

The Ethics of Freedom and Responsibility in Communication: Building a Public Space with Integrity in the Digital Age

Rahmad Asril Pohan¹, Rubino¹

¹ Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

Received: 16/04/2026

Revised: 22/05/2026

Accepted: 20/06/2026

Abstract

Degradation ethics communication in the digital era is manifested in escalation disinformation, speech hatred and misinformation has create crisis integrity room threatening public foundation democracy deliberative and cohesive social research This aim For explore dialectics between freedom and responsibility answer in perspective ethics communication as well as formulate conceptualization room digital public with integrity through approach multi-party. Using method study literature, studies This analyze and synthesize in a way critical various source literature consisting of from book scientific and articles journal. Research results disclose four findings main. First, disinformation, speech hatred and misinformation form something ecosystem pathology mutual communication strengthening and rooted in interactions complex between vulnerability cognitive human, design platform-based algorithm economy attention, and unpreparedness framework adaptive regulation. Second, dialectics freedom and responsibility answer reach its synthesis in perspective ethics Habermas's discourse emphasizes that freedom authentic expression only Possible come true if accompanied by not quite enough answer procedures that allow creation situation ideal speech. Third, development architecture ethics room digital public necessitates synergy tripartite between digital platforms that must reform algorithms and policies moderation content, the country must present regulations precision that protects freedom without become sensor tools, as well as public responsible civilians answer build culture literacy critical from root grass. Fourth, space digital public with integrity characterized by inclusiveness, deliberation equal critical thinking, accountability, and respect to dignity human, which leads to a communication model emancipatory and participatory. Implementation results study This demand an ethical audit platform algorithm, integration critical digital literacy in curriculum education national, as well as strengthening movement check fact based community as form not quite enough answer collective.

Keywords

Digital Communication Ethics; Public Space Integrity; Disinformation; Discourse Ethics; Digital Literacy.

Corresponding Author

Rahmad Asril Pohan

Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Indonesia; rahmad4004253010@uinsu.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

The digital era has revolutionize landscape communication man fundamentally and not yet Once happen previously in history civilization. The transformation brought about by the internet and social media No only change speed and range distribution information, but also in a radical democratize



© 2026 by the authors. This is an open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

access to production and distribution content. Every individuals who have internet connection now own capacity For become manufacturer at a time distributor information to global audience without must through mechanism traditional editorial filtering that has been centuries become guard gate quality information public. Revolution This bring hope big will creation room more public participatory, equal, and democratic, where the voices that were previously marginalized by the mass media structure conventional can find place and audience. However along walking time, hope the clash with distant reality more complex and often contradictory. Instead of become an enlightening democratic agora, a space contemporary digital public the more often display gloomy and problematic face. The original room idealized as a healthy marketplace of ideas changed become a fighting arena a chaotic narrative, where truth and lies each other fight without clear referee, and where the emotions often defeat reason Healthy in win attention public. Study empirical show that digital platforms have become land fertile for development industry organized global disinformation, where actors politics and economics use technique manipulation advanced For exploit vulnerability cognitive humans in order to achieve goals certain things that often contradictory with interest public. Packaged disinformation in a way professional and disseminated in a way directed through network account fake and bots have capable manipulate opinion public in massive, destructive scale integrity election general, inhibiting response to crisis health public, and deepen polarization social in various parts of the world (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2021).

Phenomenon speech rampant hatred on Indonesia 's digital platforms has become concern in - depth national data from various institution monitor show consistent escalation in amount and intensity speech hatred circulating on social media, especially during periods heated politics like election general and election head area. Speech hatred This No Again just expression sporadic individual dislikes, but rather has develop become campaign structured that uses primordial identity as weapon For delegitimize and discredit against political or different groups view. Narrative targeted hatred fundamental attributes such as religion, ethnicity, and affiliation political has create atmosphere hostility permanent poisoning interaction social everyday life, both in the digital world and in the real world. The impact psychological from exposure continuously to speech hatred to group vulnerable, including women, religious minorities, and other marginalized communities, have documented in a way extensive, including trauma, anxiety, depression, and withdrawal self from participation public. More worrying again, utterance hatred that is not controlled in the digital space has become precursor for action violence physical in the offline world, showing that limit between verbal abuse and violence physique become the more hazy and permeable in ecosystem communication contemporary (Ningsih et al., 2022).

