

Received: 10 September 2025

Revised: 21 October 2025

Accepted: 21 October 2025

# DIGITAL VOICES, LEGAL SILENCES: EXAMINING LGBTQ+ ONLINE POLITICAL EXPRESSION UNDER THE THAI CONSTITUTION

Jakkrit Na NAKHON<sup>1</sup>

1 Political Science, Maejo University at Chumphon, Thailand;  
jaknanakhon@gmail.com

**Handling Editor:**

Professor Dr.Christian KAUNERT

Dublin City University, Ireland

(This article belongs to the Theme 1: Law, Crime &amp; Justice in the Age of AI)

**Reviewers:**

- 1) Associate Professor Dr.Pyali CHATTERJEE
- 2) Associate Professor Dr.Thanaporn SRIYAKUL
- 3) Assistant Professor Dr.Nattapat LIMSIRITONG

ICFAI University, India  
MUT, Thailand  
Assumption University, Thailand

**Abstract**

This study critically examines the online political expression rights and freedoms of gender-diverse individuals (LGBTQ+) within the framework of the Thai Constitution and related legal statutes. While the 2017 Constitution unequivocally guarantees freedom of expression and prohibits sex-based discrimination, the article highlights a significant tension: subordinate laws, particularly the Computer-Related Crime Act 2007, contain ambiguous provisions on "public order" and "good morals" that are broadly interpreted to restrict LGBTQ+ voices. Through documentary qualitative research, the study analyzes Thai and international legal texts, court rulings, and academic literature to compare Thailand's situation with international human rights standards and foreign democratic systems. Findings reveal that despite constitutional protections, LGBTQ+ individuals encounter substantial legal and structural barriers to their online political participation, often leading to censorship and self-censorship. These restrictions undermine the full realization of constitutional rights and equality. The study concludes by proposing concrete recommendations, including amending vague legal provisions, explicitly safeguarding constructive LGBTQ+ online expression, and promoting inclusive legal research and civil society engagement, to foster a truly democratic and equitable digital environment in Thailand.

**Keywords:** LGBTQ+ Rights, Online Political Expression, Thai Constitution, Computer-Related Crime Act, Non-Discrimination

**Citation Information:** Na Nakhon, J. (2025). Digital Voices, Legal Silences: Examining LGBTQ+ Online Political Expression under the Thai Constitution. *Asian Crime and Society Review*, 12(2), Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.14456/acsr.2025.11>

## Introduction

The Constitution is the supreme law of the nation and is of immense importance to its citizens. It serves as the legal foundation that guarantees and protects the rights, freedoms, and interests of the people. Moreover, the Constitution defines the scope of power and duties of those who govern, ensuring that state authorities do not encroach on individuals' legitimate rights. It also provides a framework and direction for government administration, enabling the government to function effectively in pursuit of national goals that meet its citizens' needs. In essence, the Constitution serves as the structural basis of governance, outlining the principles, methods, and objectives for administering the state. Its core content establishes the form and processes of government, the scope and responsibilities of political institutions, and the guarantees of citizens' fundamental rights and freedoms. Because of this, the Constitution stands above all other laws, and no law may contradict or conflict with it.

Thailand has adopted 20 constitutions since the transition from absolute monarchy to constitutional democracy in 1932. Each version has reflected the country's political and social context at the time, with varying degrees of emphasis on citizens' rights and freedoms. Some constitutions clearly enumerated rights, while others made little or no mention of individual protections. The Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, 2017, currently in force as the twentieth constitution, establishes Thailand as a democratic constitutional monarchy (Section 2) and guarantees the dignity, rights, and equality of all persons (Section 4). Chapter 3 (Sections 25-49) further enumerates fundamental rights and freedoms, including the right to life and person, freedom of religion, and the rights of individuals and communities—reflecting democratic principles that place human rights at the foundation of governance.

