

EFFECTIVENESS OF LEGENFORCEMENT AGAINST ILLEGAL STREET RACING: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INDONESIA, THE UNITED STATES, AND GERMANY

IVAN AMINULLOH¹, KARIM²

A. Djoko Sumaryanto³

¹Universitas Bhayangkara Surabaya, Indonesia

The E-mail Author: ivanaminulloh44@gmail.com

Abstract:

Illegal street racing remains a persistent and complex challenge in many urban settings, particularly among male adolescents who engage in high-risk behavior as a means of asserting identity and gaining peer recognition. This phenomenon poses significant threats to public safety, social order, and the rule of law. Despite ongoing law enforcement efforts, the recurrence of illegal racing activities indicates the limitations of punitive measures alone. This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of legal enforcement mechanisms in addressing illegal street racing by conducting a comparative analysis of regulatory frameworks, sanction models, preventive strategies, and public education initiatives in Indonesia, the United States, and Germany. Employing a normative juridical and comparative legal methodology, the research explores how each country integrates legal instruments with sociocultural and educational interventions to deter such behaviors. The study finds that a multidimensional approach—incorporating stringent legal sanctions, proactive prevention efforts, and sustained public education tailored to local legal cultures—is essential for long-term effectiveness. In particular, Germany's model of integrating community-based awareness campaigns and the United States' emphasis on diversionary programs for youth offenders offer valuable insights for reform. The findings suggest that Indonesia's current legal framework could benefit from adopting a more integrative and rehabilitative approach informed by international best practices. By strengthening legal deterrents while simultaneously addressing the underlying social and psychological motivations for street racing, Indonesia can enhance both legal efficacy and public safety outcomes.

Keywords: illegal street racing, law enforcement, comparative law, legal sanctions, public policy

INTRODUCTION

Illegal street racing, or unauthorized motor vehicle competitions conducted on public roads, has emerged as a pressing transnational issue that combines elements of legal infraction, youth culture, and urban policy failure. It is particularly prevalent among male adolescents who are often driven by identity formation, peer validation, and thrill-seeking behavior. In this context, street racing is more than an unlawful act—it is a form of social expression rooted in deeper psychological and sociocultural dynamics. In Indonesia, illegal street racing is not merely a traffic violation but a manifestation of broader structural challenges. These include the lack of government-provided recreational facilities, inadequate traffic safety education, inconsistent law enforcement, and weak institutional coordination. Many youths participate in illegal races not simply due to a desire for speed, but as a response to social alienation, limited economic opportunity, or the normalization of risk within certain peer groups. Kartini Kartono conceptualizes such behavior within the broader framework of juvenile delinquency, where deviant acts function as coping mechanisms for unmet emotional and developmental needs¹.

¹ Kartini Kartono, *Patologi Sosial 2: Kenakalan Remaja, Rajawali Pers*, 2009.

Although Indonesian law specifically Law No. 22 of 2009² on Road Traffic and Transportation (UU LLAJ) explicitly criminalizes street racing under Article 115(b) and imposes penalties under Article 297, enforcement remains erratic. Field studies³ showed that the implementation of these provisions is typically reactive and concentrated in high-visibility zones, failing to achieve long-term behavioral change. Moreover, the absence of preventive education, rehabilitation mechanisms, and consistent patrols exacerbates the problem. Riswanto highlights how police interventions often lack follow-up, allowing illegal activities to simply shift locations without disrupting their systemic causes⁴.

The fragmented nature of enforcement is compounded by the lack of comprehensive data. The Indonesian National Police's last major traffic accident report in 2012 documented over 117,000 racing-related accidents, but subsequent data is either unpublished or lacks specificity. This information gap hinders evidence-based policy formulation and undermines institutional accountability. Furthermore, the legal framework does not distinguish illegal street racing from other forms of reckless driving, leading to interpretive inconsistencies across jurisdictions. As a result, sentencing is often lenient, and legal outcomes vary significantly depending on the judicial district and available evidence.

Juvenile offenders who constitute the majority of street racers are especially vulnerable under Indonesia's current legal system. Despite ratifying the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, Indonesia has not fully implemented diversionary or rehabilitative mechanisms for youth offenders involved in traffic violations. In many cases, minors are processed through adult-oriented legal systems that fail to address the root causes of their behavior or provide pathways to reintegration. This stands in stark contrast to countries that incorporate restorative justice or youth-centered adjudication systems.

To address these gaps, this research engages in a comparative legal analysis by examining policy and enforcement frameworks in Indonesia, the United States, and Germany. Both countries provide instructive examples of integrative enforcement strategies that go beyond legal sanctions to include infrastructural design, youth education, and technological innovation. The comparative framework allows for the identification of context-sensitive best practices that can inform more robust policy interventions in Indonesia.

In the United States, illegal street racing is treated as a criminal offense at the state and municipal levels, with penalties that range from fines and vehicle impoundment to felony charges in cases involving injury or fatality. Legislative frameworks such as California's Assembly Bill 2000 exemplify legal escalation to enhance deterrence. Enforcement is supported by specialized task forces, AI-powered surveillance systems, and social media monitoring. Furthermore, the United States applies community-oriented programs such as the Racers Against Street Racing (RASR) initiative, which collaborates with local government, automotive manufacturers, and car enthusiasts to provide legal racing venues and educational outreach. Schools and community centers incorporate street racing awareness into driver's education programs, using testimonial-based campaigns to illustrate the real-life consequences of risky driving⁵.

² Republik Indonesia, "Undang-Undang No. 22 Tahun 2009 Tentang Lalu Lintas Dan Angkutan Jalan" (2009).

