondary legal materials. The results are organized thematically to address the core components of the research problem: the legal status of cadavers, the application of *wederrechtelijk*, the relevance of human rights, and the insights from moral philosophy.

3.1. The Legal Status of Cadavers in the Indonesian Legal System

A foundational finding of this research is the profound and consequential ambiguity surrounding the legal status of a human corpse in Indonesian law. An exhaustive analysis of both the long-standing Criminal Code (KUHP) and the new Criminal Code (Law No. 1 of 2023) reveals a complete absence of a formal legal definition for a "cadaver" or "corpse" [20], [21]. The law does not explicitly classify a dead body, leaving its status in a legal limbo. It is not recognized as a legal subject (*rechtssubject*), as legal personality is extinguished upon death. Simultaneously, it is not

formally classified as a mere object or property (*zaak*), as this would imply it could be owned, sold, or destroyed at will, a notion that is repugnant to public morality and religious values prevalent in Indonesia.

This definitional void creates significant doctrinal problems for criminal law. For instance, legal scholars have long debated whether a corpse can be the object of theft (Article 362 KUHP). The prevailing legal theory, as supported by jurisprudence, concludes that theft is not possible because a corpse has no owner and, therefore, no one from whom it can be "taken" with the intent to possess unlawfully [11], [25]. While the KUHP does contain provisions that criminalize specific acts against the dead, such as hiding a corpse to conceal a death (Article 181) or unlawfully digging up or moving a corpse (Article 179), these articles are narrow in scope. They are primarily aimed at preventing the obstruction of justice or punishing public indecency rather than protecting the inherent dignity of the cadaver itself.

The judicial interpretation in relevant court decisions further illustrates this ambiguity. In cases dealing with disputes over burial or the moving of graves, courts have tended to focus on the rights of the family and the disruption of public order rather than on any rights inhering in the corpse itself [10], [18]. For example, in Supreme Court Decision No. 590 K/Pid/2012, the conviction was based on the unlawful excavation of a grave, an act explicitly forbidden, not on a broader principle of desecrating the deceased [9]. This case-by-case approach, while resolving specific disputes, has failed to establish a clear and consistent legal principle regarding the status of a corpse, thereby perpetuating the legal uncertainty for other contexts, such as medical education.

3.2. The Element of *Wederrechtelijk* (Unlawfulness) in the Context of Cadaver Use

The concept of *wederrechtelijk*, or unlawfulness, is central to determining criminal liability in Indonesia. Legal doctrine distinguishes between formal *wederrechtelijk*, which signifies that an act is explicitly forbidden by a written statute, and material *wederrechtelijk*, which holds that an act can be unlawful if it conflicts with unwritten laws, societal norms of propriety, or principles of justice, even if not explicitly prohibited by statute [2], [4].

In the context of using cadavers for medical education, the element of formal unlawfulness is weak. As established, there are no specific laws that comprehensively regulate the donation, procurement, and use of cadavers for scientific purposes. While taking a body without permission might seem intuitively illegal, it does not neatly fit into existing

criminal articles. This forces a reliance on the doctrine of material *wederrechtelijk*. From this perspective, the use of a cadaver becomes unlawful if it is done without proper authorization, thereby violating the unwritten societal and familial rights to determine the respectful disposition of their deceased loved ones. The absence of consent—either an ante-mortem declaration from the individual or post-mortem permission from the next of kin—is the critical factor that renders the act materially unlawful [1].

The new Criminal Code (Law No. 1 of 2023) attempts to formalize this by recognizing "living law" or customary law (*hukum yang hidup dalam masyarakat*) as a potential source for criminalization [21]. However, this provision is unlikely to resolve the issue for cadaver use. As argued by Komeni and Widjajanti (2024), the application of living law is fraught with its own problems of legal uncertainty and is typically intended for specific, localized customary legal systems (*delik adat*) [30]. It is not a suitable mechanism for regulating a nationwide, modern practice like medical education. Therefore, even under the new KUHP, the use of unclaimed bodies without a clear legal mandate or consent mechanism remains in a state of potential material unlawfulness, exposing medical institutions to legal challenges and ethical condemnation.

