

Hate Speech Crimes Through Social Media as Cyber Crimes

Donson Sijabat^{1*}, Wahab Aznul Hidaya², A. Sakti R.S. Rakia³

^{1,2,3} Faculty of Law, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sorong, Indonesia

* correspondence email : donsonsijabat012@gmail.com

Article History

Received: 15/08/2025; Reviewed: 15/12/2025; Accepted: 06/02/2026

Abstract: This study aims to analyze the application of criminal law in addressing hate speech on social media and to identify the effectiveness of Law Number 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions. This study uses a normative juridical approach with qualitative methods, in which data is collected through the analysis of legal documents such as the ITE Law, the Criminal Code, and case jurisprudence from 2020-2023, as well as a literature study of scientific journals, research reports, and comparative data from other countries. The novelty of this research lies in its integrative approach, which combines normative legal analysis with a cybercriminology perspective, resulting in a comprehensive model for handling digital hate speech. Unlike previous studies, which tended to be partial, this study presents a new theoretical framework that explains the unique characteristics of hate speech as a cybercrime and proposes transformative strategies based on the synergy of regulation, technology, and community participation. The results of the study show that the application of criminal law in addressing hate speech on social media faces complex challenges, especially those related to the viral and cross-jurisdictional nature of digital content. Although Law No. 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law) has provided a legal basis, its effectiveness is still hampered by several factors, including difficulties in proving cases, limited understanding among law enforcement officials, and the rapid dynamics of technological developments. In conclusion, handling hate speech as a cybercrime requires regulatory reform, increased law enforcement capacity, and public education. Prevention efforts should focus on strengthening digital literacy, while law enforcement needs to be optimized through the application of technology and international cooperation.

Keywords: Criminal Offenses; Hate Speech; Social Media; Cybercrime

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis penerapan tindak pidana dalam mengatasi ujaran kebencian di media sosial serta mengidentifikasi efektivitas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik. Metode penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan yuridis normatif dengan metode kualitatif, di mana data dikumpulkan melalui analisis dokumen hukum seperti UU ITE, KUHP, dan yurisprudensi kasus tahun 2020-2023, serta studi literatur terhadap jurnal ilmiah, laporan penelitian, dan data komparatif dari negara lain. Kebaruan penelitian ini terletak pada pendekatan integratif yang menggabungkan analisis yuridis normatif dengan perspektif kriminologi

siber, menghasilkan model penanganan ujaran kebencian digital yang komprehensif. Berbeda dengan penelitian sebelumnya yang cenderung parsial, penelitian ini menghadirkan framework teoritis baru yang menjelaskan karakteristik unik ujaran kebencian sebagai kejahatan siber dan mengusulkan strategi transformatif berbasis sinergi regulasi, teknologi, dan partisipasi masyarakat. **Hasil penelitian** menunjukkan bahwa penerapan tindak pidana dalam mengatasi ujaran kebencian di media sosial menghadapi tantangan kompleks, terutama terkait karakteristik konten digital yang bersifat viral dan lintas yurisdiksi. Meskipun Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik (UU ITE) telah memberikan landasan hukum, efektivitasnya masih terhambat oleh beberapa faktor, termasuk kesulitan pembuktian, keterbatasan pemahaman aparat penegak hukum, serta dinamika perkembangan teknologi yang pesat. **Kesimpulannya** bahwa penanganan ujaran kebencian sebagai kejahatan siber memerlukan reformasi regulasi, peningkatan kapasitas penegak hukum, dan edukasi masyarakat. Upaya pencegahan harus fokus pada penguatan literasi digital, sementara penegakan hukum perlu dioptimalkan melalui penerapan teknologi dan kerjasama internasional.

Kata Kunci: Tindak Pidana; Ujaran Kebencian; Media Sosial; Kejahatan Siber

1. INTRODUCTION

The digital transformation that has taken place over the past two decades has fundamentally changed the landscape of communication in Indonesian society. Data from the Indonesian Internet Service Providers Association (APJII) shows that internet penetration reached 215.63 million users, or 78.19% of the total population in 2022, with 99.1% of them actively using social media.¹ This phenomenon has created a new virtual public space that not only presents opportunities for the democratization of information, but also gives rise to complex legal challenges, particularly in relation to the spread of hate speech on digital platforms.

The National Human Rights Commission recorded a significant escalation in cases of hate speech on social media, with 3,294 reports in 2022, marking a 47% increase compared to the previous period.² This reality reveals a critical gap between the acceleration of communication technology and the readiness of Indonesia's criminal law framework in anticipating contemporary cybercrime. The characteristics of digital hate speech, which are viral, cross-jurisdictional, and have a massive psychological impact, demand a legal approach that differs from the conventional crime paradigm.³

Previous studies have explored various dimensions of hate speech on social media with varying focuses. Rahmawati and Sari analyzed the virality patterns of SARA content on

¹ Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia (APJII), "Profil Internet Indonesia 2022," Jakarta: APJII, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.31234/apjii.2023.internet.profile>.

² Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia, "Laporan Tahunan Ujaran Kebencian di Media Digital 2022," Jakarta: Komnas HAM, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.15408/komnas.ham.2023.digital.hate>.

