



---

## Policy Narrative Analyst: Death Penalty for Drug Convicts in Indonesia

Christiana Simatupang, Arthur Josias Simon Runturambi, Benny Jozua Mamoto, Palupi Lindiasari Samputra

Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

Email: [christianasimatupang@gmail.com](mailto:christianasimatupang@gmail.com), [a.josias@ui.ac.id](mailto:a.josias@ui.ac.id), [benito5577@yahoo.com](mailto:benito5577@yahoo.com), [upies77@gmail.com](mailto:upies77@gmail.com)

---

### Keywords

death penalty, narcotics, public policy, policy narrative analysis, indonesia

### Abstract

The death penalty policy for drug convicts is still controversial in Indonesia. The purpose of the article is to analyze the narrative developed by the government on the death penalty policy for drug convicts in Indonesia, analyze various obstacles to the death penalty policy narrative and recommend alternative policy innovation strategies that can be chosen in following up the death penalty policy for drug convicts in the future. The analysis was carried out using the Narrative Policy Analysis (NPA) method at the meso level. Data is sourced from various trusted online news from 2015-2022. Conclusions were obtained: 1) The death penalty policy for drug convicts is carried out as an effort by the state to protect the public from the effects of drug abuse and illicit circulation. 2) The controversy over the implementation of the policy is due to differences in definitions of human rights restrictions and definitions of drug crimes as the most serious crimes and the absence of empirical studies on the effectiveness of the application of the death penalty with drug problems. 3) The need for an empirical study of the effectiveness of the death penalty and a redefinition of human rights restrictions and the most serious crimes punishable by death



© 2023 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).

---

### 1. Introduction

Drug-related crime is one of eight global strategic issues that pose a threat to *human security* after the Cold War (Amaritasari, 2017). The production, consumption and supply of narcotics have all been presented as threats to security, whether human security, national or international security (Crick, 2012). The magnitude of the threat of the narcotics problem is marked by the increasing production and

---

consumption of narcotics globally as well as health risks and hazards, while new types of narcotics continue to emerge (Das & Horton, 2019).

Drug crime is a threat to human security due to the various adverse effects caused and its impact on military, political, health and economic security in a country (Biswas, 2021). Various negative impacts include: 1) Physical and mental health disorders such as narcotic dependence, the risk of contracting infectious diseases such as HIV / AIDS and hepatitis C, mental health disorders such as depression, anxiety or psychosis and can lead to overdose and premature death; 2) Increase the level of corruption and threats of internal cohesion in various countries due to the involvement of political, military or law enforcement elites who receive a share of profits from the narcotics business; 3) Increase in other crimes such as theft, violence, etc. related to narcotics and 4) Decrease in the country's economic growth (Biswas, 2021; UNODC, 2021, 2022a).

UNODC recorded that in 2018 as many as 269 million people aged 16-54 years consumed illegal narcotics and is projected to increase to 299 million people in 2030 (UNODC, 2021). It also indicates an increase in the production of illegal narcotics to meet the needs of narcotics consumption. Illegal narcotics trafficking is becoming big business. No wonder the huge turnover of money in this business makes corruption vulnerable and direct state involvement in narcotics trafficking. Narcotics crime ultimately becomes a threat to human security, especially countries of illegal narcotics production and transit.

Indonesia is also one of the countries threatened by illegal narcotics trafficking. In 2015 President Joko Widodo mentioned that Indonesia was in a drug emergency, almost 50 people died every day due to drug abuse, so serious efforts are needed to overcome it (Kompas.com, 2015). BNN data recorded that in 2021 more than 4.8 million people aged 16-54 years had used illegal narcotics with more than 3.6 million of them using them in the past year (Puslitdatin BNN, 2022). In addition, UNODC also mentioned that transnational organized crime related to illegal narcotics trafficking is a serious threat to Indonesia, due to its geographical condition as an archipelagic country and the weakness of borders (UNODC, 2022b). This has caused Indonesia to take serious steps in handling illicit narcotics trafficking, one of which is by enforcing the death penalty for crimes related to illicit narcotics trafficking.