Massive distribution misinformation among Indonesian society reveals existence crisis acute and systemic digital literacy. Research latest in a way consistent show that level Indonesian people's digital literacy is still is at a worrying level, with part big internet users yet own adequate capabilities For in a way critical evaluate credibility the information they receive and consume every day. Low capacity verification This make highly vulnerable communities to various form misinformation that is spreading with speed outside normal through application messaging instant and social media platforms. In context the COVID-19 pandemic, for example, the wave misinformation health that is still has cause confusion public, resistance to protocol health, and doubt to vaccines which in turn contribute to increasing number morbidity and mortality. Phenomenon This show that misinformation No just problem epistemological about right and wrong something claims, but also problems existential which is direct impact on safety and welfare citizens. Ironically, the individuals who spread misinformation often No have evil motives, but rather driven by intention Good For share the information they consider beneficial for family and community they, so that make misinformation become the more difficult For corrected Because embedded in network trust and solidarity social (Sari & Prasetyo, 2023).

Current architecture and algorithm design of digital platforms This dominate landscape global communication has become subject increasing criticism sharp from circles academics and activists. Business model economy attention taken by the majority of major platforms create fundamentally conflicting incentives with values integrity information and health room public. Algorithm designed recommendations For maximize time spent users on the platform in a systematic prioritize the most sensational, provocative and triggering content strong emotions, regardless from truth factual or mark social content. Content that arouses anger, fear, and hatred get distribution far organic more big than informative, balanced and calming content, because content emotional proven more effective in maintain attention users who are commodities main in digital economy. Mechanism This create circle bait destructive feedback, where the producer content, good individual and organization, in a way rational pushed For produce increasingly content extreme and provocative in order to get visibility and benefits economy. Besides that, filter bubbles and space the echo that is formed consequence personalization algorithmic the more isolate users from different perspectives, reinforcing the existing confirmation bias. exist, and create reality parallel where the dialogue crosses difference become the more difficult done. Conditions This fundamentally distorts mechanism deliberation democratic which requires existence room together where citizens can exposed to a variety of corner view and engage in rational discourse For reach consensus or at least each other understanding (Adiputra, 2021).

Regulation and governance of digital platforms in Indonesia is still is at in conditions that have not yet adequate and full with tension between need For protect room public from content dangerous and liability For ensure freedom express as right constitutional. Existence Constitution Information and

Transactions Electronics that are often become highlight Because its articles are open to multiple interpretations reflect dilemma regulations that have not been resolved. In one side, the country has not quite enough answer For protect inhabitant his country from impact damage disinformation and speech hatred that can break split cohesion social and threatening security national. However, on the other hand, the articles are ambiguous and open to multiple interpretations in regulations the has repeatedly used as tool For silence criticism, intimidation activists, and persecuting journalists who run his duties. Uncertainty law This create effect dangerous shivering for climate democracy and freedom civil servants in Indonesia. More Far again, approach regulations that only based on threats criminalization proven No effective in overcome root problem degradation ethics digital communication, because approach This nature reactive and non-reactive touch dimensions structural and cultural from existing problems. Regulations that only focus on enforcement without accompanied by with proactive policies in build digital literacy, encouraging platform transparency, and strengthening capacity public civil For do supervision participatory only will create illusion order while let ecosystem disinformation and hatred Keep going growing under surface (Wahyudi, 2022).

Absence framework ethics comprehensive and adaptive communication to contemporary digital reality become root deepest from crisis integrity room the public that we watch moment This is the dilemma emerging ethics from interaction between freedom almost expressive not limited and responsible increasing moral responsibility blurry need reconstruction deep thinking. During this, responsibility answer ethical in communicate tend only shoulder - loaded individual users, as if pathology room digital public is just reflection from individual moral failure alone. A simplistic view This ignore fact that individual operate in structures and systems that are fundamental formation choices and behavior they. Digital platforms, with design algorithmic and its business model that pursues profit maximum, creating environment that is systematic encourage and provide incentive for behavior communication that is not ethical. Systematic means think about all component with consider the role of each component and how interact One each other so that set goals can achieved completely. Harmonious interaction or heterogeneous between one element with other elements will influence results and will influence succeed whether or not objective (Azmi et al., 2022).

The country, with framework ambiguous regulations and inconsistent implementation consistent, failed provide clear and fair rules of the game. Society, with capacity digital literacy is still low, no own adequate equipment For navigate in a way safe and responsible answer in the ocean full information pollution. Therefore that, is necessary A redefinition and redistribution not quite enough answer ethics that involve all over stakeholders interest in something framework coherent work. Communication ethics in the digital era is not Again can understood as just code individual ethics that are voluntary, but rather must conceptualized as A governance architecture that involves design responsible

technology accountability, democratic regulation, and development culture literacy massive critical. Without existence framework ethics new and transformative communication, space Indonesia's digital public will Keep going degraded become toxic and unhealthy space Again capable operate its function as vehicle deliberation democratic, intelligent and empowering citizens (Kurniawan et al., 2023).