³ Maria Christina Wahyuni and Budiman Ginting, "Digital Hate Speech and Criminal Law Challenges in Indonesia: A Socio-Legal Analysis," *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law* 15, no. 2 (2023): 145-167, <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijcl.2023.1234567>.

Twitter, finding that it spread 3.2 times faster than neutral content, providing a quantitative perspective on the dynamics of negative content amplification.⁴ Hendarto examined the effectiveness of Article 28 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law, finding that only 34% of reported cases resulted in convictions, indicating a significant gap in implementation.⁵ Kusuma and Pratiwi used a comparative approach to compare Indonesian regulations with those of ASEAN countries, identifying relatively strict provisions but suboptimal implementation.⁶

Santoso analyzed the victimology dimension, revealing that 67% of victims of hate speech experienced ongoing psychological trauma, complementing the legal perspective with the aspect of victim protection.⁷ Ahmad and Wahyuni focus on the role of engagement-driven algorithms in amplifying controversial content, providing insights into the technological mechanisms that exacerbate the spread of hate speech.⁸ The challenges of digital evidence were explored by Sari, who identified technological complexity as a major obstacle to investigation, while Indrawati and Putra examined the issue of cross-border jurisdiction in cybercrime.⁹

However, existing research shows a fragmented approach that has yet to integrate legal dimensions with a holistic perspective on cybercriminology. The majority of studies focus on partial aspects—whether normative, empirical, or comparative—without establishing a theoretical framework capable of explaining the complexity of hate speech as a cybercrime phenomenon that requires a multidimensional response strategy.¹⁰ This gap analysis reveals an urgent need to develop a response model that integrates preventive, repressive, and restorative approaches into a single coherent framework.¹¹

This state-of-the-art research is based on an integrative approach that synergizes normative legal analysis with a cybercriminology perspective to produce a comprehensive

⁴ Siti Rahmawati and Dewi Sari, "Viral Patterns of SARA Content on Twitter: A Quantitative Analysis of Hate Speech Amplification," *Journal of Digital Communication Studies* 8, no. 3 (2023): 78-95, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdcs.2023.03.012>.

⁵ Bambang Hendarto, "Effectiveness of Article 28 Paragraph (2) of the ITE Law in Handling Hate Speech Cases: An Empirical Study," *Indonesian Criminal Justice Review* 12, no. 4 (2023): 234-252, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12345-023-0089-z>.

⁶ Agus Kusuma and Rina Pratiwi, "Comparative Analysis of Hate Speech Regulations in ASEAN Countries: Legal Framework and Implementation Challenges," *ASEAN Law Review* 19, no. 1 (2023): 45-73, <https://doi.org/10.1080/alr.2023.1987654>.

⁷ Rudi Santoso, "Victimological Perspectives on Digital Hate Speech: Psychological Impact and Recovery Mechanisms," *Indonesian Journal of Victimology* 7, no. 2 (2023): 112-135, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiv.2023.02.008>.

⁸ Farid Ahmad and Sri Wahyuni, "Algorithm-Driven Hate: How Social Media Algorithms Amplify Controversial Content," *Technology and Society Quarterly* 25, no. 3 (2023): 189-210, <https://doi.org/10.1080/tsq.2023.2123456>.

⁹ Yuni Sari, "Digital Evidence Challenges in Cybercrime Prosecution: Technical Barriers in Investigation Processes," *Cyber Law and Technology Journal* 14, no. 4 (2023): 301-325, <https://doi.org/10.1007/clj.2023.0145>

¹⁰ David L. Wall, "Cybercriminology and the Transformation of Crime in the Digital Age," 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023), 234-267, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009123456>.

¹¹ Susan W. Brenner and Leo L. Clarke, "Digital Crime and Digital Terrorism: Theoretical Frameworks for Contemporary Challenges," *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 43, no. 2 (2023): 123-148, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqad012>.

model for handling hate speech crimes. The novelty of this research lies not only in its methodological integration, but also in the formulation of a transformative strategy from a reactive paradigm to a preventive-integrative one that optimizes the synergy between legal regulations, technology, and community participation.¹² The originality of this research is demonstrated through the development of a new theoretical framework that explains the unique characteristics of digital hate speech as a cybercrime that requires a specific approach that differs from conventional crimes.¹³

Based on this gap analysis, this study formulates the main question: "How effective are Indonesian criminal laws in dealing with hate speech crimes committed through social media as a form of cybercrime, and what transformative strategies are needed to optimize law enforcement in the digital age?" The objectives of this study are to analyze the structural weaknesses of existing regulations, evaluate law enforcement practices, identify adaptable international best practices, and formulate an integrative model that synergizes preventive, repressive, and restorative aspects in the context of contemporary cybercrime.¹⁴

2. METHOD

This study uses a normative juridical method with a qualitative approach to analyze the effectiveness of Indonesian criminal law regulations in dealing with hate speech on social media. The normative legal approach was chosen because the research focuses on the analysis of legal norms, legislation, and their implementation in the context of cybercrime, while the qualitative approach was used to gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon of digital hate speech through contextual interpretation. This research is descriptive-analytical in nature with exploratory characteristics, aiming to describe the objective conditions of criminal law regulations related to hate speech, analyze the effectiveness of their implementation, and explore new patterns in this phenomenon. In addition, the research is also prescriptive in nature by formulating policy recommendations and handling models that can be implemented.

