

 <https://doi.org/10.47353/lawpass.v2i2.13>

# Hate Speech in India: Contemporary Legal Challenges and Responses

**Dipshreeya Das**

Gujarat National Law University, India

\*Corresponding author: [ddas@gnlu.ac.in](mailto:ddas@gnlu.ac.in)

## Abstract

This article examines the legal challenges of addressing hate speech in India, focusing on the balance between free speech and public order, as well as the protection of vulnerable communities. It reviews existing legal frameworks, including constitutional provisions under Articles 19(1)(a) and 19(2), statutory laws like Sections 153A, 295A, and 505(1) of the Indian Penal Code, and Section 69A of the Information Technology Act. Key judicial pronouncements, such as *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, are analyzed to highlight regulatory complexities. The study identifies social media proliferation, political exploitation, and legal ambiguities as critical contemporary issues. Using a qualitative research methodology, the article proposes reforms including clearer definitions of hate speech, stronger enforcement mechanisms, and new laws targeting online hate speech and political incitement. It also advocates for enhanced public awareness and education. These measures aim to curb hate speech while upholding democratic values and ensuring societal harmony, contributing to the discourse on digital governance and legal responses in India. In light of the increased incidents of hate speech in India and the legal challenges surrounding it, this article seeks to analyze the existing frameworks and propose necessary reforms.

**Keywords:** hate speech, legal framework, content moderation, freedom of expression.

## Introduction

Hate speech has emerged as one of the most pressing constitutional and socio-political challenges in contemporary India. In a nation characterized by extraordinary diversity—encompassing religion, caste, ethnicity, language, and regional identity—the regulation of speech that incites hostility or discrimination presents both a democratic dilemma and a governance challenge. The Indian constitutional order is founded upon the protection of pluralism, dignity, and equality; yet it simultaneously guarantees robust freedom of speech and expression. The tension between these commitments becomes particularly acute when expressions targeting vulnerable communities threaten social cohesion and public order.

Broadly understood, hate speech refers to expressions that incite discrimination, hostility, or violence against individuals or groups based on protected characteristics such as religion, caste, race, ethnicity, gender, or linguistic identity. Although there is no single universally accepted definition of hate speech in Indian statutory law, judicial interpretations and academic discourse have attempted to delineate its contours. At its core, hate speech is distinguished from



<https://lawpass.org/>

Received: April 13, 2025 | Revised: May 16, 2025 | Accepted: June 19, 2025 | Publication: June 30, 2025

mere offensive expression by its capacity to harm collective dignity, undermine equality, or provoke social unrest. In a society marked by historical stratification and recurring communal tensions, such speech can operate not merely as symbolic expression but as a catalyst for real-world violence.

The constitutional framework governing speech in India is rooted in Article 19(1)(a), which guarantees the right to freedom of speech and expression. However, this right is subject to “reasonable restrictions” under Article 19(2), including grounds such as public order, decency, morality, sovereignty and integrity of the State, and incitement to an offence. Unlike jurisdictions that adopt near-absolute protection of speech, the Indian constitutional scheme explicitly acknowledges the legitimacy of restricting harmful expression. The judiciary has repeatedly emphasized that freedom of speech is not an unfettered license but a right embedded within a broader social framework that prioritizes communal harmony and constitutional morality.

Statutory provisions addressing hate speech are dispersed across multiple legislative instruments. Sections 153A, 295A, and 505 of the Indian Penal Code criminalize acts that promote enmity between groups, outrage religious sentiments, or create public mischief through inflammatory statements. The Representation of the People Act, 1951, prohibits hate-based electoral appeals, recognizing the destabilizing effect of identity-based political mobilization. In the digital sphere, Section 69A of the Information Technology Act empowers the government to block online content in the interest of public order and national security. Judicial intervention, most notably in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, has further shaped the legal landscape by striking down vague provisions such as Section 66A of the IT Act and reaffirming constitutional limits on overbroad speech restrictions.

Despite this extensive legal framework, the regulation of hate speech in India remains deeply contested. Critics argue that statutory provisions are often vaguely worded, enabling selective enforcement and political misuse. Others contend that enforcement mechanisms are inconsistent and frequently ineffective, particularly when hate speech is perpetrated by politically influential actors. This dual concern—overregulation on the one hand and under-enforcement on the other—illustrates the fragile balance the legal system must maintain.