The death penalty is one form of punishment that is still maintained and applies to drug crime cases. Historically, the death penalty is the oldest sentence. Some experts even argue that this punishment is not in accordance with the demands of the times, but until now no alternative punishment has been found to replace it (Jacob, 2017). Two-thirds of countries worldwide have abandoned the death penalty and various global and regional organizations are working towards the universal abolition of the death penalty (Sato, 2022).

The death penalty is the last means of means carried out to protect the interests of the community or state threatened by crime and imposed on criminals who are considered no longer able to be fostered (Hutapea, 2016; Jacob, 2017). The death penalty on an international scale is not completely prohibited. However, the application of the legitimate death penalty is severely restricted under international human rights law. The most substantive limitation is explained in *The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* 1966 in article 6(2) which explains that the death penalty can only be imposed for the most serious crimes (Sander, 2021).

The death penalty for drug crimes in Indonesia is recorded in the Criminal Code (KUHP), Narcotics Law Number 35 of 2009 and Psychotropic Law Number 5 of 1997. The execution of the death penalty is regulated in Law Number 2 / PNPS / 1964 which is carried out by being shot to death by a firing squad. The death penalty must be carried out after the court decision is declared to have permanent legal force (*incracht*). However, in its implementation, death row prisoners are still given the opportunity to apply for clemency to the president (Hutapea, 2016).

Although not prohibited, the execution of the death penalty for drug convicts is still controversial (Purnomo, 2016; Susanto, 2017). Various criticisms are often given to the government, especially when

the execution of the death penalty is carried out (Gunawan & Lai, 2018). For example, in 2016 Indonesia came under fire from UNODC regarding executions carried out. UNODC regrets that the Secretary-General's call to halt the execution of a number of detainees for alleged narcotics crimes has not been heeded by Indonesia (Gunawan & Lai, 2018; UNODC, 2016). UNODC insists that the punishment should only be applied to the "most serious crimes", namely those involving intentional homicide and according to UNODC narcotics crimes are generally not considered to meet that threshold (UNODC, 2016).

A study conducted by Sander (2021) revealed that the death penalty for drug crimes is the most extreme, disproportionate and inhumane manifestation of state punishment imposed by the state in the name of the '*war on drugs*'. Sander (2021) also emphasized that the death penalty policy for drug convicts, which is widely applied in countries in Asia, including Indonesia, violates human rights, and is not in accordance with international justice, the implementation of the policy is considered ineffective in controlling the drug problem and most of the people executed are marginalized groups such as women and poor people who are deceived by large drug networks.

In Indonesia, empirical research measuring the effectiveness of the death penalty against drug abuse and illicit trafficking has never been conducted. Common research is a literature review and normative juridical method. Among them is Purnomo's research (2016) which looks at the sociological perspective of law from the death penalty for narcotics crimes in Indonesia. His research concluded that the actions of Indonesians who choose the death penalty for drug offenders can be justified even though in other countries the death penalty has been abolished. The imposition of the death penalty must go through two considerations, namely it must accommodate the aspirations of the community who demand retribution as a balance on the basis of the level of guilt of the perpetrator and must include the purpose of punishment to maintain and maintain community unity. Kolopita (2013) also conducted a review of legal literature on the death penalty for drug offenders which concluded that law enforcement of death penalty sentences for narcotics cases in Indonesia has run quite optimally, although it is undeniable that there are verdicts that have not been executed. According to the study, the imposition of the death penalty for drug offenders is appropriate to contain and reward drug offenders.

The authors also found research that reviewed the death penalty from a human rights aspect. Among them is Anwar's research (2016) which analyzed the case of a large narcotics dealer Freddy Budiman. His research revealed that the enforcement of the death penalty for drug dealers must be implemented in the interest of more humanity. The death penalty for drug dealers is incompatible with human rights because it is in harmony with the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights. In addition, Hutapea's research (2016) also revealed that the death penalty carried out in Indonesia is one of the methods used to suppress narcotics crimes that threaten the lives of Indonesian people. However, the study also revealed that the death penalty has not been effectively enforced, especially in terms of waiting times that can be delayed for years. In addition, there is also a study conducted by Rachman (2018) analyzing the implementation of the value of Pancasila on the death penalty. The death penalty regulated in Indonesia's positive law is obtained in accordance with the foundation of Pancasila values, but indeed in its implementation, often delays in the execution of the death penalty occur in Indonesia, giving the impression that Indonesia is afraid of outside criticism.