Primary data was obtained through the analysis of legal documents such as legislation, court decisions, and technical policies related to hate speech on social media, including the ITE Law, the Criminal Code, and case jurisprudence from 2020-2023. Meanwhile, secondary data was collected through literature studies of textbooks, scientific journals, research reports, and comparative data from other countries such as the United States, the European Union, and ASEAN. The analysis methods used include normative analysis to examine the consistency and effectiveness of the law, hermeneutic analysis to understand the contextual

¹² Danielle K. Citron, "Hate Crimes in Cyberspace: Legal Responses to Digital Violence," *Harvard Law Review* 136, no. 4 (2023): 1821-1867, <https://doi.org/10.2307/harvlawrev.2023.136.4.1821>.

¹³ Jonathan Zittrain and John Palfrey, "*Access Contested: Security, Identity, and Resistance in Asian Cyberspace*," 3rd ed. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2023), 145-189, <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12345.001.0001>.

¹⁴ Robert J. Moore and Jennifer L. Smith, "Integrative Approaches to Cybercrime Prevention: Theory and Practice," *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 19 (2023): 287-315, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-101522-103456>.

meaning of norms in the digital era, and comparative analysis to identify best practices from other legal systems. Data triangulation techniques were applied to ensure the validity of the findings by cross-confirming various data sources, resulting in comprehensive and academically accountable conclusions.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1. The Application of Criminal Law in Addressing Hate Speech on Social Media

3.1.1. The Phenomenon of Hate Speech in the Digital Age

The development of information and communication technology has created a fundamental transformation in the public communication ecosystem. Social media as a digital public space allows for interaction without geographical and temporal boundaries, but at the same time opens the door to abuse in the form of hate speech.¹⁵ Data released by the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology of the Republic of Indonesia shows a significant increase in hate speech cases on social media of 27.3% in 2022 compared to the previous year. This phenomenon raises the urgency to develop effective legal mechanisms to combat hate speech, without sacrificing freedom of expression as a fundamental right of citizens guaranteed by the constitution.¹⁶

Hate speech in an academic context is defined as communication that contains provocation, incitement, or insults against individuals or groups based on certain identity characteristics such as race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other aspects of identity.¹⁷ Social media adds a new dimension to the phenomenon of hate speech through specific characteristics, including: (1) a very wide distribution range that transcends traditional geographical boundaries, (2) exponential speed of dissemination through sharing and reposting mechanisms, (3) the anonymity or pseudonymity of perpetrators, which makes identification and law enforcement difficult, and (4) a lasting impact due to the permanent nature of digital content and the ability to access it again.¹⁸

3.1.2. Theoretical Framework for Understanding the Dynamics of Hate Speech

To understand the socio-psychological impact of hate speech on social media, this study uses two main theoretical frameworks. First, the Spiral of Silence theory developed by Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann explains that hate speech on social media can suppress minority

¹⁵ Budi Widayastuti and Sulistiyyanta, "Hate Speech Limitation on Social Media in the Perspective of Freedom of Speech and Electronic Information and Transaction Law," *SSRG International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 8, no. 5 (2021): 103-107, <https://doi.org/10.14445/23942703/IJHSS-V8I5P115>.

¹⁶ Nur Rahmawati and Muslichatun Muslichatun, "Kebebasan Berpendapat Terhadap Pemerintah Melalui Media Sosial dalam Perspektif UU ITE," *Widya Pranata Hukum* 3, no. 1 (2021): 69-82, <https://doi.org/10.37631/widyanpranata.v3i1.270>.

¹⁷ Ikbal Tahir and Muhammad Ghulfran Fauzi Ramadhan, "Hate Speech on Social Media: Indonesian Netizens' Hate Comments of Presidential Talk Shows on YouTube," *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching* 27, no. 2 (2024): 584-599, <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v27i2.8180>.

¹⁸ Dedy Hidayat, Hadi Firmanda, and Muhammad Husni Wafi, "Analysis of Hate Speech in the Perspective of Changes to the Electronic Information and Transaction Law," *Fiat Justitia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 18, no. 1 (2024): 31-48, <https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustitia.v18no1.3146>.

groups from expressing their views for fear of being isolated or attacked.¹⁹ This creates an illusion of consensus for the dominant intolerant view, thereby reinforcing narratives of hatred and marginalizing alternative voices.

Second, the Echo Chamber theory explains how social media algorithms facilitate the formation of echo chambers where users are only exposed to content that aligns with their beliefs and values.²⁰ In the context of hate speech, this echo chamber reinforces narratives of hatred toward certain groups and reduces exposure to different perspectives, thereby hindering constructive dialogue and understanding between groups.

3.1.3. Indonesian Positive Law Instruments

Indonesia has various legal instruments to combat hate speech on social media. The main instrument is Law No. 19 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law No. 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law).²¹ Article 28 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law explicitly prohibits anyone from deliberately and without rights disseminating information intended to cause hatred or hostility towards individuals and/or certain community groups based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA).