The challenge has intensified with the rapid expansion of digital communication technologies. Social media platforms have fundamentally altered the scale, speed, and reach of speech. Content that might once have been confined to local audiences can now circulate nationally or globally within minutes. Algorithm-driven amplification often prioritizes emotionally charged or polarizing content, inadvertently incentivizing inflammatory rhetoric. Anonymity and pseudonymity further complicate accountability, while cross-border data flows create jurisdictional uncertainties. The digital ecosystem thus magnifies both the harm potential of hate speech and the complexity of regulating it.

In addition to technological transformation, socio-political dynamics have contributed significantly to the contemporary hate speech landscape. Electoral politics in India frequently intersect with identity-based mobilization. Religious, caste, and ethnic narratives are sometimes instrumentalized to consolidate voter bases, resulting in rhetoric that blurs the line between political persuasion and incitement. In such contexts, hate speech may function as a tool of



symbolic power—reinforcing in-group solidarity while marginalizing minority communities. The normalization of such discourse risks eroding constitutional commitments to equality and secularism.

Furthermore, historical patterns of exclusion shape both the articulation and reception of hate speech. The legacy of caste discrimination, communal violence, and regional marginalization renders certain communities particularly vulnerable to hostile narratives. Hate speech directed at these groups does not operate in a vacuum; it resonates against a backdrop of structural inequality and historical trauma. Consequently, the harm inflicted is not merely psychological or reputational but often systemic, reinforcing existing patterns of disadvantage.

Existing scholarship has examined discrete aspects of hate speech regulation—constitutional doctrine, digital governance, socio-cultural factors, and international human rights standards. However, there remains a need for a more integrated analysis that situates legal mechanisms within broader socio-political and technological contexts. Fragmented analysis risks obscuring the interplay between doctrinal ambiguity, enforcement practices, political incentives, and platform governance structures. A comprehensive understanding requires recognizing hate speech as a multidimensional phenomenon that transcends traditional legal categories.

This article seeks to contribute to that integrated discourse. It examines the adequacy of India's existing legal framework, evaluates contemporary challenges arising from digital transformation and political polarization, and analyzes the role of media and online platforms in amplifying or mitigating hate speech. By synthesizing doctrinal analysis with socio-cultural and technological perspectives, the study aims to identify structural gaps and propose reforms that are both constitutionally sound and practically feasible.

The central argument advanced in this study is that India's hate speech regulation framework, while extensive, suffers from definitional ambiguity, inconsistent enforcement, and insufficient adaptation to digital realities. Effective reform requires clearer statutory standards distinguishing incitement from protected expression, enhanced institutional capacity for enforcement, and stronger accountability mechanisms for digital intermediaries. Equally important are non-punitive strategies—such as civic education, media literacy, and counter-speech initiatives—that address the cultural and psychological roots of hate-based hostility.

Ultimately, the regulation of hate speech in India is not merely a legal question but a test of democratic resilience. The constitutional promise of equality and dignity demands vigilance against speech that undermines social harmony, yet democratic legitimacy depends on safeguarding open discourse. Navigating this paradox requires calibrated regulation grounded in proportionality, transparency, and respect for fundamental rights. In confronting contemporary legal challenges, India must strive to preserve both its pluralistic fabric and its constitutional commitment to freedom.

## Method

This study employs a qualitative descriptive research design to examine the regulation of hate speech in India. The research is primarily doctrinal in nature, focusing on the analysis of



constitutional provisions, statutory laws, and judicial decisions relevant to hate speech. Key legal sources include Article 19(1)(a) and Article 19(2) of the Constitution of India, provisions of the Indian Penal Code such as Sections 153A, 295A, and 505, the Representation of the People Act, and relevant sections of the Information Technology Act.

In addition to primary legal materials, the study draws upon secondary sources including peer-reviewed journal articles, policy reports, academic commentaries, and international human rights frameworks. These sources are used to contextualize the legal framework within broader socio-political and technological developments, particularly the rise of digital media and online content dissemination.

The research adopts a descriptive-analytical approach. First, it describes the existing legal framework governing hate speech in India. Second, it analyzes contemporary challenges related to enforcement, definitional ambiguity, political instrumentalization, and digital platform governance. The study does not rely on empirical field data but instead synthesizes existing literature and case law to identify patterns, gaps, and areas requiring reform.