Recognition of gender and sexual diversity first appeared in the 2007 Constitution, which emphasized human dignity, equality, and freedom under Sections 4, 5, and 30, explicitly prohibiting discrimination based on sex. This marked a significant legal milestone, acknowledging sexual diversity within Thailand's supreme law. Although Thai society generally exhibits tolerance toward LGBTQ+ persons, legal and policy frameworks have not yet provided complete protection or recognition. To address this, Thailand enacted the Gender Equality Act 2015, which aims to prevent and remedy gender-based discrimination and promote equality between men and women. However, same-sex couples still lack the legal right to marry, depriving them of family-related rights enjoyed by heterosexual couples. This Act, therefore, represents the first formal legal mechanism for protecting individuals against gender-based discrimination, yet substantive equality for LGBTQ+ persons remains elusive.

Following the 2019 general election, Thailand witnessed renewed activism advocating for LGBTQ+ rights and gender equality, including efforts to advance marriage equality legislation. These movements have increased awareness of the importance of securing rights long denied to gender-diverse individuals (Rights and Liberties Protection Department, 2013).

Meanwhile, rapid technological development—particularly the expansion of the internet—has profoundly transformed modern life. Digital technology now permeates daily activities, from communication via video calls to online financial transactions, e-commerce, and digital media consumption (Panboonmee, n.d.). The internet has also become a key arena for political expression, allowing citizens, including LGBTQ+ individuals, to participate in public discourse. In democratic systems, political expression is a fundamental right protected regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation. Although the Constitution guarantees equality, many LGBTQ+ individuals in Thailand continue to face social and economic discrimination. However, for LGBTQ+ persons, the exercise of this right remains constrained by legal and social attitudes. While the 2017 Constitution guarantees freedom of expression and prohibits gender-based discrimination, and Thailand is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)—which affirms the right to free expression—the enforcement of subordinate laws such as the Computer-Related Crime Act 2007 and its

amendments has introduced conditions that can be interpreted to restrict this right. When LGBTQ+ voices challenge traditional social values or criticize state policies, their speech may be subject to censorship or prosecution.

This study, therefore, examines LGBTQ+ political expression through online media under the Thai Constitution and related laws, comparing Thailand's framework with those of democratic countries. The objectives of this study are to: 1) examine the theoretical concepts and perspectives concerning gender and sexual diversity (LGBTQ+). 2) To explore theoretical approaches related to the legal measures governing the restriction of the dissemination of computer data, with particular focus on the Computer-Related Crime Act 2007 and its implications for public order and morality. 3) To investigate the rights and freedoms of LGBTQ+ individuals in expressing political opinions through online media under the Thai Constitution, its subordinate legislation, and comparative foreign legal frameworks. 4) To compare the constitutional principles of democratic regimes with the legal mechanisms that restrict the dissemination of computer-related political information in Thailand and other countries. It also analyzes mechanisms governing online information control. Political expression among sexual and gender minorities not only exposes ongoing social inequality but also serves as a measure of democratic maturity. Protecting this right is essential not merely for minority inclusion but for strengthening Thailand's democracy and upholding human dignity for all.

## Literature Reviews

### Concept of Rights and Liberty

Rights refer to legitimate powers or entitlements—for example, a person's rights and duties under the Constitution, or the lawful ownership of a particular piece of land. Rights are powers recognized by law that allow individuals to act freely and in good faith, provided their actions do not infringe on others' rights (Intachai & Piriyaawatthana, 2023).

From both theoretical and conceptual perspectives, three key characteristics of rights can be identified:

- 1) Rights serve the interests of the rights-holder, granting the individual authority to exercise or refrain from exercising those rights, or even to authorize another person to do so on their behalf.
- 2) Rights impose duties on others to respect them. In private law, others are obliged to recognize one's rights—such as property rights (fundamental rights) or personal claims (obligations). In public law, rights may be asserted against the state, requiring it or its agencies to act or refrain from acting in ways that safeguard the rights-holder's interests. Thus, every right entails a corresponding duty on others.
- 3) Rights exist only by virtue of law. Rights and duties are enforceable only when legally recognized. The law may explicitly define rights or empower individuals to establish them by agreement, so long as such agreements do not contravene legal provisions or public morals. Rights enforceable against the state must be grounded in the Constitution or statutory law.