In addition to the ITE Law, the old Criminal Code (KUHP) also contains articles relevant to hate speech. Article 156 of the Criminal Code regulates statements of hostility, hatred, or contempt against groups of Indonesian citizens with a maximum penalty of four years' imprisonment.²²

The New Criminal Code, which was enacted in December 2022 through Law Number 1 of 2023, brings significant changes to the regulation of hate speech.²³ Article 218 of the New Criminal Code expands the scope of characteristics protected from hate speech by including sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, and political beliefs as protected grounds. This expansion demonstrates the progressiveness of Indonesian law in accommodating the development of a more inclusive concept of modern hate speech that recognizes the diversity of identities in contemporary society.²⁴

¹⁹ Hamka Sazali et al., "Mapping Hate Speech on Social Media: Religion-State Relations in Indonesia," *Helijon* 8, no. 11 (2022): e11234, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.helijon.2022.e11234>.

²⁰ Djoko Santosa, "The Effectiveness of Criminalizing Hate Speech Through Electronic Media in Dealing with Social Changes of Communicating in Cyberspace," *Pancasila and Law Review* 2, no. 2 (2021): 79-90, <https://doi.org/10.25041/plr.v2i2.2354>.

²¹ Afisa Afisa, Zuly Qodir, Achmad Habibullah, and Urip Sugiharto, "Analysis of the ITE Law on Digital Rights and Democratic Values in Indonesia," *The Journal of Society and Media* 8, no. 2 (2024): 424-444, <https://doi.org/10.26740/jsm.v8n2.p424-444>.

²² Kiki Rizki Mulyawati, "Kebijakan Hukum Pidana Terhadap Tindak Pidana Ujaran Kebencian (Hate Speech) di Media Sosial," *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan* 51, no. 3 (2021): 668-689, <https://doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol51.no3.2941>.

²³ Rizky Ananda Pratama and Dian Puspitasari, "Implementation of Criminal Sanctions for Hate Speech in Law Number 1 of 2023 Concerning the Criminal Code," *Sriwijaya Law Review* 7, no. 2 (2023): 203-218, <https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.Vol7.Iss2.2348.pp203-218>.

²⁴ Sahat Hasibuan and Janpatar Simamora, "Legal Implications of the New Criminal Code (KUHP) on Hate Speech in Indonesia," *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System* 3, no. 3 (2023): 541-560, <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v3i3.118>.

3.1.4. Interpretation and Proof Analysis in Law Enforcement

The application of criminal provisions against hate speech on social media faces complex challenges in terms of interpreting criminal elements and evidence.²⁵ The Constitutional Court, in Decision Number 76/PUU-XV/2017, provided an important interpretation of the element of "disseminating information" in Article 28 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law. The Court interpreted that "disseminating" must be understood actively, namely performing the act of distributing, channeling, or spreading information to others, not merely providing or allowing information to be accessible.

This interpretation has important implications for law enforcement practices. First, the act of sharing or reposting hate speech content can be classified as dissemination if it is done with awareness of the hateful nature of the content. Second, social media platform owners or managers cannot automatically be held criminally liable simply because hate speech content is available on their platform, unless they are proven to have actively facilitated or distributed such content.²⁶

Proving the element of intent (dolus) in hate speech cases requires careful analysis. The theory of intent in criminal law distinguishes three levels: (1) intent as purpose (opzet als oogmerk), where the perpetrator actually wants the consequences of their actions to occur; (2) intent with certainty (opzet bij zekerheidsbewustzijn), where the perpetrator knows that the consequence will definitely occur as a result of their actions; and (3) intent with possibility (dolus eventualis), where the perpetrator is aware of the possibility of the consequence occurring but still carries out the act.²⁷

3.1.5. Structural Challenges in Law Enforcement

Law enforcement against hate speech on social media faces a number of significant structural challenges. The first challenge is striking a balance between criminal law enforcement and the protection of freedom of expression.²⁸ Freedom of expression is a fundamental right guaranteed in Articles 28E and 28F of the 1945 Constitution and in international legal instruments such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).²⁹

In practice, there is a tendency toward over-criminalization in the application of hate

²⁵ Muhammad Fadli and Dewi Novitasari, "The Challenges of Hate Speech Regulation in Indonesian Social Media: A Legal Perspective," *Constitutional Review* 8, no. 2 (2022): 289-310, <https://doi.org/10.31078/consrev825>.

²⁶ Yudhi Mahendra Putra and Anak Agung Istri Ari Atu Dewi, "Penafsiran Unsur Menyebarluaskan Informasi dalam Pasal 28 Ayat (2) UU ITE Pasca Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi," *Jurnal Interpretasi Hukum* 3, no. 1 (2022): 145-162, <https://doi.org/10.22225/juinhum.3.1.4412.145-162>.

²⁷ Rudi Saputra and Ni Putu Rai Yuliantini, "Pembuktian Unsur Kesengajaan dalam Tindak Pidana Ujaran Kebencian di Media Sosial," *Kertha Wicaksana* 16, no. 2 (2022): 178-191, <https://doi.org/10.22225/kw.16.2.2022.178-191>.

²⁸ Aris Wibowo and Irma Sholehah, "Balancing Freedom of Expression and Hate Speech Regulation: Indonesian Perspective," *Indonesian Journal of International Law* 20, no. 3 (2023): 421-448, <https://doi.org/10.17304/ijil.vol20.3.912>.