Through this approach, the research aims to provide a comprehensive overview of India's current hate speech regulation regime while offering grounded recommendations for improving clarity, consistency, and effectiveness in its implementation.

### **Fragmented but Expansive Legal Framework**

The analysis demonstrates that India possesses a broad yet fragmented legal framework addressing hate speech. Rather than a single consolidated statute defining and regulating hate speech, India relies on multiple legal instruments dispersed across constitutional provisions, criminal law statutes, electoral legislation, and digital regulation.

At the constitutional level, Article 19(1)(a) guarantees freedom of speech and expression, while Article 19(2) permits reasonable restrictions on specific grounds such as public order, decency, morality, sovereignty, integrity of the State, and incitement to an offence. This constitutional architecture reflects a model of “regulated speech,” distinguishing India from jurisdictions that adopt near-absolute protection.

At the statutory level, Sections 153A, 295A, and 505 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) constitute the primary criminal provisions used to prosecute hate speech. Section 153A penalizes the promotion of enmity between different groups; Section 295A criminalizes deliberate and malicious acts intended to outrage religious feelings; and Section 505 addresses statements conducing to public mischief. Additionally, Section 123(3A) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, treats hate-based appeals during elections as corrupt practices.

In the digital sphere, Section 69A of the Information Technology Act allows the government to block online content in the interest of public order and national security. While this provision does not specifically define hate speech, it has been invoked to regulate inflammatory online material.

The findings reveal that while India's legal framework is extensive, it lacks conceptual clarity and structural coherence. The absence of a clear statutory definition of “hate speech”



results in reliance on judicial interpretation and prosecutorial discretion. This fragmented approach creates inconsistency in enforcement and uncertainty in application.

### Definitional Ambiguity and Judicial Interpretation

A central issue identified in this study is definitional ambiguity. The statutory provisions addressing hate speech use broad and open-textured language, such as “promoting enmity,” “outraging religious feelings,” or “public mischief.” These terms are inherently subjective and require judicial interpretation.

Judicial precedents have attempted to draw distinctions between protected speech, offensive speech, and incitement. The Supreme Court’s decision in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* represents a critical milestone in this regard. By striking down Section 66A of the IT Act for vagueness and overbreadth, the Court reaffirmed the constitutional principle that restrictions on speech must be narrowly tailored and clearly defined.

However, the judicial approach to hate speech has not always been consistent. Courts have sometimes adopted a cautious stance, emphasizing the need to preserve public order. At other times, they have defended robust free expression, particularly in political contexts. This oscillation reflects the inherent tension between democratic pluralism and social stability.

The results indicate that the lack of a uniform incitement standard contributes to legal uncertainty. Unlike jurisdictions that apply a clear “imminent lawless action” test, Indian courts often rely on contextual analysis, examining the likelihood of disturbance to public order. While context-sensitive adjudication has advantages, it may also lead to unpredictable outcomes.

Thus, definitional ambiguity remains one of the most significant structural weaknesses in India’s hate speech regulation framework.

### Enforcement Gaps and Selective Application

Another major finding concerns enforcement inconsistency. While legal provisions exist, their implementation varies significantly across regions and political contexts. Reports and academic analyses suggest that hate speech prosecutions are often selective, with cases against marginalized individuals proceeding more swiftly than those involving politically influential actors.

1. Enforcement gaps arise from multiple factors:
2. Political pressures influencing law enforcement agencies
3. Administrative delays in investigation and prosecution
4. Lack of digital forensic capacity in online hate speech cases
5. Reluctance to prosecute speech framed as political rhetoric

These inconsistencies undermine public confidence in the rule of law and may normalize inflammatory rhetoric. When hate speech remains unpunished, it signals tolerance for divisive narratives and weakens deterrence.

At the same time, overzealous enforcement can chill legitimate dissent. The dual risk of under-enforcement and overreach reflects the delicate balance inherent in hate speech regulation.



The findings suggest that institutional reform—particularly enhancing investigative capacity and ensuring prosecutorial independence—is crucial to improving enforcement credibility.

### Socio-Political Drivers of Hate Speech

The study identifies socio-political dynamics as a central driver of contemporary hate speech in India. Hate speech often emerges not as isolated incidents but as part of broader identity-based mobilization. Electoral cycles frequently coincide with increased inflammatory rhetoric targeting religious or caste-based communities.