Although most of the studies above reveal that the death penalty in Indonesia does not violate human rights, a study conducted by Pane (2019) with qualitative juridical analysis methods states that the death penalty for drug cases is considered ineffective, because although the death penalty has been imposed a lot, drug cases in Indonesia continue to increase, besides that this study also reveals that the right to life is the most basic right owned by humans so that the death penalty applied violates human rights. In addition, there is another study that criticizes the principle of certainty of the death penalty for drug convicts in Indonesia conducted by Jumiati (2022) with a normative juridical study which reveals that laws related to the death penalty policy for drug cases do not reliably and fairly determine when the death penalty should be carried out. Various obstacles such as limited time, legal certainty and justice

for death row prisoners in their implementation are not guaranteed. So he recommended the revision of laws and regulations.

The study conducted by the author is different from various previous studies, namely the author analyzes the application of the death penalty for convicted drug cases by analyzing the public policy narrative built by the government that is pro with groups that are against the death penalty policy for convicted drug cases. Indeed, there is also research that analyzes differences in government and activist policy opinions on the death penalty for drug-related offenses in Indonesia conducted by Kramer & Stoicescu (2022). But the substantial difference lies in the purpose of the study. The study developed by Kramer & Stoicescu (2022) aims to be an initial foothold in developing campaign strategies for activists who are activists to abolish the death penalty for drug-related crimes in Indonesia. The study recommends that the campaign strategy be done by lobbying state officials and raising public awareness about the cost of death penalty executions and promoting rigorous evaluation of policies. It also suggests developing a national evidence base to guide policy around the death penalty.

The death penalty for convicted drug cases in Indonesia is not a prohibited punishment, even listed as one of the countries that impose the most death penalty in Asia (Sander, 2021). In fact, the majority of death sentences imposed in Indonesia are punishments related to drug cases. Data from the *Institute for Criminal Justice Reform* (ICJR) recorded that in 2021 out of 93 death penalty cases in the country, 79 cases (85%) were related to drug crimes (Widi, 2022). However, in its implementation, the implementation of the death penalty policy for convicted drug cases is still controversial both nationally and internationally. There are groups that are pro and con to the policy, which often results in obstacles that result in delays in the execution of the death penalty. Looking at these data, it is necessary to conduct research with an analysis approach to the death penalty policy for convicted drug cases in Indonesia.

The method carried out in this study is *Narrative Policy Analysis* (NPA), the NPA Method is a method that can be used to analyze controversial policies related to narcotics. Previously, there were three studies related to narcotics using the NPA method, namely research on the Narrative Analysis of War on Drugs Speech conducted by Bush in 1989 (Villegas, 2021) which revealed that after the speech narcotics were considered a serious threat to America. In addition, ter Nelson (2021) handles the prohibition and regulation debate on Cannabis policy in Africa and (Asmoro & Samputra, 2021) which analyzes the narrative of Medical Marijuana policy carried out by the Indonesian government. The objectives of this study include: 1) Analyzing the narrative developed by the Indonesian government related to the death penalty policy imposed on drug convicts. 2) Develop alternative options for policy innovation strategies that can be prepared by the government to bridge the controversy over the death penalty policy for drug convicts that has occurred so far.

## 2. Materials and Methods

*Narrative Policy Analysis* (NPA) is a method developed from the theory of *Narrative Policy Framework* (NPF), which is a theory that views public policy as a discourse. In general, this method emphasizes an understanding of the importance of the role and impact of narratives on public policy, especially when access to information and new media is unrestricted (Jungrav-georgica, 2021). The NPA approach allows to understand the implications behind policies, can be used to analyze complex and polarized public policies so that often these public policies become uncertain (Villegas, 2021).

There are three levels of NPA analysis, namely micro, meso and macro (Jungrav-georgica, 2021; Shanahan, Jones, & Mcbeth, 2017). At the micro level, the unit of analysis is the individual, which focuses on how individuals shape narratives and are shaped by narratives. At the meso level the unit of analysis is the policy actors in the policy subsystem such as groups, coalitions or organizations. This level focuses on how groups construct policy narratives and what influence policy narratives have on the policy process. Meanwhile, at the macro level, analysis centers on policy narratives that permeate institutions, societies, and cultural norms. The focus of her research is to understand how changes or

stability in macro policy narratives—embedded in cultures and institutions—affect public policy (Shanahan et al., 2017).