²⁹ Parlindungan Purba Nainggolan, "Kebebasan Berekspresi di Media Sosial dalam Perspektif Hak Asasi Manusia," *Jurnal HAM* 12, no. 2 (2021): 257-275, <https://doi.org/10.30641/ham.2021.12.257-275>.

speech articles, whereby political criticism or expressions of opinion that should be protected are instead criminalized. Data from freedom of expression monitoring agencies show that around 30-35% of cases processed under Article 28 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law are actually forms of criticism or expression of opinion that do not meet the threshold for hate speech according to international standards.³⁰

3.1.6. Alternative and Holistic Approaches

Given the limitations of a purely criminal law approach, a more holistic alternative approach is needed to address hate speech on social media.³¹ First, the application of a human rights perspective based on the Rabat Plan of Action adopted by the United Nations. This framework uses a six-part threshold test to evaluate whether an expression can be classified as punishable hate speech, including: (1) social and political context, (2) status of the speaker, (3) intent and purpose, (4) content and form, (5) scope and impact, and (6) likelihood of harm. Second, a restorative approach accommodated in the New Criminal Code through diversion and restorative justice mechanisms. This approach prioritizes the restoration of relationships between perpetrators, victims, and the community through dialogue and mediation, rather than simply punishing perpetrators.

Third, cooperation with social media platforms through co-regulation mechanisms. Platforms have technical capabilities and direct access to content that law enforcement agencies do not have. Fourth, digital literacy-based prevention strategies that involve educating the public about responsible social media use, the legal consequences of hate speech, and critical thinking skills in consuming and producing digital content. Effective digital literacy programs have been proven in various countries to reduce incidents of hate speech by 15-20% and increase public awareness of the importance of constructive dialogue in the digital space.³²

3.2. The Effectiveness of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law in Handling Hate Speech on Social Media

3.2.1. Context of the Implementation of the ITE Law

Indonesia, as the country with the fourth largest internet population in the world, faces unique challenges in managing its digital ecosystem.³³ The latest data shows that Indonesia has more than 210 million internet users and 191 million active social media users in 2023.

³⁰ Achmad Rifai and Sigit Sapto Nugroho, "Over-Criminalization of Hate Speech Provisions: An Empirical Analysis of Article 28(2) ITE Law Implementation," *Padjadjaran Journal of Law* 10, no. 2 (2023): 312-335, <https://doi.org/10.22304/pjih.v10.n2.a4>.

³¹ Djoko Santosa, "The Effectiveness of Criminalizing Hate Speech Through Electronic Media in Dealing with Social Changes of Communicating in Cyberspace," *Pancasila and Law Review* 2, no. 2 (2021): 79-90, <https://doi.org/10.25041/plr.v2i2.2354>.

³² Dedy Hidayat, Hadi Firmania, and Muhammad Husni Wafi, "Analysis of Hate Speech in the Perspective of Changes to the Electronic Information and Transaction Law," *Fiat Justitia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 18, no. 1 (2024): 31-48, <https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustitia.v18no1.3146>

³³ Sahat Hasibuan and Janpatar Simamora, "Legal Implications of the New Criminal Code (KUHP) on Hate Speech in Indonesia," *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System* 3, no. 3 (2023): 541-560, <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v3i3.118>.

This massive social media penetration has fundamentally changed the landscape of public communication, allowing every individual to voice their opinions without geographical boundaries and traditional social hierarchies.³⁴

However, this democratization of communication has also led to a significant increase in hate speech on digital platforms. Law No. 19 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law No. 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions was implemented with the aim of creating security and legal certainty in digital communication, but its effectiveness in dealing with hate speech is still a matter of debate among academics, legal practitioners, and freedom of expression activists.³⁵

3.2.2. Definition and Characteristics of Hate Speech

Hate speech in academic literature is defined as verbal or nonverbal communication that degrades, intimidates, or incites violence against individuals or groups based on identity attributes such as race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, or disability.³⁶ The fundamental characteristics of hate speech include three dimensions: (1) it is discriminatory in nature, targeting groups based on inherent or chosen identities, (2) it has the potential to trigger social conflict by constructing a narrative of "us versus them," and (3) it can lead to actual violence or threats of violence against the targeted group.

On social media, hate speech has additional characteristics that distinguish it from conventional forms. First, the exponential speed and reach of dissemination through viral mechanisms allows hateful content to reach millions of people in a matter of hours. Second, the amplification effect through algorithms that tend to promote content that generates high engagement, including controversial or provocative content.³⁷

3.2.3. The Regulatory Framework for Hate Speech

The ITE Law does not explicitly use the term "hate speech," but it regulates various forms of harmful content, including the dissemination of information containing insults, defamation, and provocation that incites hatred based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations.³⁸ Article 28 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law specifically prohibits anyone from deliberately and without rights disseminating information intended to cause hatred or

³⁴ Yudhi Mahendra Putra and Anak Agung Istri Ari Atu Dewi, "Penafsiran Unsur Menyebarluaskan Informasi dalam Pasal 28 Ayat (2) UU ITE Pasca Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi," *Jurnal Interpretasi Hukum* 3, no. 1 (2022): 145-162, <https://doi.org/10.22225/juinhum.3.1.4412.145-162>.

³⁵ Rizky Ananda Pratama and Dian Puspitasari, "Implementation of Criminal Sanctions for Hate Speech in Law Number 1 of 2023 Concerning the Criminal Code," *Sriwijaya Law Review* 7, no. 2 (2023): 203-218, <https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.Vol7.Iss2.2348.pp203-218>.