Historical stratification—particularly caste hierarchies and communal tensions—creates fertile ground for identity-based hostility. Hate speech in this context functions as a mechanism of symbolic power. It reinforces in-group solidarity while marginalizing minorities, thereby shaping public discourse around exclusionary narratives.

The research further reveals that hate speech often operates within a framework of plausible deniability. Political actors may frame inflammatory remarks as cultural defense, national security concerns, or majority sentiment. This rhetorical strategy complicates legal prosecution, as statements may not explicitly incite violence but nonetheless contribute to stigmatization.

Additionally, communities historically subjected to discrimination experience hate speech as a continuation of structural marginalization. The harm inflicted is cumulative, reinforcing patterns of social exclusion.

Thus, addressing hate speech requires more than legal prohibition; it demands structural engagement with underlying social divisions and political incentives.

### Digital Amplification and Algorithmic Challenges

The rise of digital platforms has transformed the dynamics of hate speech dissemination. Unlike traditional media, digital platforms rely on algorithmic curation designed to maximize engagement. Content that provokes strong emotional reactions—anger, outrage, fear—often receives greater visibility.

This algorithmic amplification creates an incentive structure that may indirectly reward polarizing or inflammatory content. Echo chambers and filter bubbles further intensify ideological polarization, increasing exposure to identity-based hostility.

Anonymity and pseudonymity online complicate accountability. Identifying perpetrators of online hate speech can be technically challenging, particularly when content originates outside Indian jurisdiction. Cross-border communication raises questions about applicable law and enforcement authority.

The study also highlights the increasing privatization of speech regulation. Social media companies develop and enforce community standards that may differ from national legal frameworks. Content moderation decisions are often opaque, raising concerns about transparency and due process.



While automated detection tools are improving, they remain imperfect. False positives may suppress legitimate speech, while false negatives allow harmful content to circulate. Human moderation at scale presents logistical and economic challenges.

Therefore, digital governance emerges as one of the most complex contemporary legal challenges in hate speech regulation.

### Evaluating Current Regulatory Responses

India's responses to hate speech include criminal prosecution, electoral sanctions, content blocking, and platform-based moderation. Non-legal measures such as media literacy campaigns and civil society counter-speech initiatives have also been implemented.

The findings suggest that criminal law alone is insufficient to address the problem comprehensively. Prosecution is reactive and often delayed, limiting its deterrent impact. Content blocking under Section 69A can prevent immediate harm but raises transparency and proportionality concerns.

Electoral regulations play an important symbolic role but are unevenly enforced. Meanwhile, platform moderation has become central to online regulation, yet accountability mechanisms remain underdeveloped.

Preventive strategies—such as civic education, digital literacy programs, and counter-speech initiatives—appear promising. By addressing underlying prejudices and misinformation, these approaches reduce susceptibility to hate-based narratives. However, their long-term impact depends on sustained institutional commitment.

The study underscores the importance of a multi-stakeholder approach involving government, judiciary, digital platforms, civil society, and academic institutions. Regulatory reform must combine clearer statutory standards, enhanced enforcement capacity, algorithmic transparency, and community-based resilience strategies.

### Balancing Free Speech and Democratic Resilience

The overarching tension identified throughout the analysis is the balance between protecting freedom of expression and preventing harm. Overregulation risks authoritarian misuse, while under-regulation permits normalization of hostility.

The Indian constitutional model requires proportionality, clarity, and procedural safeguards. Reform efforts should focus on:

1. Providing a clearer statutory definition distinguishing advocacy from incitement
2. Establishing consistent judicial standards for assessing harm
3. Enhancing transparency in content blocking decisions
4. Strengthening oversight of platform moderation practices

Ultimately, the effectiveness of hate speech regulation depends not only on legal architecture but also on democratic culture. A resilient democracy must protect dissent while rejecting expressions that undermine equality and dignity.



The results indicate that India’s hate speech challenge is multidimensional: legal, political, technological, and cultural. While the country possesses a broad legal framework, structural weaknesses—particularly definitional ambiguity, inconsistent enforcement, and digital complexity—limit its effectiveness.

