

ABSTRAK

This research tried to prove that there is a contradiction in forms of ideological interests prior to human rights violations in Raif Badawi case. These ideological interests are considered to be Sweden and Saudi Arabia's consideration in making foreign policy decisions. Theory which this study stands is from Donald E. Nuechterlein's perspective called Ideological Interest. Prior to Raif Badawi case, there has been a different stance between Sweden and Saudi Arabia over human rights implementation which leads to diplomatic spats between two countries. Based on Sweden's foreign policy, Sweden feels the obligation to promote human rights, and sees Badawi's case as an action of human rights abuse. So then there's a critical statement addressed to Saudi Arabia's authorities over the inappropriate punishments to Raif Badawi. In the other hand, Saudi Arabia takes Sweden criticism as an insult of Sharia and also as form of intervention over Sharia implementation in the kingdom. Nevertheless, this research also tried to reveal redirection of foreign policies for both countries. Using a model called Adaptive Foreign Policy, which conducted by Charles Hermann and James N. Rosenau, there are 3 remarkable factors noting the case, namely international public opinion, domestic or structural factor, and additional factor known as leader's influence.

Key words: *Sharia, Hak Asasi Manusia, Ideologi, Swedia, Arab Saudi*