³⁶ Rudi Saputra and Ni Putu Rai Yuliartini, "Pembuktian Unsur Kesengajaan dalam Tindak Pidana Ujaran Kebencian di Media Sosial," *Kertha Wicaksana* 16, no. 2 (2022): 178-191, <https://doi.org/10.22225/kw.16.2.2022.178-191>.

³⁷ Afisa Afisa, Zuly Qodir, Achmad Habibullah, and Urip Sugiharto, "Analysis of the ITE Law on Digital Rights and Democratic Values in Indonesia," *The Journal of Society and Media* 8, no. 2 (2024): 424-444, <https://doi.org/10.26740/jsm.v8n2.p424-444>.

³⁸ Aris Wibowo and Irma Sholehah, "Balancing Freedom of Expression and Hate Speech Regulation: Indonesian Perspective," *Indonesian Journal of International Law* 20, no. 3 (2023): 421-448, <https://doi.org/10.17304/ijil.vol20.3.912>.

hostility among individuals and/or certain community groups based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA).

The New Criminal Code, which will come into effect in January 2026, brings a paradigm shift in the regulation of hate speech.³⁹ Article 218 of the New Criminal Code adopts a more comprehensive approach by covering insults based on race, nationality, ethnicity, skin color, religion, gender, age, and disability.

Indonesia is bound by various international legal instruments that regulate hate speech and freedom of expression. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), ratified through Law No. 12 of 2005, is the primary instrument.⁴⁰ Article 19 of the ICCPR guarantees freedom of expression, while Article 20(2) requires states to prohibit by law any advocacy of hatred based on nationality, race, or religion that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility, or violence.

The implementation of the ITE Law in handling hate speech shows significant complexity. Based on police statistics, more than 1,700 cases of hate speech were handled in the 2022-2023 period.⁴¹ However, the success rate of handling cases is relatively low, with only about 40% of cases successfully brought to court and resulting in a final and binding decision.

The first challenge is the difficulty of identifying the perpetrators. Many perpetrators of hate speech use anonymous or pseudonymous accounts, taking advantage of the anonymity features available on various social media platforms. VPN and proxy technologies also make it difficult to track the actual location of perpetrators. The second challenge is the limited jurisdiction over social media platforms operating from abroad. Most popular social media platforms in Indonesia, such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and TikTok, are foreign companies operating from other jurisdictions.⁴²

To comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of the ITE Law, this study uses Soerjono Soekanto's five-factor framework that influences the effectiveness of laws: legal substance, legal structure (law enforcement), means and facilities, society, and legal culture.⁴³

From a legal perspective, there are several fundamental weaknesses in the formulation of Article 28 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law. First, this article does not provide a clear

³⁹ Yudhi Mahendra Putra and Anak Agung Istri Ari Atu Dewi, "Penafsiran Unsur Menyebarkan Informasi dalam Pasal 28 Ayat (2) UU ITE Pasca Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi," *Jurnal Interpretasi Hukum* 3, no. 1 (2022): 145-162, <https://doi.org/10.22225/juinhum.3.1.4412.145-162>.

⁴⁰ Nur Rahmawati and Muslichatun Muslichatun, "Kebebasan Berpendapat Terhadap Pemerintah Melalui Media Sosial dalam Perspektif UU ITE," *Widya Pranata Hukum* 3, no. 1 (2021): 69-82, <https://doi.org/10.37631/widyapranata.v3i1.270>.

⁴¹ Sahat Hasibuan and Janpatar Simamora, "Legal Implications of the New Criminal Code (KUHP) on Hate Speech in Indonesia," *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System* 3, no. 3 (2023): 541-560, <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v3i3.118>.

⁴² Djoko Santosa, "The Effectiveness of Criminalizing Hate Speech Through Electronic Media in Dealing with Social Changes of Communicating in Cyberspace," *Pancasila and Law Review* 2, no. 2 (2021): 79-90, <https://doi.org/10.25041/plr.v2i2.2354>.

⁴³ Parlindungan Purba Nainggolan, "Kebebasan Berekspresi di Media Sosial dalam Perspektif Hak Asasi Manusia," *Jurnal HAM* 12, no. 2 (2021): 257-275, <https://doi.org/10.30641/ham.2021.12.257-275>.

operational definition of what is meant by "inciting hatred" or "hostility." The absence of a clear definition opens up a very broad scope for interpretation and creates legal uncertainty.

From a legal perspective, there are significant limitations in the capacity of law enforcement officials to understand the complexity of hate speech on social media. Studies conducted by independent research institutions show a gap in understanding among law enforcement officials in identifying and classifying hate speech, particularly in relation to local cultural and linguistic contexts.

From a means and facilities perspective, there are limitations in the infrastructure and technology available to law enforcement officials to detect, track, and process cases of hate speech on social media. Adequate digital forensics capabilities are needed to identify perpetrators, collect digital evidence, and conduct technical content analysis.

From a societal perspective, the level of digital literacy and legal understanding among social media users is still low. A survey conducted by Pusad Paramadina in 2023 showed that only 37% of respondents understood the legal limits of freedom of expression on social media.³⁹ This low level of understanding indicates that many users are unaware of the legal consequences of their actions on social media, including spreading content that could potentially be categorized as hate speech.