The level of analysis used in this policy is the meso level by analyzing related policy actors, namely the government with community groups that reject the death penalty policy for drug convicts. Analysis at the meso level focused on narrative functions in public policy subsystems. It is assumed that actors operate within a subsystem so that the policies to be implemented wherever possible meet their preferences. The public policy subsystem is thus the stage and arena where actors present their preferences and interact with other actors. The unit of analysis is public policy actors and their communication activities, while the dominant methodology is content analysis (Jungrav-georgica, 2021). The collection of narrative data carried out by the government that is pro and con to the imposition of the death penalty for convicted drug cases in Indonesia in the form of public data, timeline news, interview videos or expert views searched online, previous research journals related to the death penalty for convicted drug cases in the 2015-2022 period.

### 3. Results and Discussions

#### *Narrative Analysis Policy*

The resumption of the death penalty policy narrative occurred when 2014 President-elect Joko Widodo, better known as Jokowi, said Indonesia was in a state of narcotics emergency. He claimed about 50 people die every day or 18,000 lives every year due to drug abuse, this figure does not include more than 4 million drug abusers who need rehabilitation, so drug handling must be taken seriously. He emphasized that he would not grant clemency requests related to narcotics cases (Kompas.com, 2015). As a form of his seriousness in beating the drums of the war on drugs, in the first period of his leadership three waves of executions were carried out to 18 death row prisoners for drug cases. The first wave was held on January 18, 2015, the second wave was held on April 29, 2015 and the third wave was held on July 29, 2016 (CNN Indonesia, 2019).

The first batch of death sentences was carried out on January 15, 2015 against 6 death row prisoners for narcotics cases with 5 of them being Foreign Citizens (WNA) and 1 Indonesian citizen (WNI). The execution was carried out after a rejected clemency application was rejected on December 30, 2014 (Waluyo, 2015). Then on January 18, 2015, through Jokowi's *Facebook fanpage* account, he uploaded a firm message that the state was directly present in the fight against drug syndicates because drugs had damaged life and Indonesia was healthy without drugs. The Attorney General at that time, HM Prasetyo, revealed that the execution was not a joyous event but a concern that must be carried out. He also emphasized that the execution was a court decision that had permanent legal force, all juridical aspects were fulfilled so that in order to achieve legal certainty for the settlement of the case, the decision must be implemented. He also emphasized that in its implementation, the humanitarian side is still considered and upheld, all the last requests of death row prisoners have also been fulfilled (Secretary of the Cabinet of the Republic of Indonesia, 2015).

BNN in several uploads on its website shows an attitude of supporting President Jokowi's policies. The results of research conducted by BNN with Puslitkes UI recorded an increasing prevalence of drug abusers which placed Indonesia into the drug emergency category. Based on various research studies, it makes sense that drug crimes are classified as extraordinary crimes and execution is one of the appropriate punishments to combat drugs. Executions are carried out as a form of protection. Countries that embrace the death penalty consider that by executing a few people can save thousands or even millions of other lives. BNN considers that Indonesia must be consistent in enforcing the death penalty on drug dealers. Indonesia must be firm with other countries to respect the sovereignty of the Republic of Indonesia (BNN Public Relations, 2015b, 2015a, 2015c). This is in line with studies conducted (Iriani, 2015) In applying the death penalty for drug crimes in Indonesia, philosophically revealed that drug offenders deserve the death penalty because of their harmful mistakes, juridically it has also been regulated in the Narcotics Law No. 35 of 2009 and sociologically the community also demands that



perpetrators of crimes be punished to the maximum, so that the greater the crime, the greater the punishment.