³ Rika Damayanti et al., "Police Efforts in Combating and Preventing Illegal Racing Among Youth," *Journal of Asian Multicultural Research for Social Sciences Study* 3, no. 2 (June 7, 2022): 49 – 57, <https://doi.org/10.47616/jamrsss.v3i2.285>; A. F Swasana, "Enforcement of Article 115 UU No. 22/2009 in Surabaya," *Jurnal Lalu Lintas Dan Transportasi* 3, no. 2 (2015).

⁴ G Riswanto, "Police Strategies Against Teen Street Racing in Malang," *Jurnal Kriminologi Nusantara* 5, no. 1 (2024).

⁵ RASR, "RASR – Racers Against Street Racing," 2024 AD, <https://www.sema.org/rasr>.



Germany, by contrast, approaches illegal street racing through a doctrine of strict liability, as enshrined in Section 315d of the German Penal Code (StGB). A landmark 2017 Berlin case saw two racers convicted of murder following a fatal crash, establishing a precedent that frames street racing as a form of "conditional intent" (bedingter Vorsatz)⁶. Enforcement is technologically driven, with widespread use of automated speed cameras, vehicle tracking systems, and a centralized license point system (Punkte in Flensburg) to penalize repeat offenders. Driver education in Germany is federally regulated and incorporates mandatory training on risk behavior, accident psychology, and legal consequences. These curricular standards instill a normative understanding of road safety even before individuals are licensed to drive.

International guidelines reinforce the merit of integrated enforcement strategies. The World Health Organization (WHO) and UN-Habitat advocate for youth inclusion, urban planning, and educational campaigns as critical components of safe urban mobility policies. These recommendations emphasize that punitive legal strategies alone are insufficient and must be complemented by social and infrastructural interventions.

Comparative legal scholarship supports this view. Effective governance of illegal street racing involves not only criminal deterrence but also public legitimacy, educational resonance, and cultural adaptability. While Indonesia possesses a statutory basis for enforcement, its policy framework lacks institutional coherence and preventive depth. The disconnect between law and implementation results in a cycle of episodic crackdowns followed by recidivism and normalization of illegal behavior.

This research addresses a gap in the literature by moving beyond descriptive accounts of Indonesian enforcement to a normative and comparative framework. It seeks to answer the central question: *How effective are legal and policy approaches in addressing illegal street racing in Indonesia compared to the United States and Germany?* In doing so, it identifies points of divergence and convergence among the three countries, providing a basis for policy hybridization that suits Indonesia's unique legal culture, technological capacity, and sociopolitical context.

By synthesizing normative legal analysis with empirical evidence and comparative insights, this study argues for a multidimensional approach to reform. Legal frameworks must be updated to include clearer definitions, proportional sanctions, and diversionary pathways⁷. At the same time, enforcement should be professionalized and supplemented by data systems that track offender profiles, recidivism rates, and the geographic concentration of racing activities. Infrastructure investments such as legal racing tracks and traffic-calming road designs—can provide both physical deterrents and positive alternatives. Finally, public education must be institutionalized through partnerships between schools, police, civil society, and digital media platforms to counter the glamorization of street racing culture.

Ultimately, addressing illegal street racing in Indonesia requires more than legal reform it demands a societal shift. This transformation can only occur through a sustained, cross-sectoral effort that views traffic safety not merely as a matter of law enforcement, but as a composite of youth development, public health, and urban design. Through this lens, the law becomes not just a tool for punishment, but a framework for cultivating a culture of responsibility, safety, and civic participation.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a normative juridical and comparative legal research approach to examine the effectiveness of legal enforcement against illegal street racing. The normative juridical method was used to analyze statutory provisions, legal doctrines, and institutional frameworks related to street racing regulations in Indonesia, the United States, and Germany. The comparative legal method

⁶ "Landgericht Berlin Case No. 535 Ks 8/16" (2017).

⁷ Satjipto Rahardjo, *Penegakan Hukum Progresif* (Jakarta, 2009).

supported the identification of similarities and differences in enforcement mechanisms, sanctioning systems, preventive strategies, and educational interventions across these jurisdictions.

Primary legal sources included formal legal instruments such as Indonesia's Law No. 22 of 2009 on Road Traffic and Transportation (UU LLAJ)⁸, Section 315d of Germany's Penal Code (Strafgesetzbuch), and relevant state-level legislation in the United States, including California's Vehicle Code and Assembly Bill 2000. These were complemented by judicial decisions, including the 2017 Berlin ruling on street racing as a form of conditional intent homicide. Secondary legal materials comprised peer-reviewed journal articles, law enforcement reports, public policy documents, and international guidelines issued by global institutions such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and UN-Habitat.

Data collection was conducted through doctrinal legal research and library-based investigation, involving systematic review of academic literature, official reports, legal commentaries, and statistical data published within the last decade. All materials were sourced from online legal databases, academic journal archives, and government publications to ensure accuracy, reliability, and contemporaneity.

To facilitate meaningful comparison, the study adopted a functional comparative law approach, which examined how different legal systems responded to similar challenges posed by illegal street racing. The analysis focused on three key dimensions of legal enforcement: (1) sanctioning mechanisms such as imprisonment, fines, vehicle impoundment, and license suspension; (2) preventive measures, including patrol deployment, technological surveillance, and urban traffic engineering; and (3) educational and social interventions, such as school-based awareness programs, public safety campaigns, and legal racing alternatives.