A sustainable response requires doctrinal clarity, institutional reform, technological accountability, and societal engagement. Hate speech regulation in India must evolve alongside digital transformation while remaining anchored in constitutional values.

## Conclusion

The regulation of hate speech in India presents a profound constitutional and democratic challenge. As this study has demonstrated, India possesses a broad and multi-layered legal framework addressing hate speech through constitutional provisions, criminal law statutes, electoral regulations, and digital governance mechanisms. However, the existence of these laws does not automatically translate into regulatory effectiveness. Instead, the contemporary landscape reveals a complex interplay between doctrinal ambiguity, enforcement inconsistency, socio-political mobilization, and technological transformation.

At the constitutional level, the Indian model reflects a deliberate attempt to balance freedom of expression with the preservation of public order and communal harmony. Article 19(1)(a) guarantees free speech, while Article 19(2) recognizes the legitimacy of reasonable restrictions. This dual structure embodies the central tension explored throughout this study: how to prevent speech that undermines dignity and equality without eroding democratic discourse itself. The challenge lies not in choosing between liberty and regulation, but in calibrating the two in a principled and proportionate manner.

One of the key findings of this research is the persistent problem of definitional ambiguity. The absence of a clear statutory definition of “hate speech” results in reliance on broad and open-textured language such as “promoting enmity” or “outraging religious feelings.” While such flexibility allows contextual adjudication, it also generates unpredictability and opens the door to selective enforcement. Judicial interventions, particularly in striking down vague provisions such as Section 66A of the Information Technology Act, have reaffirmed constitutional safeguards against overbroad restrictions. Nevertheless, inconsistency in interpretation continues to create uncertainty regarding the threshold between protected expression and punishable incitement.

Enforcement gaps further complicate the regulatory landscape. Although legal provisions are available, their application often varies depending on political context, administrative capacity, and institutional independence. Selective prosecution undermines both deterrence and public trust in the rule of law. Conversely, excessive or politically motivated enforcement risks chilling legitimate dissent and weakening democratic pluralism. Strengthening institutional neutrality and enhancing digital investigative capacity are therefore essential components of effective reform.



The study also highlights the central role of socio-political dynamics in shaping hate speech patterns. Identity-based mobilization, especially during electoral cycles, frequently amplifies divisive rhetoric. Historical structures of caste hierarchy, communal tension, and regional marginalization intensify both the articulation and reception of hate speech. In this context, hate speech is not merely a legal infraction but a manifestation of deeper structural inequalities. Addressing it requires engagement with the broader social conditions that sustain identity-based hostility.

Perhaps the most transformative challenge arises from the digital ecosystem. Social media platforms have altered the scale, speed, and reach of expression. Algorithm-driven amplification often prioritizes emotionally charged content, inadvertently incentivizing polarizing speech. The anonymity and cross-border nature of digital communication complicate jurisdictional enforcement and accountability. Moreover, the increasing privatization of content moderation places substantial regulatory power in the hands of technology companies, raising concerns about transparency, due process, and democratic oversight.

These findings suggest that criminal law alone cannot adequately address contemporary hate speech. While punitive measures remain necessary for serious incitement, sustainable regulation requires a multi-dimensional approach. Clearer statutory definitions aligned with international human rights standards would enhance doctrinal coherence. Consistent judicial standards emphasizing incitement and proportionality would reduce unpredictability. Improved transparency in content blocking and platform moderation decisions would strengthen legitimacy.

Equally important are preventive strategies. Media literacy programs, civic education, counter-speech initiatives, and community engagement can address the cultural and psychological drivers of hate-based hostility. By fostering critical thinking and empathy, such measures build societal resilience against divisive narratives. Collaboration between government institutions, digital platforms, civil society organizations, and academic researchers is essential for developing coordinated and rights-respecting solutions.

Ultimately, the regulation of hate speech in India is a test of democratic maturity. A resilient democracy must tolerate dissent, disagreement, and even discomfiting ideas. However, it cannot remain indifferent to speech that systematically dehumanizes communities or incites violence. The task is not to suppress pluralism but to protect it. Effective regulation must therefore be guided by constitutional morality, proportionality, transparency, and accountability.

India's constitutional vision is anchored in dignity, equality, and fraternity. Addressing contemporary hate speech challenges requires reaffirming these foundational values while adapting regulatory tools to the realities of digital transformation and political polarization. By pursuing calibrated legal reform alongside broader societal engagement, India can strengthen its democratic fabric and ensure that freedom of expression remains a vehicle for dialogue rather than division.