Liberty, on the other hand, refers to the ability to act according to one's will without external obstacles—for instance, freedom of speech or freedom of religion (Intachai & Piriyaawatthana, 2023). According to the Royal Institute Dictionary, liberty means the capacity to act freely according to one's desires without interference, provided that such actions do not infringe upon the rights of others (Bunpitak, 2018).

In summary, rights and liberties are distinct yet interconnected concepts. Rights concern entitlements that can be claimed or demanded from others. When claims are made against private individuals, they are private rights (e.g., civil rights). When asserted against the state, they are public rights or constitutional rights. Liberty, in contrast, represents freedom from coercion—the ability to act or refrain from acting without interference. Liberty does not require

active exercise or enforcement but protects individuals from being compelled to act against their will. Nevertheless, liberty can give rise to what is known as a “right to liberty.” This means individuals may claim protection against any infringement of their freedom, whether by other individuals or by the state. If liberty is violated, the rights-holder has the right to seek redress. Ultimately, rights and liberties are among the most fundamental values that society must safeguard. Rights represent legitimate authority that allows individuals to demand that others act or abstain from acting in specific ways, forming a lawful power between persons and the state. Liberty, however, does not inherently impose duties on others (e.g., freedom of religion), unless it becomes a right to liberty recognized by the Constitution. At this point, it creates a mutual obligation of respect among citizens. The classification of rights and liberties varies depending on their origins and content, as defined by legal scholars. Importantly, both concepts exist within both democratic and socialist systems, though their expression and implementation differ across societies and political ideologies.

### **Concepts and Theories Regarding the Rights and Freedoms of People of Diverse Genders**

The rights of individuals with diverse sexual orientations and gender identities are grounded in the principles of human rights, which denote lawful entitlements protected by legal systems. Human rights are universal, inalienable, and equal, derived from human dignity, and encompass freedoms, equality, and respect free from discrimination.

In Thailand, the rights of LGBTQ+ persons must be protected under both the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand and international human rights treaties to which the nation is a party. Human rights serve as the foundation of peaceful coexistence, ensuring respect for equality and preventing the infringement of others’ freedoms. According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), these rights can be classified into five major domains:

- 1) Civil Rights: Right to life, liberty, personal security, nationality, and protection from torture or arbitrary killing.
- 2) Political Rights: Right to participate in public affairs, freedom of assembly, political association, and fair elections.
- 3) Social Rights: Right to education, health, social welfare, and family life.
- 4) Economic Rights: Right to work, fair remuneration, and property ownership.
- 5) Cultural Rights: Right to language, cultural expression, and freedom of religion (Rights and Liberties Protection Department, 2013).

Empirical studies highlight the evolving dynamics of LGBTQ+ rights in Thailand. Sookpornasawan et al. (2024) found that positive media representation of sexual diversity reduces prejudice and enhances acceptance among Thai youth, illustrating the transformative role of digital media in shaping public attitudes. Conversely, Keclíková (2025) revealed that mainstream news still underrepresents LGBTQ+ issues, reflecting limited public awareness compared with other social concerns.

In the digital age, social activism has increasingly migrated online. Putra (2024) introduced the concept of digital activism through the #MilkTeaAlliance movement, demonstrating the potential of online networks to advance human rights and democratic participation. This shift has also empowered Thai LGBTQ+ communities to express political opinions more freely and creatively in virtual spaces. Nevertheless, Thailand’s recognition of LGBTQ+ rights remains partial and conditional. When compared with the Yogyakarta Principles (2007), which outline the application of international human rights law to sexual orientation and gender identity, Thailand still faces structural, political, and legal challenges. These limitations reflect deeper hierarchies of state power and social inequality that continue to constrain the realization of full rights and freedoms for LGBTQ+ individuals in Thai society.