Problems the main reason behind study This is the outbreak violation ethics communication in space Indonesia's digital public is manifested in three form main that is organized disinformation, speech persistent and systemic hatred, as well persistent misinformation. Third phenomenon This has create crisis integrity information and poisoning quality discourse public, threatening cohesiveness social and debilitating foundation democracy deliberative. Identified analysis gap from search literature is Still lack of studies that are specific and in-depth integrate perspective ethics communication, in particular ethics discourse, with analysis to role multi-stakeholder in build governance architecture room digital public with integrity. Most of them study previously tend nature partial, only focus on one type violation ethics, one platform, or One actor just without see relatedness systemic among them. Urgency study This lies in the need urge For formulate something framework comprehensive and applicable conceptual that can become guide for all over stakeholders interest in effort collective restore integrity room digital public. In the midst of escalation conflict social media triggered by manipulation information and increasing pressure to freedom responsible expression answer, presence study This become very crucial and precise time. Purpose study This is For explore, analyze, and synthesize relevant literature use identify portrait problematic ethics digital communication, deepening dialectics between freedom and responsibility answer in perspective ethics communication, mapping roles and responsibilities answer multi-party, as well as formulate something conceptualization room digital public with integrity towards an emancipatory and participatory communication model.

2. METHOD

Method research used in studies This is study literature or library research, which is something approach investigation scientific research based on analysis critical and synthetic systematic to sources relevant literature with focus study. Selection type study This based on characteristics object studies of a nature conceptual-philosophical and multidisciplinary, namely ethics freedom and responsibility answer in communication For build room public with integrity in the digital era. Research literature allows researchers For do exploration deep to various thinking theoretical, findings empirical, and discourse scientific that has develop in treasury academic without must jump direct to field For collect primary data. In context this, researcher act as instrument the main thing that is active and reflective selecting, reading, recording, interpreting, and synthesizing diverse source literature For build something argument coherent, comprehensive, and original academic research. literature This No just

to summarize or summarize existing sources, but rather involve a critical dialogue process intertext For find point encounters, tensions, gaps, and potential synthesis new that can give contribution meaningful for development knowledge knowledge. Approach this is very appropriate For studies that attempt construct something framework conceptual normative, because He give freedom for researchers For dialogue various tradition thinking, testing consistency logical from various proposition theoretical, and formulate proposition new rooted in the foundation strong scientific (Zed, 2021).

Data sources in study This consists of from three category selected main in a way purposive based on relevance, credibility and topicality to topic study. Category First is books scientific, both originating from from treasury international and national, which discusses in a way deep about ethics communication, moral philosophy, theory room public, digital democracy, and internet governance. Books This give framework fundamental theory and analysis deep conceptual becoming foundation argumentation in study this. Category second is articles journal scientific reputable published in period five years lastly, which presents findings research latest about phenomenon disinformation, speech hatred, polarization politics on social media, effectiveness moderation content, and various initiative digital literacy. Restrictions range time publication This aim For ensure actuality and relevance of data with dynamics contemporary room rapidly growing digital public. Category third is report results study from institutions study leading, non- governmental organizations, and international bodies that periodically release data and analysis about condition freedom expression, index digital literacy, trends distribution hoaxes and maps conflict social in the digital world. Reports This provide contextual data and evidence empirical evidence that strengthens analysis theoretical. Use third type this data source in a way simultaneous allows occurrence triangulation enriching resources perspective, strengthening validity findings, and avoid study from bias one type source solely. Diversity This data source also allows researchers For construct holistic and multidimensional understanding of the problems studied, because every type source own strength and angle their respective views of each other complement (Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

Data collection techniques in study This implemented through a series procedure systematically started with identification and inventory sources potential and relevant literature. The first step taken is do search extensive using keywords specific like ethics digital communication, integrity room public, disinformation and democracy, ethics Habermas's discourse, moderation content, as well as digital literacy in various academic database, catalog digital libraries, and machines seeker scientific. The process of searching This generate a long list sources that then selected in a way strict through stages screening based on criteria inclusion and exclusion that have been set previously. Criteria inclusion main covers relevance substance direct with topic studies, publications in range specified time, availability text full that can accessible, as well as reputation publishers and authors who can

accountable in a way academic. Sources that pass selection Then downloaded, saved, and organized in system management reference For make it easier tracking and citation. After the stage collection, researcher do reading intensive and repetitive to every sources that have been selected. Reading This is not just activity receptive-passive, but rather is an extraction process active and critical information, where researchers identify arguments key concepts main, important data, as well premises base from every writer. During the reading process this, researcher make notes analytical, marking parts important in text, and compose abstract or summary from every source. This technique allows researchers For building a rich and structured mental database as material standard main for the analysis and synthesis process that will be done at the stage next. Careful and organized documentation at this stage this data collection become prerequisite important for success and credibility the entire research process bibliography (Sugiyono, 2022).