## References

- Adcock, C. S. (2014). DEBATING CONVERSION, SILENCING CASTE: THE LIMITED SCOPE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM. In Cambridge University Press (Vol. 29, Issue 3, pp. 363–377). <https://doi.org/10.1017/jlr.2014.19>
- Arun, C., & Nayak, N. (2016). Preliminary Findings on Online Hate Speech and the Law in India. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2882238>
- Bias, Media Bias, Bias in the Media, News Bias. (2019). <https://www.imediaethics.org/topics/bias/>
- Bilewicz, M., & Soral, W. (2020). Hate Speech Epidemic. The Dynamic Effects of Derogatory Language on Intergroup Relations and Political Radicalization. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12670>
- Caste-based discrimination in Indian education. (2021). [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Caste-based\\_discrimination\\_in\\_Indian\\_education](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Caste-based_discrimination_in_Indian_education)
- Costa, A. P. (2023). Qualitative Research Methods: Do digital tools open promising trends? *Revista Lusofona de Educacao*, 59(59), 67–76. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.24140/issn.1645-7250.rle59.04>
- Dauids, N. (2018). On the (in)tolerance of hate speech: Does it have legitimacy in a democracy? <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2018.1477036>
- Dharmapala, D., & McAdams, R. H. (2005). Words That Kill? An Economic Model of the Influence of Speech on Behavior (with Particular Reference to Hate Speech). <https://doi.org/10.1086/425599>
- Diversity and Expression. (2017). <https://freespeechcenter.universityofcalifornia.edu/programs-and-resources/resource-materials/ask-the-experts/what-steps-can-campus-take-in-order-to-enhance-both-free-expression-and-diversity-and-inclusion/>
- Do Indian Courts Face A Dilemma in Interpreting Hate Speech? (2020). <https://www.epw.in/engage/article/do-indian-courts-face-dilemma-interpreting-hate>
- Education and Literacy—Freedom of Expression. (2023). <https://www.coe.int/en/web/freedom-expression/education-and-literacy>
- Explained | What is ‘hate speech,’ and how is it treated in Indian law? (2022). <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/explained-what-is-hate-speech-and-how-is-it-treated-in-indian-law/article64851585.ece>
- Gillespie, T. (2020). Content moderation, AI, and the question of scale—Tarleton Gillespie, 2020. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2053951720943234>
- Haigh, G. (2023). Global Overview of Censorship Law & Policy: Mapping the Censorship Industrial Complex—Censorship Industrial Complex. <https://censorshipindustrialcomplex.org/resources-2/globalcensorshipreport>
- Hate speech and incitement to hatred or violence. (2023). <https://www.ohchr.org/en/special-procedures/sr-religion-or-belief/hate-speech-and-incitement-hatred-or-violence>
- Hate Speech Laws in Democratic Countries. (2021). <https://compassjournal.org/hate-speech-laws-in-democratic-countries/>