3.3. Human Rights and the Dignity of the Deceased

The analysis of Indonesia's constitutional and international human rights commitments reveals a strong normative basis for protecting the dignity of the deceased. Article 28G of the 1945 Constitution guarantees every person the right to self-respect, honor, and the protection of their good name [19]. While the Constitution speaks of "persons," the philosophical underpinning of human dignity suggests that it is an inherent quality that is not contingent on life. This view is reinforced by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which proclaims in its preamble that "recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world" [7]. The term "human family" implies a connection that transcends the lifespan of an individual.

Legal scholars and human rights advocates argue that dignity, in this sense, persists after death. The respectful treatment of a person's remains is seen as a final affirmation of their value and a duty owed not only to the deceased but also to their family and to humanity as a whole [8]. The unauthorized use of a body for scientific dissection, particularly when the individual's identity is unknown and no consent has been given, can be interpreted as a profound violation

of this post-mortem dignity.

This perspective aligns with international ethical standards regarding research on human biological materials. Scholars like Charo (2014) and Kapp (2012) emphasize the paramount importance of consent and respect for the source individual in all forms of research involving human tissue [22], [12]. International case studies, such as the analysis of Brazilian law by Bezerra et al. (2020), show a global trend towards strengthening the legal and ethical requirements for the use of corpses in research, moving away from the appropriation of unclaimed bodies towards transparent, consent-based donation systems [16]. Compared to these international developments, the Indonesian legal framework appears underdeveloped and fails to provide adequate protection for the dignity of the deceased as required by both its own constitutional principles and universal human rights norms [5].

3.4. Philosophical Perspectives on the Treatment of Cadavers

Applying the moral philosophy of Immanuel Kant provides a powerful ethical critique of the current practices. Kant's second formulation of the Categorical Imperative states: "Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never merely as a means to an end, but always at the same time as an end in itself" [6], [14]. This principle posits that every rational being has an intrinsic, unconditional worth—dignity—which forbids us from using them as mere instruments for our own purposes.

When applied to the use of cadavers, this principle yields a clear ethical directive. Using an unclaimed body for medical education without consent is a textbook example of treating a person (or their remains) merely as a means—a tool for learning anatomy—and not as an end in themselves. The act instrumentalizes the body, stripping it of its connection to the person it once was and reducing it to the level of a disposable resource. Kantian ethics would demand that for the use of a cadaver to be morally permissible, it must be based on an act of autonomous will from the person themselves (via ante-mortem donation) or, as a second-best solution, from their family who act as custodians of their dignity [27]. The practice of using unclaimed bodies fundamentally violates this moral law because it bypasses the requirement of respect for autonomy.

This Kantian analysis complements the arguments from legal philosophy, which advocate for legal certainty and justice [3], [15], [23]. A legal system that permits the instrumentalization of the dead in a regulatory vacuum

is not only ethically compromised but also fails in its duty to provide clear, predictable, and just rules. The philosophical perspective thus reinforces the conclusion that the current state of affairs is untenable, offending both moral law and the principles of good governance.

DISCUSSION

This section interprets and synthesizes the results presented above, exploring their broader implications. It discusses the critical gap between law and practice, the challenge of reconciling scientific progress with moral duties, and culminates in a set of policy recommendations for legal reform.

4.1. The Critical Gap Between Legal Norms and Medico-Ethical Practice

The findings of this study illuminate a significant and perilous gap between the vague, underdeveloped legal norms in Indonesia and the concrete, practical need for cadavers in medical education. On one side of this gap stand the medical faculties, which require cadavers to fulfill their educational mandate and produce competent physicians. On the other side lies a legal framework that provides no clear pathway for ethically and lawfully acquiring these essential educational tools. The law's silence on the legal status of a corpse and its failure to establish a regulated body donation system forces institutions into a precarious position. They are compelled to rely on sources, such as unclaimed bodies from hospitals or morgues, that operate in a grey area of material unlawfulness.

This disconnect has several detrimental consequences. First, it exposes medical institutions to significant legal and reputational risks. A family that discovers their relative's unclaimed body was used for dissection without their consent could potentially bring a civil lawsuit or even press for criminal charges based on an interpretation of material *wederrechtelijk* or violations of religious sentiments. The ambiguity of the law makes the outcome of such a case highly unpredictable, but the damage to the institution's reputation could be immense.