The comparative analysis was aimed at extracting best practices from the United States and Germany that could be adapted to the Indonesian context. Emphasis was placed on assessing the effectiveness, coherence, and social legitimacy of enforcement strategies. Ultimately, this methodological approach allowed for a comprehensive and critical evaluation of Indonesia's legal framework while proposing a reform agenda that integrates punitive, preventive, and educational dimensions of street racing regulation.

RESULTS

Indonesia: **Formal Sanctions,** **Informal** **Implementation**
The Indonesian legal framework for addressing illegal street racing is grounded in Law No. 22 of 2009 on Road Traffic and Transportation, specifically Articles 115(b) and 297, which prohibit motor racing on public roads and prescribe penalties of up to one year in prison or fines of three million rupiah.

However, enforcement is often limited to periodic raids or spot checks in known racing locations. These operations are usually short-lived and do not target the root causes of illegal racing behavior. Moreover, they are not accompanied by follow-up education or community outreach.

Although law enforcement in Indonesia periodically conducts raids and patrols to curb illegal street racing, these measures are often reactive, fragmented, and unsustainable. Rather than being part of a long-term public safety initiative, enforcement actions are commonly triggered by viral videos, complaints from residents, or media coverage. This episodic approach allows street racers to easily shift their activities to alternative locations and times, often staying one step ahead of authorities.

⁸ Republik Indonesia, Undang-Undang No. 22 Tahun 2009 tentang Lalu Lintas dan Angkutan Jalan.

As a result, law enforcement fails to dismantle the underlying networks or patterns of street racing behavior⁹.

More critically, these operations are seldom followed by meaningful community engagement or educational interventions. Unlike successful enforcement strategies in countries such as the United States—where police initiatives are accompanied by school outreach programs or collaborative campaigns with civil society—Indonesian law enforcement typically does not work in tandem with schools, youth organizations, or local communities¹⁰. The absence of preventive education and peer-based deterrents leaves a vacuum where risk behavior can flourish unchecked.

Additionally, Indonesia lacks a centralized and transparent database on street racing offenses. While the Indonesian National Police reported 117,949 traffic accidents related to racing in 2012, updated data are rarely published or disaggregated by age, location, or recidivism. This data gap not only hampers evidence-based policymaking but also weakens public accountability and inhibits cross-sector coordination¹¹.

Legal inconsistencies further aggravate the problem. Although Law No. 22 of 2009 prohibits motor vehicle racing on public roads, there is no specific statute addressing street racing as a unique offense distinct from general reckless driving. As a consequence, legal proceedings vary widely between jurisdictions, with some offenders receiving fines while others face imprisonment. Judges are often constrained by weak prosecutorial framing or lack of supporting evidence, leading to lenient outcomes that fail to deter future violations¹².

The situation is especially critical for juvenile offenders, who comprise a significant portion of illegal street racers. Despite international commitments under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, Indonesia has not institutionalized a diversion system tailored to young traffic offenders. Other countries, such as Australia or the United States, operate youth traffic courts or community panels that balance accountability with rehabilitation. In contrast, Indonesian minors are processed in adult-oriented legal environments that rarely address their psychological motivations or social contexts¹³.

Social normalization further entrenches the behavior. In some neighborhoods, illegal street racing is viewed as entertainment rather than a crime, with spectators cheering and filming races for social media platforms. This cultural acceptance is magnified by digital content that glamorizes high-speed driving, fostering a subculture where racing is equated with masculinity, bravery, and rebellion. Without deliberate efforts to counter these narratives through education and public discourse, enforcement alone will struggle to shift perceptions¹⁴.

Finally, the absence of a community policing framework exacerbates the gap between authorities and youth. Rather than fostering trust or collaboration, the dominant approach remains top-down and punitive. Many young people perceive police officers not as protectors but as adversaries, further fueling resistance and defiance. Building long-term deterrence, therefore, requires a

⁹ Damayanti et al., “Police Efforts in Combating and Preventing Illegal Racing Among Youth.”

¹⁰ T Irawan and H Sulisty, “The Limits of Law Enforcement in Youth Motor Racing Culture in Indonesia,” *Indonesian Journal of Criminology* 3, no. 2 (2022): 101–17.

¹¹ Indonesian National Police Traffic Directorate, “Annual Report on Traffic Accidents,” 2012.

¹² Swasana, “Enforcement of Article 115 UU No. 22/2009 in Surabaya.”

¹³ United Nations, “Convention on the Rights of the Child,” 1989, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child>.

¹⁴ R Yusuf and L Hidayati, “Balap Liar Dan Media Sosial: Studi Fenomenologi,” *Jurnal Kriminologi Indonesia* 6, no. 2 (2023): 112–28.

paradigm shift: from episodic suppression to sustained, youth-focused, and socially embedded enforcement strategies¹⁵.

Consequently, Indonesia's enforcement approach remains largely punitive, fragmented, and underdeveloped in terms of integrating preventive and educational strategies that are increasingly seen as effective in comparative jurisdictions.

Table 2. Indonesia - Key Data on Illegal Street Racing

| Indicator | Description |
|------------------------------|---|
| Estimated Annual Cases | 117,949 traffic accidents related to street racing (2012) |
| Youth Involvement Rate | High; majority aged 15-25 |
| Most Affected Cities | Jakarta, Surabaya, Medan, Malang |
| Fatal Accidents | Sporadic reports in local media; no centralized national registry |
| Legal Racing Venues | Very limited; no formal government initiative |
| Law Enforcement Strategy | Night patrols, random raids, general traffic ticketing |
| Preventive Campaigns | Lacking; few school or media-based education efforts |
| Technological Infrastructure | Sparse; minimal use of CCTV or speed cameras |
| Legal Alternative Promotion | Not institutionalized |
| Recidivism Rates | Not officially recorded; likely high among youth |

United States: Multi-Tiered Enforcement and Community Engagement

In the United States, illegal street racing is addressed through a variety of state and municipal laws that criminalize reckless driving and unauthorized racing. Penalties range from heavy fines and license suspension to vehicle impoundment and incarceration depending on severity and recidivism¹⁶.