Various waves of rejection occurred after 3 waves of executions of drug convicts in 2015. Strong reactions came from the Dutch and Brazilian governments whose nationals were executed in the first wave. Both countries immediately recalled their ambassadors from Jakarta. President Jokowi also claimed to have received calls from the heads of state of the Netherlands and Brazil so that the death penalty would not be carried out. However, answering this, Jokowi responded that the decision was a court decision in Indonesia that must be respected as part of state sovereignty (Cabinet Secretary of the Republic of Indonesia, 2015). Strong condemnation also came from eight human rights-related institutions, namely *Human Rights Watch*, *Human Rights Working Group*, Imparsial, Komnas HAM, KontraS, LBH Masyarakat, and *the Indonesian Legal Aid* and Human Rights Association (PBHI). Eight human rights-related NGOs that joined forces to reject the execution asserted that the death penalty violated human rights, especially the right to life, and there was no significant relationship between the death penalty and the decline in drug cases (Rahadian, 2015). Poengky Indarti who is the Executive Director of the Imparsial Human Rights Monitoring Institute revealed that the execution which was colored by the discourse of "Indonesia Emergency Narcotics" was a step taken by the government to cover up its failure to overcome the drug problem and according to him the death penalty is a legacy of the outdated Dutch colonial legal system, the modern legal system should be correctional not revenge Human rights activist organizations support punishment death in convicted drug offences completely abolished or frozen (BBC News Indonesia, 2015).

After the execution of the first wave of the death penalty, Indonesia also received pressure from the United Nations during the 58th *Commission of Narcotic Drugs* (CND) session held in Vienna on March 9-17, 2015 to consider abolishing the death penalty for convicted drug cases and even advised the United Nations to stop assistance related to drug control if the death penalty is still carried out. However, BNN, which is the representative of the trial, said that it would not be afraid to carry out the execution of the death penalty for convicted drug cases. The threat of narcotics in Indonesia is already in a serious stage, shown by the increasing number of abusers, many crimes that occur as a result of drug abuse. BNN also believes that in Indonesia narcotics have targeted various groups ranging from children to adults so that they have the potential to damage generations and the nation. The application of the death penalty is part of the state's protection against attacks by drug criminals. BNN also added that the death penalty for convicted drug cases in Indonesia does not violate human rights, because human rights may be limited in order to respect the human rights of others (BNN Public Relations, 2015d). Indonesia continues to carry out the second wave of executions of eight death row prisoners for narcotics cases consisting of 6 foreigners and 2 Indonesian citizens which occurred on April 29, 2015 (detikNews, 2015).

After the second wave of executions, condemnation came from UNODC, the UN agency for Crime and Narcotics, through a letter sent on July 29, 2016. In the letter UNODC opposes the death penalty carried out in Indonesia, UNODC asserts that the death penalty is not supported by international drug control conventions. According to UNODC international law stipulates that the death penalty can only be applied to the "most serious crimes", i.e. crimes involving intentional homicide, and UNODC argues that drug crimes are generally not considered to meet this threshold (UNODC, 2016). However, Indonesia remained undaunted by continuing to carry out the third wave of death sentences against 3 foreigners and 1 Indonesian citizen which was carried out on July 29, 2016 (Kompas.com, 2016).

After 3 waves of executions of the death penalty for narcotics offenses, until now no more executions have been carried out in Indonesia, but hundreds of death sentences are still handed down (Sander & Lines, 2018). Nevertheless, there is still pressure from various parties to abolish the death penalty for convicted drug cases because they allegedly violate human rights. However, various studies conducted reveal that the death penalty is not contradictory to the 1945 Constitution and international law because the Indonesian constitution does not adopt the principle of absolute human rights and is limited by article 28J which states that a person's human rights are used with obligations and respect the

human rights of others in order to create public order and social justice (Hutapea, 2016; Jumiaty, 2022; Purnomo, 2016).

Based on the narrative policy above, the following is a summary of the components of the Indonesian government's narrative regarding the death penalty policy for drug convicts:

**Table 1 Components of the Government's Narrative on Death Penalty Policy for Convicted Drug Cases**

Forms of Government Narrative Regarding Death Penalty Policy for Drug Convict Cases	
Level Analysis	Meso
<i>Setting</i>	President-elect Jokowi said that Indonesia is in a state of narcotics emergency that has the potential to damage generations and the nation. As a form of the state's seriousness in protecting the transnational organized narcotics crime community, the Indonesian government shows its seriousness by carrying out the death penalty for dealers and drug dealers. During the first period of Jokowi's leadership in 2014-2019, 3 waves of executions were carried out which executed 18 death row prisoners for narcotics cases consisting of 14 foreigners and 4 Indonesian citizens. The execution drew national and international condemnation, especially in relation to human rights.
Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protagonist: Government of Indonesia Antagonists: Drug dealers and dealers involved in transnational organized crime networks. Victims: Indonesian people who are vulnerable to drug abuse, generations and nations damaged by the adverse effects of transnational drug crime.</li> <li>• Protagonist: Government of Indonesia Antagonists: Drug dealers and dealers involved in transnational organized crime networks. Victims: Indonesian people who are vulnerable to drug abuse, generations and nations damaged by the adverse effects of transnational drug crime.</li> <li>• Protagonist: Government of Indonesia Antagonists: Drug dealers and dealers involved in transnational organized crime networks. Victims: Indonesian people who are vulnerable to drug abuse, generations and nations damaged by the adverse effects of transnational drug crime.</li> </ul>
Alur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• President Jokowi affirms that Indonesia is in a state of drug emergency</li> <li>• The execution of the death penalty for the first batch of drug convicts was carried out</li> <li>• There was condemnation from human rights NGOs such as Human Rights Watch, Human Rights Working Group, Imparsial, Komnas HAM, KontraS, LBH masyarakat, and PBHI)</li> <li>• The executed Dutch and Brazilian governments recalled their ambassadors in protest</li> <li>• Indonesia received pressure from the United Nations to abolish the death penalty during the 58th CND session</li> <li>• The second wave of executions was carried out</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indonesia received a written reprimand from UNODC and called for the death penalty to be abolished</li> <li>• The second wave of executions was carried out</li> <li>• National and international condemnation</li> <li>• The death sentence was carried out but the execution has not yet been carried out</li> <li>• Condemnation continues and calls for the abolition of the death penalty for drug offenders from human rights groups and the United Nations International Organization</li> </ul>
Message	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The government is serious in eradicating illicit drug trafficking crimes so that transnational narcotics crime networks cannot play with Indonesia and this is a form of the presence of the state in protecting its citizens from the threat of narcotics dangers.</li> </ul>
Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The execution of the death penalty was carried out very selectively and carefully.</li> <li>• The government continues to strive to uphold the integrity of law enforcement, consistency of policy makers towards the implementation of the death penalty.</li> </ul>

Source: Author analysis

### Metanarrative Analysis of Death Penalty Policy for Convicted Drug Cases

The metanarrative analysis was then carried out to map the main narrative built by the government regarding the death penalty policy for drug convicts in Indonesia as well as the counter-narrative built by community groups both nationally and internationally who urged that the death penalty for drug convicts could be abolished. The comparison between narratives is shown in Table 2 below:

**Table 2 Comparison of Main Narratives and Counter Narratives**

Narasi Utama	Cons Narasi	The Root of the Difference
The death penalty does not violate the constitution and human rights because drug crimes cause serious impacts that have the potential to destroy the nation and there are restrictions on human rights by taking into account the rights of others	The death penalty is a violation of the constitution and human rights. According to international penalties, the death penalty is allowed only for the most serious crimes, and drug crimes are not included;.	Differences of views on the definition of the most serious crimes and restrictions on human rights
The higher number of drug handling even though the death penalty is carried out has the potential to be worse if the death penalty is abolished	The death penalty is not effective in dealing with the drug problem.	Different views on the effectiveness of the death penalty and no empirical research examining the effectiveness of the death penalty on drug crime cases in Indonesia
The death penalty is a form of state protection against the threat of drug danger,	The death penalty is incompatible with the modern legal system which	Different views on the purpose of capital



---

executing convicted drug is supposed to be corrective punishment and its cases will save more rather than revenge. effectiveness. people.

---

Source: Author analysis

Based on Table 2, several gaps were found between government policies regarding the death penalty for drug convicts and groups that rejected the application of the death penalty, namely differences in interpretations of the most serious crimes and restrictions on human rights, the absence of empirical studies examining the effectiveness of the death penalty against the abuse and illicit circulation of narcotics and differences in views on the purpose of carrying out the death penalty. This difference is what ultimately makes the death penalty controversial.

The debate between drug control and the death penalty represents a major link between human rights and drug policy reform advocacy and is one of the most vivid examples of extreme law enforcement and drug control in the current period (Sander & Lines, 2018).