### **The Principle of Public Order and Good Morals**

The principles of public order and good morals have several key characteristics: 1) A fundamental principle in all legal systems - It relates to essential aspects of society, economy,

and morality that enable the stability and sustainability of social order. 2) A principle concerning the general welfare of the nation or the people - Therefore, it must not be violated even if the law does not explicitly state provisions on public order or good morals. The court may raise the issue on its own initiative, even when neither party invokes it. 3) An indeterminate and broad concept - Its meaning and scope are not fixed, as it evolves in line with state policies and changing social conditions over time. This flexibility allows courts to exercise discretion, ensuring that public order and morality can be effectively maintained. 4) A principle of justice - Since it is difficult to define precisely what constitutes public order or good morals, there are no fixed factual elements. Courts are therefore empowered to interpret and decide on a case-by-case basis to ensure fairness to all parties. 5) A mandatory legal norm - It is a peremptory rule that cannot be altered or waived by agreement between parties—any violation results in legal penalties or adverse consequences (Horayangkura & Asawalertsak, 2023).

The principle of public order and good morals is a fundamental concept that appears in both private law and public law: 1) In private law, although it governs relationships between private individuals, specific provisions are deemed to involve public order and good morals and must be assessed on a case-by-case basis—such as those concerning legal status and capacity, formal requirements for legal acts, and family law provisions. 2) In public law, it governs the relationship between the state (or its agencies) and individuals in the exercise of administrative authority for the public benefit—for instance, constitutional law, administrative law, tax law, and criminal law. These areas directly embody and enforce the principles of public order and good morals.

### **Critical Race Theory (CRT)**

Critical Race Theory (CRT) is an academic framework developed over four decades ago that asserts that race is a social construct and that racism is not merely the result of individual bias but is deeply embedded in laws, institutions, and policies. Originating in the late 1970s and early 1980s, CRT, drawing on the work of Derrick Bell, Kimberlé Crenshaw, and Richard Delgado, redefined how scholars understand systemic inequality within the legal system.

A classic illustration of CRT's principles is found in the redlining policies of the 1930s United States, where government officials designated minority neighborhoods as high-risk areas, leading banks to deny mortgages to Black residents. This practice exemplifies how law and policy can structurally perpetuate discrimination under the guise of neutrality.

In contemporary contexts, CRT provides a valuable lens for analyzing how people of diverse genders encounter systemic barriers in exercising their rights and freedoms—particularly in digital spaces. It highlights how power structures, cultural norms, and institutional biases reinforce inequality even when constitutional protections formally exist.

Thailand presents a parallel situation. Although the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand guarantees equality and freedom of expression, gender-binary legal and social frameworks continue to marginalize LGBTQ+ individuals. This exclusion mirrors racial segregation in its structural effects, as it restricts full legal recognition and social acceptance. In the realm of online political expression, the contradiction is particularly stark: while the Constitution enshrines the right to express opinions, in practice, such expression—especially criticism of state institutions—may be constrained by security laws, the Computer Crime Act, or overly broad legal interpretations. Consequently, the political freedoms of LGBTQ+ citizens remain more limited than those of other groups, reflecting the enduring influence of social hierarchy and institutional control.

### **Queer Theory**

Teresa de Lauretis first introduced the term “Queer Theory” at a 1990 conference at the University of California, Santa Cruz, to challenge dominant paradigms in gay and lesbian studies. At that time, such studies often treated sexual identity as fixed and inherent—an

empiricist view that ignored its social construction. De Lauretis urged scholars to reconsider the frameworks shaping Western gay and lesbian scholarship, noting persistent inequalities within these supposedly inclusive movements, particularly between middle-class white activists and marginalized communities. What appeared to be a unified gay and lesbian culture was, in reality, diverse and fragmented.