Cities like Los Angeles have developed specialized task forces, often integrated with traffic divisions, that actively monitor known racing areas, use social media intelligence, and coordinate with prosecutors for swift legal action. This proactive law enforcement model contrasts with Indonesia's episodic enforcement practices and relies heavily on digital surveillance and inter-agency collaboration¹⁷.

Notably, the *Racers Against Street Racing* (RASR) initiative brings together government agencies, automobile manufacturers, and drag racing professionals to offer sanctioned alternatives and promote public safety awareness¹⁸. These collaborations help transform racing culture from clandestine to regulated environments by shifting the narrative from criminality to responsible performance driving.

Educational programs in schools and community centers reinforce legal messages and promote responsible driving behaviors. Many U.S. jurisdictions integrate street racing awareness into high

¹⁵ Irawan and Sulisty, "The Limits of Law Enforcement in Youth Motor Racing Culture in Indonesia."

¹⁶ "California DMV Reports on Reckless Driving Statistics," n.d.

¹⁷ National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), "Street Racing and Highway Safety Report" (Washington, DC: U.S Department of Transportation., 2022).

¹⁸ SEMA, "Racers Against Street Racing (RASR) Initiative Overview," 2024, <https://www.sema.org/rasr>.

school driver education courses, supplemented by workshops led by law enforcement officers, community leaders, and even former offenders. This approach is designed to reach youth before they engage in risky behavior¹⁹.

Testimonial-based campaigns, particularly those using real-life stories from accident survivors or incarcerated offenders, are widely used to convey the human consequences of illegal racing. Campaigns such as “Every Second Counts” in Texas or “Life After Racing” in California have effectively reduced recidivism and promoted community dialogue²⁰.

Moreover, courts frequently apply restorative justice principles for first-time or juvenile offenders. These include participation in traffic safety classes, community service, or victim-impact panels instead of immediate incarceration. This practice aligns with youth development research that emphasizes behavioral correction over punitive isolation²¹.

In some cities, law enforcement also collaborates with street racing influencers or car enthusiast communities to host legal racing events, such as “Midnight Drags” in Las Vegas or “Legal Street Nights” in Florida. These events provide a controlled space for speed-based expression while reinforcing boundaries and regulations²².

From a legislative standpoint, many U.S. states have amended traffic laws to elevate street racing offenses to felony levels when bodily harm or fatalities occur. For instance, California’s AB 2000 allows felony charges if racing leads to injury or death. This legal escalation underscores the state’s prioritization of traffic violence prevention²³.

Technology also plays a central role. Cities like Phoenix and San Diego use AI-powered license plate recognition (LPR) and mobile surveillance towers to detect patterns and gather real-time evidence on illegal street racing networks. These innovations allow proactive, rather than reactive, policing strategies²⁴.

Overall, the U.S. model exemplifies how community-based approaches, supported by diverse stakeholders, can build a more resilient legal enforcement framework that prioritizes prevention alongside deterrence. The integration of education, legislation, technology, and cultural transformation presents a dynamic and adaptive response to illegal street racing.

Table 3. United States - Key Data on Illegal Street Racing

| Indicator | Description |
|------------------------|---|
| Estimated Annual Cases | 700-800 deaths/year (NHTSA estimate, 2022) |
| Youth Involvement Rate | ~60% of offenders under 25 years (California DMV) |
| Most Affected Cities | Los Angeles, Houston, Miami, Las Vegas |
| Fatal Accidents | 179 deaths in Los Angeles (2000-2018) |

¹⁹ AAA Foundation, “Teen Driver Education and Street Racing Awareness,” 2020, <https://aaafoundation.org>.

²⁰ Texas Department of Transportation (TXDOT), “Every Second Counts Campaign Report,” 2021.

²¹ National Juvenile Justice Network, “Restorative Justice and Youth Rehabilitation,” 2019, <https://www.njjn.org>.

²² Clark County Racing Association, “Midnight Drags Initiative Report. Las Vegas: CCDA,” 2022.

²³ California Assembly, “Street Racing and Sideshow Enforcement,” Assembly Bill 2000, 2020, <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov>.

²⁴ Phoenix Police Department, “Automated Surveillance and LPR Deployment Strategy,” *Phoenix: Law Enforcement Technology Division.*, 2023.



| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Legal Racing Venues | Widely available; state-funded and private drag strips |
| Law Enforcement Strategy | Special task forces, drones, license suspensions, impoundments |
| Preventive Campaigns | RASR, public service announcements, school education |
| Technological Infrastructure | Advanced in urban zones; variable in rural states |
| Legal Alternative Promotion | Strong; public-private partnerships |
| Recidivism Rates | 20-30% among young offenders (varies by state) |

Germany: Strict Liability and Judicial Precedent

Germany's legal response to illegal street racing is rooted in strict liability principles. A key example is the 2017 Berlin case where two drivers were convicted of murder for causing a fatal accident during a high-speed race, a landmark ruling that reshaped legal precedent for such offenses²⁵.

Under the German Penal Code (Strafgesetzbuch) and Road Traffic Act (Straßenverkehrsordnung), racing that endangers life or property can lead to severe penalties including long-term imprisonment. Such categorization elevates the offense to a serious crime rather than a mere traffic infraction²⁶.