- Hate speech laws in India. (2009). [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hate\\_speech\\_laws\\_in\\_India](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hate_speech_laws_in_India)
- Hate-Speech-Reading-List. (2023). <https://github.com/hate-alert/Hate-Speech-Reading-List>
- Hechiche, A. (2004). The Ethics and Culture of Peace. In Taylor & Francis (Vol. 29, Issue 4, pp. 495–502). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03797720500083864>
- How can digital public technologies accelerate progress on the Sustainable Development Goals? (2022). <https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-can-digital-public-technologies-accelerate-progress-on-the-sustainable-development-goals/>
- How do prosecutors collect and use data in decisionmaking? (2018). <https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/how-do-prosecutors-collect-and-use-data-decisionmaking>
- Illegal content on online platforms. (2023). <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/illegal-content-online-platforms>
- Indian Penal Code, § 375 (1860).
- Indian Penal Code, 1860. (2022). <https://devgan.in/ipc/index.php>
- IPC Section 153—Wantonly giving provocation with intent to cause riot. (2022). <https://devgan.in/ipc/section/153/>
- ‘It’s just a joke’: The subtle effects of offensive language. (2016). [https://www.sydney.edu.au/news-opinion/news/2016/07/20/\\_it\\_s-just-a-joke--the-subtle-effects-of-offensive-language.html](https://www.sydney.edu.au/news-opinion/news/2016/07/20/_it_s-just-a-joke--the-subtle-effects-of-offensive-language.html)
- Jasper, K. (1993). Monitoring and responding to media messages. In Taylor & Francis (Vol. 1, Issue 2, pp. 109–114). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10640269308248278>
- Kumar, D. (2021). Journey with Rural Identity and Linguicism (Vol. 2, Issue 1, pp. 202–218). <https://doi.org/10.26812/caste.v2i1.285>
- Lepoutre, M. (2019). HATE SPEECH LAWS: EXPRESSIVE POWER IS NOT THE ANSWER. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s135232522000004x>
- Lochmiller, C. R. (2021). Conducting Thematic Analysis with Qualitative Data. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2021.5008>
- López, A. (2014). Greening the Mediapolis with Media Literacy. In IGI Global (Vol. 5, Issue 2, pp. 1–12). <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijsesd.2014040101>
- Lysa, H. (2007). Singapore and its Tensed Pasts: History and Nation-Building. In RELX Group (Netherlands). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1317164>
- Madheswaran, S., & Singhari, S. (2016). Social exclusion and caste discrimination in public and private sectors in India: A decomposition analysis. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41027-017-0053-8>
- Modh, K. (2015). Controlling Hate Speech on the Internet: The Indian Perspective. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2783447>
- Müller, K., & Schwarz, C. (2020). Fanning the Flames of Hate: Social Media and Hate Crime. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeea/jvaa045>
- Narrain, S. (2016). Hate Speech, Hurt Sentiment, and the (Im)Possibility of Free Speech. <https://www.epw.in/journal/2016/17/special-articles/hate-speech-hurt-sentiment-and-impossibility-free-speech.html>



- Office, R.-G. I. P. (2021). EU research and innovation to foster and enhance European democracy. <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/dc161934-771b-11eb-9ac9-01aa75ed71a1/>
- Omar, A., & Hashem, M. E. (2022). An Evaluation of the Automatic Detection of Hate Speech in Social Media Networks. <https://doi.org/10.14569/ijacsa.2022.0130228>
- Parker, S., & Ruths, D. (2023). Is hate speech detection the solution the world wants? <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2209384120>
- Pozniak, H. (2023). Tackling the impossible problem of content moderation. <https://eandt.theiet.org/content/articles/2023/04/tackling-the-impossible-problem-of-content-moderation/>
- Reichert, F., & Print, M. (2017). Civic participation of high school students: The effect of civic learning in school. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2017.1316239>
- Schwarzmann, W. (2020). Traditional Knowledge on Modern Milling Robots How CNC-joinery machines promote a renaissance to lost techniques in the profession of a carpenter. 2, 597–604. Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85128162770&partnerID=40&md5=02df7496980636a918d0ff556ca26c33>
- Section 295A of the Indian Penal Code—Wikipedia. (2022). [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Section\\_295A\\_of\\_the\\_Indian\\_Penal\\_Code](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Section_295A_of_the_Indian_Penal_Code)
- Subba, D. (2014). Democratic Values and Democratic Approach in Teaching: A Perspective. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-2-12a-6>
- UCU, E. (2023). Define “Academic Freedom” and “Freedom of Expression.” <https://www.ucuedinburgh.org.uk/blog/define-academic-freedom>
- Vimal, J. (2020). Thematic Content Analysis in Literary Studies. <https://doi.org/10.34256/irjt2118>
- Weispfenning, J. T. (1994). Television Self-Regulation: Organizational Processes and the Network Censors. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769909407100312>
- What you need to know about hate speech. (2023). <https://www.unesco.org/en/countering-hate-speech/need-know>
- Will India Criminalise Online Hate Speech? Here Are Some Answers. (2018). <https://www.thebetterindia.com/135099/india-criminalise-online-hate-speech-smriti-irani/>
- Zapata, J., & Deroy, O. (2023). Ordinary citizens are more severe towards verbal than nonverbal hate-motivated incidents with identical consequences. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-33892-8>
- Zargar, H. (2024). India elections: Vying for a third term, Modi is intensifying voter polarisation. <https://www.middleeasteye.net/opinion/india-elections-modi-third-term-intensifying-voter-polarisation>