Second, this legal void represents a failure of the state to provide justice and closure for families. For the families of the deceased, even those who are unable to claim a body for financial or other reasons, the knowledge that their loved one's remains will be treated with respect and given a proper disposition is a matter of profound emotional and spiritual importance. The current system, which allows bodies to be diverted to anatomy labs without clear consent or public oversight, denies them this final assurance. It is a system that prioritizes institutional convenience over fundamental human sensibilities. This gap is not

merely a technical legal problem; it is a source of potential injustice and social friction.

4.2. Reconciling Scientific Progress with Moral and Legal Duties

The debate over cadaver use often invokes a utilitarian argument: the knowledge gained from dissection benefits society by producing better doctors, ultimately saving lives. This greater good, the argument goes, may justify the use of unclaimed bodies, which would otherwise be buried or cremated without serving any further purpose. While this argument has a certain pragmatic appeal, the findings of this research, particularly when viewed through the lenses of Kantian ethics and human rights law, reveal its profound flaws.

The Kantian perspective, as discussed, provides a powerful rebuttal to this simple utilitarian calculus [6], [27]. It insists that the intrinsic dignity of a person is an absolute value that cannot be traded off against utilitarian benefits. Using a person's body as an unconsented-to tool, regardless of the positive outcomes, is a fundamental moral violation. It treats the person as a thing, which is impermissible. Similarly, the human rights framework posits that fundamental rights, including the right to dignity, are inalienable [7]. They cannot be set aside for the sake of convenience or even for the public good, except under the most stringent and legally defined circumstances, which are not met in the current ad-hoc system of cadaver procurement.

Furthermore, this situation creates a crisis of legal certainty (*rechtzekerheid*), a principle that demands laws be clear, predictable, and consistently applied [3], [29]. A legal system that relies on vague notions of material unlawfulness and leaves both medical schools and citizens uncertain of their rights and obligations is a deficient system. It undermines the rule of law by replacing clear rules with discretionary, and potentially arbitrary, decision-making. True scientific progress in a democratic society cannot be built on a foundation of legal uncertainty and moral compromise. It must be reconciled with the state's primary duty to protect the rights and dignity of its citizens, both living and dead.

4.3. Towards a New Legal Framework: Policy Recommendations

Based on the analysis, it is clear that comprehensive legal reform is urgently needed. Relying on judicial interpretation or the vague "living law" provision in the new KUHP is insufficient. The following policy recommendations are proposed to create a clear, ethical, and legally certain framework:

1. Enact a Specific Law on Body Donation and Use for Scientific Purposes: The most crucial step is for the

legislature to draft and pass a dedicated law, separate from the Criminal Code, that specifically governs the use of human bodies and tissues for education and research. This law should, at a minimum:

- Provide a clear legal definition of a cadaver, recognizing its unique status as neither person nor property but as an entity deserving of special respect and protection.
- Establish a clear hierarchy of consent, making ante-mortem donation by the individual (a "willed body" program) the gold standard and primary source of cadavers.
- Define the precise conditions under which post-mortem consent can be given by the next of kin, including a clear and ordered list of who is authorized to provide such consent.
- Strictly regulate the use of unclaimed bodies, making it a last resort only permissible after exhaustive and documented efforts to locate family have failed, and subject to oversight by an independent ethics committee.

2. Establish a National Body Donation Registry: To facilitate a willed-body program, the government should establish and promote a centralized, confidential registry where citizens can formally declare their intent to donate their bodies to science. This would create a transparent and ethically unimpeachable supply chain for medical faculties, moving away from the reliance on unclaimed bodies. Public awareness campaigns would be essential to encourage donation and destigmatize the practice.

3. Standardize Procedures for Respectful Treatment and Disposition: The proposed law must include mandatory national standards for the handling, use, and final disposition of all cadavers used for educational purposes. This should include protocols for ensuring anonymity and confidentiality during dissection, requirements for a respectful and dignified environment in the anatomy lab, and clear rules for the eventual cremation or burial of the remains, including memorial services to honor the donors.