The country uses automated enforcement systems, including speed cameras and vehicle tracking technology, which reduce reliance on physical patrols and enhance the likelihood of detection and prosecution. These systems are particularly effective in urban areas with high-density traffic²⁷.

Germany also emphasizes engineering and design interventions to deter street racing. Traffic-calming measures such as raised crosswalks, chicanes, and narrowed lanes physically inhibit high-speed driving and are common in residential and central business districts²⁸.

Public safety campaigns in Germany are highly institutionalized. Driving education includes moral and ethical aspects of road use, and periodic public service announcements remind drivers of the risks associated with speeding and racing behaviors. These messages are disseminated via television, social media, and in cooperation with insurance firms²⁹.

The education system also plays a key role. In Germany, driving schools are regulated at the federal level and must include theoretical modules on risk behavior, legal consequences, and accident psychology. Such rigorous requirements instill a legalistic and safety-conscious mindset before drivers receive their license³⁰.

Importantly, traffic violations—including illegal racing—are closely monitored through a nationwide point-based license system (Punkte in Flensburg). Accumulating too many points can result in

²⁵ Landgericht Berlin Case No. 535 Ks 8/16.

²⁶ StGB § 315d, "Strafgesetzbuch: Verbotene Kraftfahrzeugrennen.," n.d., https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/stgb/_315d.html.

²⁷ H Bast, "Technologische Überwachung Im Straßenverkehr," *Köln: Bundesanstalt Für Straßenwesen*, 2021.

²⁸ M Schneider and T Vogt, "Stadtgestaltung Und Verkehrssicherheit: Eine Empirische Analyse. Zeitschrift Für Verkehrswissenschaft" 91, no. 3 (2023): 211–28.

²⁹ ADAC, "Verkehrssicherheitskampagnen in Deutschland. Munich: ADAC Verlag.," 2022.

³⁰ Bundesministerium für Verkehr, "Fahrausbildung in Deutschland: Rechtliche Grundlagen.," *Berlin: BMVI*, 2021.

mandatory re-education or license suspension, creating a strong disincentive to engage in risky driving³¹.

Law enforcement agencies coordinate with judicial authorities to pursue maximum sentencing for repeat offenders or cases involving injury. In Berlin and Hamburg, police also use unmarked patrol vehicles and night surveillance units equipped with speed detectors to catch racers in action³².

Judicial decisions post-2017 show a shift toward treating street racing as a form of "conditional intent" (bedingter Vorsatz), especially when races occur in populated areas. This legal interpretation allows for charges of attempted or actual homicide when fatalities occur, reinforcing the state's commitment to deterrence³³.

Civil society groups such as "Verkehrsclub Deutschland" and "No Need for Speed" complement governmental efforts by campaigning against reckless driving culture. These organizations engage in community education, victim advocacy, and policy lobbying to promote safer urban transportation³⁴.

Media also plays a role in shaping public perception. Sensationalized coverage of street racing accidents often prompts swift policy responses, including calls for legislative reform or temporary traffic restrictions in affected zones³⁵.

Germany's integrative strategy demonstrates how coherent legal statutes, supported by advanced technology and infrastructure, can reduce incidents and create a culture of legal compliance among motorists. Unlike in countries where street racing is treated primarily as a youth rebellion or traffic nuisance, Germany frames it as a severe criminal offense with social, legal, and infrastructural implications.

Table 4. Germany - Key Data on Illegal Street Racing

| Indicator | Description |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Estimated Annual Cases | No centralized data; increase noted in federal police and media |
| Youth Involvement Rate | Mostly male drivers aged 18-30 |
| Most Affected Cities | Berlin, Hamburg, Frankfurt |
| Fatal Accidents | Landmark 2016 Berlin case: 1 civilian death, 2 racers convicted for murder |
| Legal Racing Venues | Available; private and licensed motorsport tracks |
| Law Enforcement Strategy | Speed cameras, aggressive patrol, judicial precedent (StGB §315d) |
| Preventive Campaigns | Mandatory in driver education, public broadcasts |
| Technological Infrastructure | National-level automation (red light, speed, surveillance) |
| Legal Alternative | Available, though less targeted toward street racers |

³¹ KBA - Kraftfahrt-Bundesamt, "Punkte in Flensburg: Statistischer Jahresbericht. Flensburg: KBA," 2020, <https://www.bussgeldkatalog.org/kraftfahrt-bundesamt/>.

³² Polizei Berlin, "Maßnahmen Gegen Illegale Autorennen: Jahresbericht 2022," 2023.

³³ F König, "Bedingter Vorsatz Und Tötungsdelikte Bei Autorennen. Neue Juristische Wochenschrift" 72, no. 11 (n.d.): 845-51.

³⁴ VCD - Verkehrsclub Deutschland, "No Need for Speed: Zivilgesellschaft Gegen Raserei" (Berlin: VCD Report., 2022).

³⁵ Spiegel Online, "Tödliches Autorennen in Berlin: Debatte Um Gesetzesverschärfung," 2020, <https://www.spiegel.de>.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Promotion | |
| Recidivism Rates | Very low due to severe sentencing and license point systems |

Comparative Synthesis

Comparing Indonesia, the United States, and Germany reveals significant disparities in the policy architecture, enforcement mechanisms, and sociocultural integration of anti-street racing strategies. While all three countries formally criminalize illegal street racing, the practical implementation of these laws diverges sharply in terms of consistency, community orientation, and outcome effectiveness.