Since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, human sexual desire has been categorized as heterosexuality, bisexuality, or homosexuality—based on biological sex as the defining criterion. This biological determinism produced a discourse that naturalized heterosexuality as “normal” while labeling same-sex or bisexual desire as “deviant.” Such discourse reflects social power—how Western societies used “bio-power” to regulate sexuality through the relationship between bodies and institutional control.

Queer theory questions how science itself became a vehicle of power. From the Industrial Revolution onward, capitalist and democratic ideologies sought to regulate sexuality to reinforce economic and familial order. Biological sex thus became the basis for defining legitimate sexual desire, with heterosexual reproduction idealized as natural and moral. This heteronormative ideology, intertwined with Christian doctrine, positioned heterosexuality as the social norm while marginalizing non-reproductive or nonbinary relationships as immoral. Challenging heteronormativity became central to queer theory. It exposed how these norms fuel prejudice against transgender and same-sex individuals, reinforcing rigid hierarchies of gender and sexuality. Moreover, Western heteronormative frameworks were exported through colonialism, imposing moral and legal norms on colonized societies and defining local sexualities as sinful or pathological—contributing to contemporary homophobia and transphobia.

Queer theorists further argue that Western societies evolved under the influence of science, Christianity, capitalism, and democracy—all grounded in heterosexual assumptions. Consequently, social inequalities based on sexuality, race, religion, and class all stem from binary gender and heteronormative structures. As Butler (2005) and later scholars observed, what societies call “normal” or “natural” is socially constructed, privileging masculinity and heterosexuality as superior or more evolved.

From this perspective, even the Constitution—as the highest legal instrument—fails to dismantle entrenched heteronormativity. Although rights and freedoms are constitutionally guaranteed, conservative interpretations continue to limit full LGBTQ+ equality. Digital platforms have become vital spaces for gender-diverse individuals to express identity and political opinions, transcending traditional social boundaries. However, computer crime laws, defamation statutes, and national security measures are often used to suppress these expressions, restricting the freedoms theoretically protected by the Constitution.

Creating safer, more inclusive online environments; amending discriminatory laws; and promoting broader social acceptance are therefore crucial to realizing genuine freedom of expression and equality for all gender-diverse communities.

## **Research Methodology**

This study employs a documentary research methodology, which is a form of qualitative research. The study involves the analysis of data from legal texts, commentaries on Supreme Court (Dika Court) judgments, and both domestic and international legal documents and academic articles. This research concerns the rights and freedoms of LGBTQ+ individuals regarding political expression through online media under the Thai Constitution and subordinate legislation, such as the Computer-related Crime Act 2007, as amended. This data will be collected from libraries and online databases. Subsequently, the gathered information will be compiled, researched, analyzed, and compared with foreign laws.

## Research Results

Studies across different countries reveal varying perspectives on LGBTQ+ identities. Reports of having relatives, friends, or colleagues who are lesbian, gay, or bisexual are highest in Latin America, Spain, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. Sexual diversity is also most visible throughout the Anglosphere, in Brazil, and—significantly—in Thailand. According to LGBT Capital, a financial advisory firm serving primarily LGBTQ+ clients, the openly identified LGBTQ+ population currently stands at approximately 483 million people out of 7.4 billion worldwide, or about 6.53% of the global population. Of these, 288 million (60%) reside in Asia, including 85 million in China, 80 million in India, 8 million in Japan, and 4 million in Thailand. Internationally, individuals of diverse sexual orientations and gender identities are collectively known as the LGBTQ+ community.