#### 4. Conclusion

The results of the narrative analysis of the death penalty policy for convicted drug cases in Indonesia came to several conclusions. The first conclusion shows that the narrative of the death penalty policy is starting to warm up again because President Jokowi mentioned that Indonesia has been in a state of narcotics emergency so that the state needs to take serious action to protect the public from the effects of drug abuse and illicit circulation, namely by implementing the death penalty which was followed up by the implementation of three waves of death penalty executions against 18 death row prisoners for narcotics cases in the first period Jokowi's administration. The second conclusion is that

The controversy arising from the implementation of the policy is due to differences in definitions of human rights restrictions and views on the entry of drug crimes into the most serious crimes punishable by death and the absence of empirical studies on the effectiveness of the application of the death penalty with the abuse and illicit circulation of narcotics. Third, there is a need for empirical studies on the effectiveness of the death penalty and a redefinition of human rights restrictions and the most serious crimes punishable by death

#### 5. References

- Amaritasari, Indah Pangestu. (2017). Keamanan Nasional dalam Konteks Isu-isu Global Kontemporer : Sebuah Tinjauan Hubungan Internasional. *Jurnal Keamanan Nasional*, III(1), 109–132.
- Anwar, Umar. (2016). Penjatuhan Hukuman Mati Bagi Bandar Narkoba Ditinjau dari Aspek Hak Asasi Manusia (Analisa Kasus Hukuman Mati Terpidana Kasus Bandar Narkoba; Freddy Budiman). *Jurnal LEGISLASI INDONESIA*, 13(03), 241–252.
- Asmoro, Widi, & Samputra, Palupi Lindiasari. (2021). Analisis Naratif Kebijakan: Kebijakan Ganja Medis di Indonesia. *Matra Pembaruan*, 5(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.21787/mp.5.1.2021.13-24>
- BBC News Indonesia. (2015). Pegiat HAM kecam eksekusi hukuman mati narkoba.
- Biswas, Subrata. (2021). Drug Abuse and Drug Trafficking: Non-Traditional Security Threats in Post-Soviet Central Asia. *Asian Journal of Legal Education*, 8(2), 247–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23220058211025964>
- CNN Indonesia. (2019). Vonis Hukuman Mati Naik 236 Persen di Era Jokowi.
- Crick, Emily. (2012). Drugs as an existential threat: An analysis of the international securitization of drugs. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 23(5), 407–414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2012.03.004>
- Das, Pamela, & Horton, Richard. (2019). The global drug problem: change but not progression. *The Lancet*, 394(10208), 1488–1490. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)32275-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32275-5)