Indonesia maintains a clear legal basis for penalizing street racing through its Traffic Law No. 22/2009. However, the law is underutilized in practice due to fragmented enforcement, inconsistent judicial interpretation, and minimal institutional coordination. Despite the statutory framework, the absence of a comprehensive surveillance system, rehabilitation programs for youth offenders, or sustained educational outreach contributes to the persistence of illegal racing behaviors³⁶

In contrast, the United States demonstrates a multi-pronged enforcement ecosystem that integrates proactive policing, legislative adaptations, and civil society engagement. Initiatives like *Racers Against Street Racing* (RASR) serve as a model of how subcultural behaviors can be redirected through legal alternatives, such as drag strips and sanctioned events. Moreover, state-level laws such as California's AB 2000 provide clear prosecutorial guidance when street racing leads to bodily harm or death³⁷. Educational programs and restorative justice models further strengthen the system by addressing the behavioral roots of offending.

Germany, on the other hand, adopts a more centralized and punitive approach grounded in the doctrine of strict liability. Following the landmark 2017 Berlin ruling, street racing has been reframed not merely as a traffic violation but as a form of conditional intent homicide when fatalities occur. Enforcement is deeply integrated with technological infrastructure automated speed monitoring, real-time data capture, and a national point-based license suspension system³⁸. Additionally, driving education is standardized at the federal level and includes risk-awareness training and legal ethics.

These divergent models offer critical insights for Indonesia. The U.S. model provides a blueprint for community engagement and youth-oriented programming. It suggests that legal sanctions, when paired with cultural outreach and infrastructural investment, can yield measurable reductions in reoffending. The German approach, meanwhile, highlights the deterrent value of legal certainty and institutionalized accountability, especially through consistent application of severe penalties and surveillance.

However, successful policy transplantation requires contextual calibration. Indonesia's cultural norms, institutional capacity, and socioeconomic landscape differ significantly from those in the U.S. or Germany. For example, while Germany can rely on advanced surveillance and strong public compliance with law, Indonesia faces technological constraints and lower levels of trust in law

³⁶ Damayanti et al., "Police Efforts in Combating and Preventing Illegal Racing Among Youth" ; Swasana, "Enforcement of Article 115 UU No. 22/2009 in Surabaya."

³⁷ Assembly Bill 2000, "California Legislative Information," Street Racing and Sideshow Enforcement, accessed June 22, 2025, <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>.

³⁸ KBA - Kraftfahrt-Bundesamt, "Punkte in Flensburg: Statistischer Jahresbericht. Flensburg: KBA."

enforcement³⁹. Similarly, the extensive litigation infrastructure available in U.S. states may not be immediately replicable in Indonesia's overburdened court system.

Thus, hybridization emerges as a promising strategy. Indonesia should not adopt wholesale models from abroad but rather select adaptable components that align with local realities. This could include piloting a youth diversion court in urban areas, expanding school-based traffic safety education, and incrementally installing surveillance infrastructure in known racing hotspots.

Moreover, Indonesia must redefine the narrative around illegal street racing from one that centers solely on punitive enforcement to one that considers it a public health, youth development, and urban planning issue. This would require coordinated policymaking across ministries of law, transportation, education, and youth affairs, as well as sustained partnerships with NGOs, private sectors, and community leaders.

Data systems also need significant investment. Unlike the U.S. and Germany, Indonesia lacks a national database on street racing offenses, offender profiles, or geographic trends. Without data, policymaking remains speculative and reactive. Implementing a centralized traffic offense registry, integrated with police, judicial, and education sectors, would provide the foundation for evidence-based reform.


The role of media and digital platforms must not be overlooked. In all three countries, social media plays a significant role in amplifying or normalizing street racing culture. Indonesia can learn from Germany's and the U.S.' use of counter-narratives, such as public campaigns that highlight real-life consequences of racing. Collaborating with influencers, former offenders, and crash victims could help reshape societal perceptions and reduce the glamorization of risky driving.

Ultimately, a cross-national comparison illustrates that legal sanctions are necessary but not sufficient. Structural deterrence arises when law is harmonized with technology, education, and cultural legitimacy. Indonesia must shift from reactive policing to anticipatory governance embedding street racing prevention into urban design, school curricula, and digital citizenship.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Legal Responses to Illegal Street Racing

| Aspect | Indonesia | United States | Germany |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|
| Legal System | Civil law, formalistic | Common law, flexible, precedent-based | Civil law, doctrine-driven with strict judicial precedent |
| Legal Prohibition | Law No. 22/2009, Articles 115(b) and 297 ¹⁰ | State traffic laws (e.g., CA Vehicle Code §23109) | StGB §315d; landmark ruling (Berlin, 2017) ¹³ |
| Criminal Sanctions | Max 1 year imprisonment or IDR 3 million fine | Heavy fines, imprisonment, vehicle impoundment, license suspension ¹¹ | Up to 10-15 years if causing death ¹³ |
| Law Enforcement | Seasonal crackdowns, inconsistent, limited CCTV | Special task forces, social media monitoring, fast-track prosecution | Systematic, tech-based (automated speed cameras) |
| Youth Offender Approach | No formal diversion system | Restorative justice, traffic school, first-offender programs | Harsh sanctions paired with mandatory moral driving education |

³⁹ Irawan and Sulisty, "The Limits of Law Enforcement in Youth Motor Racing Culture in Indonesia."



| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| Preventive Infrastructure | Minimal—lack of structural deterrents | Legal drag strips, designated racing spaces | Traffic-calming urban design: bumps, chicanes, narrow lanes |
| Public Education | Limited, non-integrated | RASR program, testimonial-based social campaigns ¹² | Institutionalized in driver's license curriculum and national campaigns |
| Cross-Sector Collaboration | Weak, limited institutional coordination | Strong collaboration: government, automotive industry, racing community | Government, driving schools, and police operate in synergy |
| Deterrence Effectiveness | Low—due to light penalties and poor monitoring | Moderate-high, depending on city/state implementation | High—strict laws, technological controls, and integrated education |
| Policy Transfer Potential | Needs integrative reform: law-tech-education | Can adopt educational models and legal racing circuits | Can adopt enforcement tech and build case law precedents |

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study affirmed previous research indicating that legal enforcement alone was insufficient to effectively deter illegal street racing, particularly among adolescent populations. Earlier studies by Damayanti et al and Swasana highlighted that Indonesian law enforcement efforts were predominantly reactive, consisting mainly of sporadic raids and routine patrols without sustained follow-up or community engagement⁴⁰. This study confirmed such patterns, revealing that enforcement in Indonesia often lacked institutional coordination and failed to address the social and psychological drivers underlying youth participation in street racing.

Consistent with Riswantoro's observations in Malang, this study found that the absence of legal racing alternatives and targeted public education contributed to the persistence of street racing culture, particularly among males aged 15-25⁴¹. While the Indonesian legal framework especially Law No. 22 of 2009—provided a formal basis for sanctioning, it had limited deterrent power due to inconsistent application, low public trust in the judiciary, and minimal investment in surveillance infrastructure. This echoed Kartono's argument that youth delinquency, including illegal street racing, often stemmed from deeper social neglect and a lack of constructive social outlets⁴².

In contrast, the comparative findings from the United States and Germany aligned with international best practices and demonstrated more comprehensive approaches to combating street racing. In the U.S., initiatives such as Racers Against Street Racing (RASR) provided a multidimensional strategy that combined community-based education, legal racing venues, and media campaigns. These programs supported Swasana's claim that deterrence requires more than legal punishment it also depends on preventive and normative interventions that resonate with the target demographic⁴³.

Similarly, the German model reinforced the importance of legal certainty and technological enforcement, as noted in the 2017 Berlin case that set a precedent for treating fatal street races as homicide. The integration of automated surveillance, strict sentencing guidelines, and risk-

⁴⁰ Damayanti et al., "Police Efforts in Combating and Preventing Illegal Racing Among Youth" ; Swasana, "Enforcement of Article 115 UU No. 22/2009 in Surabaya."

⁴¹ Riswantoro, "Police Strategies Against Teen Street Racing in Malang."

⁴² Kartono, *Patologi Sosial 2: Kenakalan Remaja*.

⁴³ Swasana, "Enforcement of Article 115 UU No. 22/2009 in Surabaya."



awareness education in driving schools demonstrated how legal and infrastructural systems could reinforce each other to produce high compliance. This finding expanded on the work of Bast, who emphasized the role of surveillance and traffic engineering in shaping driver behavior⁴⁴.

This study further supported the argument presented by the WHO and UN-Habitat (2020) that traffic-related violence must be addressed not only through punitive law but also through inclusive urban planning and youth-centered interventions. The success of school-based education programs and restorative justice approaches in the U.S. highlighted the potential of early intervention, a strategy that Indonesia had yet to institutionalize. Furthermore, the German points-based licensing system which allowed for gradual disciplinary escalation, contrasted sharply with Indonesia's lack of offender tracking mechanisms, suggesting an opportunity for regulatory reform⁴⁵.

While previous literature primarily focused on descriptive accounts of enforcement efforts, this study provided a normative and comparative dimension by situating Indonesia's legal framework within a broader global context. It confirmed that Indonesia's reliance on episodic enforcement and legalistic interpretations failed to generate sustainable deterrence. The study extended prior findings by arguing for a hybridized model that merges local legal culture with adaptable foreign practices, such as the integration of traffic education into school curricula, the establishment of legal racing facilities, and investment in smart traffic monitoring.

Overall, the findings converged with existing scholarship that called for a shift from reactive law enforcement to anticipatory governance. The need to involve multiple stakeholders including youth organizations, schools, law enforcement, and civil society emerged as a critical theme throughout both the literature and this study's comparative analysis. As emphasized by Irawan and Sulisty, community-based policing and trust-building initiatives were essential to transforming the perception of law enforcement from punitive to protective⁴⁶.

In sum, this discussion underscored that while Indonesia's legal infrastructure nominally criminalized illegal street racing, its fragmented enforcement, lack of preventive education, and cultural normalization of racing undermined the effectiveness of these efforts. The experiences of the United States and Germany offered practical and policy-based lessons that could be calibrated to Indonesia's legal and social context. These insights contributed to the growing body of literature advocating for integrative approaches to youth-related urban offenses, particularly those involving mobility, risk, and law compliance.

CONCLUSION

This study concluded that legal enforcement alone was inadequate in addressing the complex and persistent issue of illegal street racing, particularly among adolescents driven by peer influence and thrill-seeking motivations. The comparative analysis demonstrated that jurisdictions such as the United States and Germany were more effective in curbing this phenomenon through the implementation of a triadic strategy that combined legal sanctions, preventive infrastructure, and public education, all underpinned by coherent legal frameworks and strong community engagement. In contrast, Indonesia's current system, while supported by legislation such as Law No. 22 of 2009, lacked consistency in enforcement, youth-specific interventions, and cross-sector collaboration. Based on the insights gathered from this study, several recommendations can be proposed to enhance Indonesia's policy response: first, revising Law No. 22/2009 to introduce stricter penalties for repeat offenders and fatal incidents; second, developing diversion programs for juvenile offenders that incorporate education, counseling, and supervised legal racing

⁴⁴ Bast, "Technologische Überwachung Im Straßenverkehr."