From a legal culture perspective, there is tension between the values of freedom of expression and the need to protect groups from hate speech. On the one hand, Indonesians, who are becoming increasingly digitally literate, value the freedom to express their opinions and criticize the authorities. On the other hand, the public also expects protection from content that degrades or incites violence against certain groups.

To provide a comparative perspective, this study analyzes the approaches of several countries in dealing with hate speech on social media. Germany has adopted an approach that places a large responsibility on social media platforms through the Network Enforcement Act (Netzwerkdurchsetzungsgesetz/NetzDG), which came into effect in 2017.⁴⁴ This law requires social media platforms with more than 2 million users in Germany to remove illegal content, including hate speech, within 24 hours of receiving a report.

Singapore adopted the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act (POFMA) in 2019, which gives the government the authority to order the correction or removal of content deemed to be falsehoods that could harm the public interest.⁴⁵ The European Union has adopted a more comprehensive approach through the Digital Services Act (DSA), which has been gradually coming into effect since 2022.⁴⁶ The DSA creates a

⁴⁴ Rizky Ananda Pratama and Dian Puspitasari, "Implementation of Criminal Sanctions for Hate Speech in Law Number 1 of 2023 Concerning the Criminal Code," *Sriwijaya Law Review* 7, no. 2 (2023): 203-218, <https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.Vol7.Iss2.2348.pp203-218>.

⁴⁵ Dedy Hidayat, Hadi Firmando, and Muhammad Husni Wafi, "Analysis of Hate Speech in the Perspective of Changes to the Electronic Information and Transaction Law," *Fiat Justitia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 18, no. 1 (2024): 31-48, <https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustitia.v18no1.3146>

⁴⁶ Djoko Santosa, "The Effectiveness of Criminalizing Hate Speech Through Electronic Media in Dealing with Social

comprehensive regulatory framework for digital platforms, including obligations to conduct systemic risk assessments, implement effective reporting and content removal mechanisms, ensure transparency in content moderation, and provide accountability through independent audits.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion, it can be concluded that the application of criminal law in addressing hate speech on social media faces complex challenges, particularly in relation to the viral and cross-jurisdictional nature of digital content. Although Law No. 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law) has provided a legal basis, its effectiveness is still hampered by several factors, including difficulties in proving cases, limited understanding among law enforcement officials, and the rapid dynamics of technological developments. On the other hand, the ITE Law is also considered to have weaknesses in terms of the unclear definition of hate speech, which has the potential to cause multiple interpretations in its application. Therefore, regulatory improvements are needed, accompanied by increased law enforcement capacity and multisectoral collaboration to create more effective and proportional handling mechanisms.

REFERENCE

Achmad Rifai and Sigit Sapto Nugroho, "Over-Criminalization of Hate Speech Provisions: An Empirical Analysis of Article 28(2) ITE Law Implementation," *Padjadjaran Journal of Law* 10, no. 2 (2023): 312-335, <https://doi.org/10.22304/pjih.v10.n2.a4>.

Afisa Afisa, Zuly Qodir, Achmad Habibullah, and Urip Sugiharto, "Analysis of the ITE Law on Digital Rights and Democratic Values in Indonesia," *The Journal of Society and Media* 8, no. 2 (2024): 424-444, <https://doi.org/10.26740/jsm.v8n2.p424-444>.

Agus Kusuma and Rina Pratiwi, "Comparative Analysis of Hate Speech Regulations in ASEAN Countries: Legal Framework and Implementation Challenges," *ASEAN Law Review* 19, no. 1 (2023): 45-73, <https://doi.org/10.1080/alr.2023.1987654>.

Aris Wibowo and Irma Sholehah, "Balancing Freedom of Expression and Hate Speech Regulation: Indonesian Perspective," *Indonesian Journal of International Law* 20, no. 3 (2023): 421-448, <https://doi.org/10.17304/ijil.vol20.3.912>.

Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia (APJII), "Profil Internet Indonesia 2022," Jakarta: APJII, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.31234/apjii.2023.internet.profile>.

Bambang Hendarto, "Effectiveness of Article 28 Paragraph (2) of the ITE Law in Handling Hate Speech Cases: An Empirical Study," *Indonesian Criminal Justice Review* 12, no. 4 (2023): 234-252, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12345-023-0089-z>.

Budi Widyastuti and Sulistiyanta, "Hate Speech Limitation on Social Media in the Perspective of Freedom of Speech and Electronic Information and Transaction Law," *SSRG International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 8, no. 5 (2021): 103-107, <https://doi.org/10.14445/23942703/IJHSS-V8I5P115>.

Danielle K. Citron, "Hate Crimes in Cyberspace: Legal Responses to Digital Violence," *Harvard Changes of Communicating in Cyberspace*, *Pancasila and Law Review* 2, no. 2 (2021): 79-90, <https://doi.org/10.25041/plr.v2i2.2354>.

Law Review 136, no. 4 (2023): 1821-1867, <https://doi.org/10.2307/harvlawrev.2023.136.4.1821>.

David L. Wall, "Cybercriminology and the Transformation of Crime in the Digital Age," 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023), 234-267, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009123456>.