This diversity has led to increased recognition across many nations. Nevertheless, LGBTQ+ persons have the same political rights as all citizens, including the right to vote, express opinions, and engage in political activities. Under international human rights law, Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights protects freedom of expression—affirming every person’s right to speak, share information, and advocate for a better world. It also safeguards the right to agree or disagree with those in power and to express such opinions through peaceful protest. Exercising these rights freely and without unlawful interference is essential for an open and just society in which all individuals can access justice and thoroughly enjoy their human rights. A diversity of viewpoints is further vital to a nation’s democratic development and social progress (Amnesty International Thailand, 2025).

Under the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, 2017, Section 34 guarantees freedom of expression and communication by all means—including speech, writing, printing, and other forms—while Section 27 ensures equality and prohibits unfair discrimination based on sex. Although “gender identity” is not explicitly mentioned, these provisions can be interpreted to include LGBTQ+ persons. Thus, when LGBTQ+ individuals express political opinions online, such actions fall under constitutionally protected rights. Any limitation on these freedoms must meet the tests of necessity and proportionality.

However, secondary legislation such as the Computer-Related Crime Act 2007 and its amendments (CCA) presents challenges. Originally designed to prevent misuse of computer systems and address cybercrime, Section 14 defines offenses concerning public order and morality, including: (1) fraudulent or deceptive introduction of false or distorted data likely to harm the public; (2) false information threatening national or economic security or causing public panic; (3) data related to national security or terrorism offenses; (4) obscene content accessible to the public; and (5) dissemination of such data with knowledge of its falsity.

While the CCA aims to prevent harm, its vague definition of “false information” can restrict freedom of expression, particularly for LGBTQ+ individuals. Criticizing state policies or advocating for LGBTQ+ rights—such as marriage equality or anti-discrimination laws—may be misinterpreted as spreading false or subversive information. Under Section 14, offenders must knowingly post false data with malicious intent, yet courts have interpreted this broadly. For instance, in Bangkok South Criminal Court Judgment No.899/2558, data inconsistent with verifiable facts were deemed false and thus unprotected (Noiphang, 2024). Such interpretations risk undermining international standards on freedom of expression, especially during periods of political tension.

Section 20 of the CCA authorizes the Minister of Digital Economy and Society to seek court orders to suspend or remove computer data deemed harmful to state security, public order, or good morals. While this authority aims to protect the public interest, its broad enforcement can directly suppress LGBTQ+ voices. Advocacy related to marriage equality, family recognition, or anti-discrimination—central to LGBTQ+ rights—often occurs online and can easily be labeled as “contrary to good morals” or “affecting public order.” Such vague standards risk

silencing legitimate human rights discourse, fostering fear and self-censorship among LGBTQ+ individuals who may hesitate to express themselves politically for fear of prosecution or social backlash.

Therefore, online political expression must be assessed through both constitutional principles and subordinate legislation, alongside international human rights standards. For LGBTQ+ persons, such expression is not merely a personal liberty but an essential means to claim equality and challenge structural discrimination. When enforcement of the CCA leads to blocking or removing LGBTQ+-related content, it constitutes a disproportionate restriction that deepens inequality. Thai legal practice must evolve to recognize the special vulnerability of sexual and gender minorities by adopting non-discriminatory screening criteria and effective appeal mechanisms.

Sections 14 and 20 grant broad discretion to authorities to define what constitutes “public order” or “good morals”—terms lacking precise legal definitions. This vagueness allows interpretation based on prevailing social norms or personal beliefs, often leading to unjustified restrictions on LGBTQ+ expression. Such practices disproportionately limit LGBTQ+ individuals’ access to political participation and public spaces.

Comparative analysis highlights alternative approaches. In Germany, the Federal Constitutional Court applies a strict proportionality test, distinguishing between subjective opinions—protected as personal value judgments—and objectively false statements, which are not (Schulze-Fielitz, 1994; Noiphang, 2024). Canada employs the Oakes test to ensure any restriction serves a legitimate and proportionate purpose. At the same time, South Africa excludes hate speech and incitement to violence but fully protects political expression (Centre for Constitutional Studies, 2019). These democratic systems illustrate clear statutory safeguards and proportionate limitations on speech—models Thailand can adapt to strengthen equality and the rule of law.