⁴⁵ KBA - Kraftfahrt-Bundesamt, "Punkte in Flensburg: Statistischer Jahresbericht. Flensburg: KBA."

⁴⁶ Irawan and Sulisty, "The Limits of Law Enforcement in Youth Motor Racing Culture in Indonesia."

alternatives; third, launching nationwide public campaigns to raise awareness of the risks of illegal racing, drawing from successful initiatives in the U.S. and Germany; fourth, deploying surveillance technologies such as speed cameras and mobile monitoring units in racing-prone areas; and fifth, fostering institutional collaboration between law enforcement, transportation agencies, educational institutions, and civil society organizations to build a comprehensive and sustainable framework for prevention. Collectively, these recommendations aim to shift Indonesia's response from reactive punishment to proactive and integrative governance, thereby promoting road safety, youth development, and public order.

REFERENCES

1. (NHTSA), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. "Street Racing and Highway Safety Report." Washington, DC: U.S Department of Transportation., 2022.
2. §315d, StGB. "Strafgesetzbuch: Verbotene Kraftfahrzeugrennen.," n.d. https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/stgb/_315d.html.
3. AAA Foundation. "Teen Driver Education and Street Racing Awareness," 2020. <https://aaafoundation.org>.
4. ADAC. "Verkehrssicherheitskampagnen in Deutschland. Munich: ADAC Verlag.," 2022.
5. Assembly Bill 2000. "California Legislative Information." Street Racing and Sideshow Enforcement. Accessed June 22, 2025. <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>.
6. Association, Clark County Racing. "Midnight Drags Initiative Report. Las Vegas: CCDA," 2022.
7. Bast, H. "Technologische Überwachung Im Straßenverkehr." Köln: Bundesanstalt Für Straßenwesen., 2021.
8. Berlin, Polizei. "Maßnahmen Gegen Illegale Autorennen: Jahresbericht 2022," 2023.
9. Bundesministerium für Verkehr. "Fahrausbildung in Deutschland: Rechtliche Grundlagen." Berlin: BMVI., 2021.
10. California Assembly. "Street Racing and Sideshow Enforcement." Assembly Bill 2000, 2020. <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov>.
11. "California DMV Reports on Reckless Driving Statistics," n.d.
12. Damayanti, Rika, Muh. Bakri, Jumra Jumra, Gustika Sandra, and Sakti Yadi. "Police Efforts in Combating and Preventing Illegal Racing Among Youth." *Journal of Asian Multicultural Research for Social Sciences Study* 3, no. 2 (June 7, 2022): 49-57. <https://doi.org/10.47616/jamrsss.v3i2.285>.
13. Department, Phoenix Police. "Automated Surveillance and LPR Deployment Strategy." Phoenix: Law Enforcement Technology Division., 2023.
14. Indonesian National Police Traffic Directorate. "Annual Report on Traffic Accidents," 2012.
15. Irawan, T, and H Sulisty. "The Limits of Law Enforcement in Youth Motor Racing Culture in Indonesia." *Indonesian Journal of Criminology* 3, no. 2 (2022): 101-17.
16. Kartono, Kartini. *Patologi Sosial 2 : Kenakalan Remaja. Rajawali Pers*, 2009.
17. KBA - Kraftfahrt-Bundesamt. "Punkte in Flensburg: Statistischer Jahresbericht. Flensburg: KBA," 2020. <https://www.bussgeldkatalog.org/kraftfahrt-bundesamt/>.
18. König, F. "Bedingter Vorsatz Und Tötungsdelikte Bei Autorennen. Neue Juristische Wochenschrift" 72, no. 11 (n.d.): 845-51.
19. Landgericht Berlin Case No. 535 Ks 8/16 (2017).



20. National Juvenile Justice Network. "Restorative Justice and Youth Rehabilitation," 2019. <https://www.njjn.org>.
21. Online, Spiegel. "Tödliches Autorennen in Berlin: Debatte Um Gesetzesverschärfung," 2020. <https://www.spiegel.de>.
22. Rahardjo, Satjipto. *Penegakan Hukum Progresif*. Jakarta, 2009.
23. RASR. "RASR - Racers Against Street Racing," 2024. <https://www.sema.org/rasr>.
24. Republik Indonesia. Undang-Undang No. 22 Tahun 2009 tentang Lalu Lintas dan Angkutan Jalan (2009).
25. Riswantoro, G. "Police Strategies Against Teen Street Racing in Malang." *Jurnal Kriminologi Nusantara* 5, no. 1 (2024).
26. Schneider, M, and T Vogt. "Stadtgestaltung Und Verkehrssicherheit: Eine Empirische Analyse. Zeitschrift Für Verkehrswissenschaft" 91, no. 3 (2023): 211-28.
27. SEMA. "Racers Against Street Racing (RASR) Initiative Overview," 2024. <https://www.sema.org/rasr>.
28. Swasana, A. F. "Enforcement of Article 115 UU No. 22/2009 in Surabaya." *Jurnal Lalu Lintas Dan Transportasi* 3, no. 2 (2015).
29. Texas Department of Transportation (TXDOT). "Every Second Counts Campaign Report," 2021.
30. United Nations. "Convention on the Rights of the Child," 1989. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child>.
31. VCD - Verkehrsclub Deutschland. "No Need for Speed: Zivilgesellschaft Gegen Raserei." Berlin: VCD Report., 2022.
32. Yusuf, R, and L Hidayati. "Balap Liar Dan Media Sosial: Studi Fenomenologi." *Jurnal Kriminologi Indonesia* 6, no. 2 (2023): 112-28.