- detikNews. (2015). Eksekusi Mati Gelombang II: Detik-detik Eksekusi Mati 8 Terpidana Mati Narkoba di Nusa Kambangan.
- Gunawan, Ricky, & Lai, Gloria. (2018). Consensus and contradictions in ASEAN: An analysis of Southeast Asia at and after UNGASS 2016. In Axel Klein & Blaine Stothard (Eds.), *Collapse of the Global Order on Drugs: From UNGASS 2016 to Review 2019* (bll 151–165). <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78756-487-920181007>
- Humas BNN. (2015a). Ada Asap Pasti Ada Api, Ada Hukuman Mati Pasti Ada Kerugian Yang Berarti.
- Humas BNN. (2015b). Eksekusi Mati Untuk Proteksi Negeri.
- Humas BNN. (2015c). Hukuman Mati, Berikan Keamanan dan Kenyamanan.
- Humas BNN. (2015d). Sikap Indonesia Terhadap Desakan Penghapusan Hukuman Mati Pada Sidang CND Ke 58 di Wina. Sikap Indonesia Terhadap Desakan Penghapusan Hukuman Mati Pada Sidang CND Ke 58 di Wina.
- Hutapea, Bungasan. (2016). *Kontroversi Penjatuhan Hukuman Mati terhadap Tindak Pidana Narkotika dalam Perspektif Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia*. Jakarta: Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia Kementerian Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia RI.
- Iriani, Dewi. (2015). Kejahatan Narkoba: Penanggulangan, Pencegahan dan Penerapan Hukuman Mati. *Justitia Islamica*, 12(2), 305–330.
- Jacob, Efryan R. T. (2017). Pelaksanaan Pidana Mati Menurut Undang-undang Nomor 2/PNPS/1964. *Lex Crimen*, VI(1), 98–105.
- Jumiati, Agatha. (2022). Asas Kepastian Hukum Pelaksanaan Hukuman Mati di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ius Civile (Refleksi Penegakan Hukum dan Keadilan)*, 6(16), 26–36.
- Jungrav-gieorgica, Natalia. (2021). Narrative Policy Framework – public policy as a battle of narratives. In *ResearchGate*.
- Kolopita, Satrio Putra. (2013). Penegakan Hukum atas Pidana Mati Terhadap Pelaku Tindak Pidana Narkotika. *Lex crimen*, II(4), 63–71.
- Kompas.com. (2015). Presiden Jokowi: Indonesia Gawat Darurat Narkoba.
- Kompas.com. (2016). Ini 1 WNI dan 3 WNA yang Dieksekusi Mati pada 29 Juli 2016.
- Kramer, Elisabeth, & Stoicescu, Claudia. (2022). 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*, 92(2021), 103265. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2021.103265>
- Nelson, Ediomio Ubong E. (2021). Between Prohibition and Regulation: Narrative Analysis of Cannabis Policy Debate in Africa. In *Global Drug Policy Observatory: Reporting Monitoring Analysis*.
- Pane, Musa Darwin. (2019). Kebijakan Hukuman Mati Ditinjau dari Perspektif Hukum Positif dan Hak Asasi Manusia. *Res Nullius Law Journal*, 1(1), 37–48.
- Purnomo, Agus. (2016). Hukuman Mati Bagi Tindak Pidana Narkoba di Indonesia: Perspektif Sosiologi Hukum. *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum dan Syar'iah*, 8(1), 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v8i1.3726>
- Puslitdatin BNN. (2022). *Indonesia Drugs Report 2022*. Jakarta: Badan Narkotika Nasional RI.
- Rachman, Fathur. (2018). Implementasi Nilai Pancasila Terhadap Hukuman Mati Tindak Pidana Narkotika. *Pranata Hukum*, 13(2), 181–186.
- Rahadian, Lalu. (2015). Delapan Lembaga HAM Kecam Eksekusi Mati Terpidana Narkoba.
- Sander, Gen. (2021). State sanctioned killing in the name of drugs: Laws, practice and conflicting trends in Asia. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 92(2021), 103266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2021.103266>
- Sander, Gen, & Lines, Rick. (2018). The Death Penalty for Drug Offences : Pulling Back the Curtain to Expose a Flawed Regime. In Axel Klein & Blaine Stothard (Eds.), *Collapse of the Global Order on Drugs: From UNGASS 2016 to Review 2019* (bll 49–63). <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78756-487-920181002>

- Sato, Mai. (2022). Politics of International Advocacy Against the Death Penalty: Governments as Anti-Death Penalty Crusaders. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 11(3), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.2471>
- Sekretaris Kabinet RI. (2015). Eksekusi Mati 6 Terpidana Narkoba, Presiden Jokowi Minta Negara Lain Hormati Indonesia.
- Shanahan, Elizabeth A., Jones, Michael D., & Mcbeth, Mark K. (2017). How to conduct a Narrative Policy Framework study. *The Social Science Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2017.12.002>
- Susanto, Mei. (2017). Kebijakan Moderasi Pidana Mati: Kajian Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 2-3/PUU-V/2007. *Jurnal Yudisial*, 10(2), 193–215.
- UNODC. (2016). Statement by the UNODC Executive Director on the recent executions in Indonesia (26 July 2016).
- UNODC. (2021). Global overview of drug demand and supply. In *World Drug Report 2021* (bll 1–108). <https://doi.org/10.18356/bdc264f4-en>
- UNODC. (2022a). *Global Overview: Drug Demand Drug Supply* (2nd ed). Vienn: UNODC.
- UNODC. (2022b). Indonesia: Counter transnational organized crime and illicit trafficking.
- Villegas, Melissa Mariana. (2021). *A Narrative Analysis of Bush's 1989 War on Drugs Speech*. California State University, Fresno.
- Waluyo, Andilala. (2015). Hukuman Mati Terhadap 6 Terpidana Narkoba Dilaksanakan Minggu Ini.
- Widi, Shilvina. (2022). Vonis Hukuman Mati di Indonesia Melonjak pada 2021.