Ultimately, developing a democratic and inclusive digital environment in Thailand requires both legal reform and cultural change. Refining the CCA to align with constitutional and international human rights standards will ensure that digital spaces remain open, equitable, and safe for LGBTQ+ participation. As research by Newman et al. (2021) and Langlois (2025) indicates, Thailand continues to face gaps in the application of global human rights norms, despite being a party to the ICCPR. Strengthening protections for online expression will empower LGBTQ+ communities—who have long been central to advancing human rights, justice, and democracy—to participate fully in shaping Thailand’s democratic future.

## **Conclusion and Discussion**

Political expression by gender-diverse individuals reflects the intersection of human rights and political institutions in Thailand. Legally, freedom of expression is protected under Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, 2017, which guarantees equality and political participation without discrimination. In practice, however, LGBTQ+ individuals still face restrictions under the Computer-Related Crime Act 2007 and its amendments.

Most LGBTQ+ political activism centers on demands for equality—such as marriage rights, family recognition, workplace equality, and anti-discrimination. However, these voices are often delegitimized through legal and social sanctions under the guise of “public order” or “good morals,” thereby undermining constitutional freedoms and Thailand’s international human rights commitments.

Despite these barriers, LGBTQ+ activism plays a vital role in advancing democratic values by broadening the human rights discourse and promoting equality, dignity, and inclusion. To ensure genuine protection, Thailand should adopt Newman et al.’s (2021) recommendations for comprehensive anti-discrimination and legal gender recognition laws, and follow Putra’s



(2024) call for safe, open digital spaces that empower LGBTQ+ participation. Additionally, the concept of queer culture in Asia deepens understanding of online identity and interaction. Ultimately, while equality is constitutionally recognized, systemic exclusion persists. Legal reforms aligning Thai law with international human rights standards—particularly regarding expression and digital rights—are essential to achieving true equality and reinforcing democratic governance in the digital era.

### **Recommendations**

The mechanisms for preventing and regulating the dissemination of computer data in Thailand remain ambiguous and overly restrictive, particularly regarding online political expression by LGBTQ+ individuals. Such limitations are disproportionate to the actual risks posed and result in an undue infringement on the rights of sexual and gender minorities. To ensure that LGBTQ+ persons can freely express political opinions within a democratic framework, the following recommendations are proposed:

#### **1) Legal Recommendations**

1.1) Amendment of Ambiguous Provisions: The Computer-Related Crime Act 2007 and its amendments—specifically Sections 14 and 20—should be revised to align with international human rights standards. Ambiguous phrases such as “good morals” and “false information” should be clearly defined to reduce interpretive discretion that may lead to discrimination or suppression of LGBTQ+ voices.

#### **2) Policy Recommendations**

2.1) Protection of Freedom of Expression: The Thai state should explicitly guarantee LGBTQ+ individuals the right to express political opinions online under the Constitution and subordinate legislation. At the same time, the Computer-Related Crime Act should be amended to specify that political expression—when conducted constructively, peacefully, and without unlawful intent—is fully protected and does not constitute an offence.

2.2) Legal Research and Administrative Reform: The government should promote empirical legal research on administrative and regulatory inequalities affecting LGBTQ+ persons, including unclear or inconsistent laws that contribute to misunderstanding or discrimination. Transparent and inclusive legislation will help ensure equal treatment and legal certainty for sexual and gender minorities.

2.3) Participation of Civil Society and LGBTQ+ Organizations: The state should establish formal mechanisms for LGBTQ+ networks and civil society organizations to participate in policy- and law-making processes. This inclusive approach will ensure that LGBTQ+ perspectives are genuinely represented, prevent their exclusion from political spaces, and promote equality in both digital and physical public spheres.