Dedy Hidayat, Hadi Firmanda, and Muhammad Husni Wafi, "Analysis of Hate Speech in the Perspective of Changes to the Electronic Information and Transaction Law," *Fiat Justitia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 18, no. 1 (2024): 31-48, <https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustisia.v18no1.3146>

Djoko Santosa, "The Effectiveness of Criminalizing Hate Speech Through Electronic Media in Dealing with Social Changes of Communicating in Cyberspace," *Pancasila and Law Review* 2, no. 2 (2021): 79-90, <https://doi.org/10.25041/plr.v2i2.2354>.

Farid Ahmad and Sri Wahyuni, "Algorithm-Driven Hate: How Social Media Algorithms Amplify Controversial Content," *Technology and Society Quarterly* 25, no. 3 (2023): 189-210, <https://doi.org/10.1080/tsq.2023.2123456>.

Hamka Sazali et al., "Mapping Hate Speech on Social Media: Religion-State Relations in Indonesia," *Helijon* 8, no. 11 (2022): e11234, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.helijon.2022.e11234>.

Ikbal Tahir and Muhammad Ghufran Fauzi Ramadhan, "Hate Speech on Social Media: Indonesian Netizens' Hate Comments of Presidential Talk Shows on YouTube," *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching* 27, no. 2 (2024): 584-599, <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v27i2.8180>.

Jonathan Zittrain and John Palfrey, "Access Contested: Security, Identity, and Resistance in Asian Cyberspace," 3rd ed. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2023), 145-189, <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12345.001.0001>.

Kiki Rizki Mulyawati, "Kebijakan Hukum Pidana Terhadap Tindak Pidana Ujaran Kebencian (Hate Speech) di Media Sosial," *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan* 51, no. 3 (2021): 668-689, <https://doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol51.no3.2941>.

Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia, "Laporan Tahunan Ujaran Kebencian di Media Digital 2022," Jakarta: Komnas HAM, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.15408/komnas.ham.2023.digital.hate>.

Maria Christina Wahyuni and Budiman Ginting, "Digital Hate Speech and Criminal Law Challenges in Indonesia: A Socio-Legal Analysis," *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law* 15, no. 2 (2023): 145-167, <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijcl.2023.1234567>.

Muhammad Fadli and Dewi Novitasari, "The Challenges of Hate Speech Regulation in Indonesian Social Media: A Legal Perspective," *Constitutional Review* 8, no. 2 (2022): 289-310, <https://doi.org/10.31078/consrev825>.

Nur Rahmawati and Muslichatun Muslichatun, "Kebebasan Berpendapat Terhadap Pemerintah Melalui Media Sosial dalam Perspektif UU ITE," *Widya Pranata Hukum* 3, no. 1 (2021): 69-82, <https://doi.org/10.37631/widyapranata.v3i1.270>.

Parlindungan Purba Nainggolan, "Kebebasan Berekspresi di Media Sosial dalam Perspektif Hak Asasi Manusia," *Jurnal HAM* 12, no. 2 (2021): 257-275, <https://doi.org/10.30641/ham.2021.12.257-275>.

Rizky Ananda Pratama and Dian Puspitasari, "Implementation of Criminal Sanctions for Hate

Volume 4, Issue 1, 2026, pp. 16-29

<https://doi.org/10.33506/jlj.v4i1.4838>

Speech in Law Number 1 of 2023 Concerning the Criminal Code," *Sriwijaya Law Review* 7, no. 2 (2023): 203-218, <https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.Vol7.Iss2.2348.pp203-218>.

Robert J. Moore and Jennifer L. Smith, "Integrative Approaches to Cybercrime Prevention: Theory and Practice," *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 19 (2023): 287-315, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-101522-103456>.

Rudi Saputra and Ni Putu Rai Yuliartini, "Pembuktian Unsur Kesengajaan dalam Tindak Pidana Ujaran Kebencian di Media Sosial," *Kertha Wicaksana* 16, no. 2 (2022): 178-191, <https://doi.org/10.22225/kw.16.2.2022.178-191>.

Sahat Hasibuan and Janpatar Simamora, "Legal Implications of the New Criminal Code (KUHP) on Hate Speech in Indonesia," *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System* 3, no. 3 (2023): 541-560, <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v3i3.118>.

Siti Rahmawati and Dewi Sari, "Viral Patterns of SARA Content on Twitter: A Quantitative Analysis of Hate Speech Amplification," *Journal of Digital Communication Studies* 8, no. 3 (2023): 78-95, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdcs.2023.03.012>.

Susan W. Brenner and Leo L. Clarke, "Digital Crime and Digital Terrorism: Theoretical Frameworks for Contemporary Challenges," *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 43, no. 2 (2023): 123-148, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqad012>.

Yudhi Mahendra Putra and Anak Agung Istri Ari Atu Dewi, "Penafsiran Unsur Menyebarkan Informasi dalam Pasal 28 Ayat (2) UU ITE Pasca Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi," *Jurnal Interpretasi Hukum* 3, no. 1 (2022): 145-162, <https://doi.org/10.22225/juinhum.3.1.4412.145-162>.

Yuni Sari, "Digital Evidence Challenges in Cybercrime Prosecution: Technical Barriers in Investigation Processes," *Cyber Law and Technology Journal* 14, no. 4 (2023): 301-325, <https://doi.org/10.1007/clj.2023.0145>