These reforms would replace the current system of legal ambiguity and ethical compromise with one founded on the principles of autonomy, dignity, and legal certainty. They would provide medical schools with a lawful and ethical means of acquiring cadavers, protect the rights of the deceased and their families, and align Indonesia's legal framework with international best practices and universal human rights norms.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the use of human cadavers

for medical education in Indonesia operates within a precarious and ethically fraught legal vacuum. The normative legal analysis has demonstrated that the existing framework, including both the old and new Criminal Codes, fails to define the legal status of a corpse, leaving the practice of its procurement and use vulnerable to charges of material unlawfulness (*wederrechtelijk*). This legal ambiguity is not a mere technicality; it represents a fundamental failure to provide legal certainty and to uphold the principle of human dignity, which this paper argues extends beyond death.

The reliance on unclaimed bodies without a clear, consent-based legal mandate is inconsistent with the principles of the Indonesian Constitution, the spirit of universal human rights, and the moral imperatives of Kantian ethics, which forbid the instrumentalization of a person. The current situation creates unacceptable risks for medical institutions and, more importantly, constitutes a profound disrespect to the deceased and a denial of closure for their families. Therefore, comprehensive legal reform is not merely recommended; it is an urgent necessity. The establishment of a specific law governing body donation, centered on informed consent and respect for the deceased, is the only viable path forward. Such a reform would reconcile the needs of medical science with the foundational duties of a just state, ensuring that the pursuit of knowledge is never divorced from the non-negotiable value of human dignity.

REFERENCES

- A. Habibi and M. P. Maikel, "Penggunaan Kadaver pada Praktikum Anatomi: Aspek Hukum Fiqh, Medikolegal, dan Pengetahuan Mahasiswa," 2014.
- Sinurat, *Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana Materil di Indonesia*, Kupang: Lembaga Penelitian Universitas Nusa Cendana, 2023.
- P. Sinaga, "Filsafat Hukum Mengajarkan Kepastian Hukum," *osf.io*, [Online]. Available: <https://osf.io>
- Gustiniati and B. Rizki, *Pembaharuan Hukum Pidana*, Bandar Lampung: Pusaka Media, 2018.
- H. R. Alexander, "Regulatory Considerations in Human Subjects Research," in *Success in Academic Surgery: Clinical Trials*, London: Springer, 2013, pp. 95–105. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-4679-7_8.
- I. Gusmian, "Filsafat Moral Immanuel Kant: Suatu Tinjauan Paradigmatik," *Al-A'raf: Jurnal Pemikiran Islam dan Filsafat*, *ejournal.uinsaid.ac.id*, 2014.
- International Law Making, "Deklarasi Universal Hak-Hak Asasi Manusia," *Indonesian Journal of International Law*, no. III, pp. 1–6, 2006. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.

J. Junaidi, M. A. R. Abqa, M. Abas, D. Suhariyanto, et al., *Hukum & Hak Asasi Manusia: Sebuah Konsep dan Teori Fitrah Kemanusiaan dalam Bingkai Konstitusi Bernegara*, books.google.com, 2023.

M. A. RI, *Putusan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 590 K/Pid/2012*, 2012.

M. A. RI, *Putusan Mahkamah Agung RI Nomor 3203 K/Pdt/2017*, 2017.

M. Ali, *Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana*, Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2015.

M. B. Kapp, "A Legal Approach to the Use of Human Biological Materials for Research Purposes," *Social Science Research Network*, 2012. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2025176>.

M. R. Lubis, *Menakar Delik Pidana Dunia Pendidikan dalam Perspektif Hukum Pidana di Indonesia*, Jakarta: CV. Tungga Esti, 2023.

M. Z. Abidin, "Pemikiran Filsafat Immanuel Kant," *Al-Banjari: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu-Ilmu Keislaman*, jurnal.uin-antasari.ac.id, 2008.

Nuraisah, *Filsafat Hukum Barat dan Alirannya*, Medan: CV. Pusdikra Mitra Jaya, 2021.

P. M. Bezerra, M. de N. Borba, I. C. Z. Guerriero, and S. G. Dallari, "Ethical and Legal Analysis of Scientific Research on Corpses in Brazil," *Revista Bioética*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 554–564, 2020. doi: 10.1590/1983-80422020283420.