### **Acknowledgement**

The researcher would like to express sincere gratitude to Maejo University-Chumphon Campus for providing financial support, academic assistance, and valuable resources for this study. Appreciation is also extended to all scholars whose insightful comments have contributed significantly to the improvement of this research.

### **References**

- Amnesty International Thailand. (2025). *Freedom of expression*. Retrieved from [www.amnesty.or.th/our-work/freedom-expression/](http://www.amnesty.or.th/our-work/freedom-expression/).
- Bunpitak, P. (2018). *Rights and freedoms of the Thai people according to the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, 2017*. Retrieved from <https://prt.parliament.go.th/items/b478086a-7b31-4353-a88f-76b2be8924b1/full>.
- Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an account of oneself*. New York: Fordham University Press.

- Centre for Constitutional Studies. (2019). *Oakes test*. Retrieved from [www.constitutionalstudies.ca/2019/07/oakes-test/](http://www.constitutionalstudies.ca/2019/07/oakes-test/).
- Computer-Related Crime Act, 2007*.
- Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand 2017*.
- Horayangkura, P., & Asawalertsak, N. (2023). *The principle of public order and good morals*. Retrieved from [www.stou.ac.th/schools/slsw/upload/ex.40701-2.pdf](http://www.stou.ac.th/schools/slsw/upload/ex.40701-2.pdf)
- Intachai, M., & Piriyawatthana, W. (2023). The Constitutional Rights and Liberties of Citizens to Complain: A Case Study of Problems and Obstacles in Submitting Complaints through the 1555 Bangkok Hotline of the Phasi Charoen District Office. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 252-270.
- Keclíková, A. (2025). Discrepancies in Popularity and Research Focus in Online Social Networks. *ProInflow*, 17(2), 1-26.
- Langlois, A. (2025). LGBT rights claiming and political participation in Southeast Asia. *The Pacific Review*, 38(2), 262-284.
- Newman, P., Reid, L., Tepjan, S., & Akkakanjanasupar, P. (2021). LGBT+ inclusion and human rights in Thailand: A scoping review of the literature. *BMC Public Health*, 21, 1816.
- Noiphang, C. (2024). *Legal Problems Pertaining to Freedom of Expression: An Analysis of Section 14 and Section 20 of the Computer-Relate Crime Act 2007*. Master of Laws Thesis, Thammasat University.
- Panboonmee, S. (n.d.). *Parenting in the digital age: Turning screen-addicted children into digital citizens*. Retrieved from [www.depa.or.th/th/article-view/Raising-kids-in-digital-era](http://www.depa.or.th/th/article-view/Raising-kids-in-digital-era).
- Putra, B. (2024). Digital activism in Southeast Asia: the #MilkTeaAlliance and prospects for social resistance. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 9, 1478630.
- Rights and Liberties Protection Department. (2013). *National Human Rights Plan No. 3 (2014-2018)*. Bangkok: Rights and Liberties Protection Department
- Schulze-Fielitz, H. (1994). BVerfG, 13. 4. 1994 — 1 BvR 23/94. Zur Leugnung der Judenverfolgung. *JuristenZeitung*, 49(18), 900-905.
- Sookpornsawan, R., Kiatrungrit, K., Seree, P., Korpaisarn, S., & Arunakul, J. (2024). Association between exposure to gender and sexual diversity in media (GSDM) and Thai adolescents' attitude towards LGBT individuals: A cross-sectional study in Bangkok schools. *BMJ Open*, 14, e089390.
- Yogyakarta Principles. (2007). *Principles on the Application of International Human Rights Law in Relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity*. Retrieved from [https://yogyakartaprinciples.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/principles\\_en.pdf](https://yogyakartaprinciples.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/principles_en.pdf).

**Data Availability Statement:** The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

**Publisher's Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations or those of the publisher, the editors, and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article or claim that may be made by its manufacturer is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.



**Copyright:** © 2025 by the authors. This is a fully open-access article distributed under the terms of the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).