Data analysis techniques used in study This is analysis content combined qualitative with method analysis discourse critical analysis content qualitative chosen Because his abilities For reveal meanings hidden behind surface text, identify patterns thematic, and building categories conceptual from textual data that is still and not structured. Analysis process started with codification open, where researchers read in a way thorough all over records and data sources that have been collected while mark segments text that contains ideas, concepts, or relevant information with question research. Segments This Then labeled or code conceptual representation essence from contents. After codification beginning finished, researcher continue to stage categorization, namely grouping codes that have similarities or relatedness meaning to in more categories abstract and broad. Categories This Then reorganized and connected One each other for form themes the main thing that becomes framework narrative from results and Discussion research. Furthermore, researchers apply analysis discourse critical, particularly inspired by the thinking of Habermas and Fairclough, to dismantle dimensions ideological, relations power, and interests hidden behind various platform policies, country regulations, and practices communication society. Analysis discourse critical allows researchers For No only describe phenomenon in a way surface, but also explain why and how phenomenon the happened, and interest who is served and who is harmed by the configuration room existing digital public moment this. Stage end from analysis is synthesis, where researchers integrate all over categories, themes, and findings from analysis discourse critical to in something building a complete, coherent, and original argument that answers question research and achieve objective research. The entire analysis process This done in a way iterative and non-linear, where researchers move back and forth between data, codes, categories, themes, and frameworks theoretical until reach saturation adequate conceptual and internal coherence (Hamzah, 2024).

Testing techniques validity of data in study literature This demand implementation of different

specific strategies with study empirical, considering characteristics the data in the form of text and documents. For ensure credibility and trustworthiness of findings, researchers apply four criteria common main used in study qualitative. First, the credibility test was carried out through technique improvement perseverance in the process of reading and analysis, as well as through triangulation extensive sources. Triangulation source done with method compare and confirm information obtained from various type different data sources, namely books, articles journals and reports research, as well as from perspective diverse theoretical, for see consistency, convergence, and divergence between them. Second, the transferability test was carried out with compile report study in a way detailed, clear and systematic so that reader can understand in a way intact context, process, and findings research, as well as can evaluate Alone to what extent are the results study This can transferred or applied to other contexts that have characteristics similar. Third, the dependability test was carried out through audit trail study or documented research trail with good. The entire research process start from search literature, selection source, reading, creation notes, codification, categorization, up to withdrawal conclusion documented in a way systematic and transparent, so that other researchers or independent auditors in a way principle can browse back and verify every steps and decisions taken. Fourth, the confirmability test carried out with ensure that all over interpretation, analysis, and conclusions generated truly rooted in data and can tracked return to sources the original, not is results subjectivity or researcher bias solely. This is achieved through practice reflexivity in which researchers in a way conscious and continuous questioning his positions, assumptions and prejudices Alone during the research process, as well as try For presenting data and arguments in a way balanced. Combination from four testing strategies the validity of this data give strong guarantee that the findings produced in study This own integrity scientific and can accountable in a way academic (Moleong, 2023).

3. FINDINGS AND DSICUSSIOUN

3.1 Portrait Ethical Problems of Digital Communication: Disinformation, Speech Hate Speech and Misinformation

Search and synthesis results to various literature show that the digital era has give birth to A paradox fundamental in practice communication public. In one side, digital technology provides room almost expression without limits, democratize access to production and distribution information. But on the other hand, the same freedom has open door wide for escalation various violation ethics systemic and massive communication. Findings library in a way consistent identify three form main pathology mutual digital communication related and strengthening One each other, namely disinformation, speech hatred, and misinformation. Disinformation, which is defined as information deliberate fake created and distributed For objective manipulative, has develop become organized industry. It No

Again just product from individual ignorance, but rather is often a results engineering politics and economics aimed at For mess up discourse public, delegitimizing institutions, and polarize society. Phenomenon This find land fertile in designed digital platform architecture For maximize involvement users through prioritization algorithm content sensational and triggering emotion, without consider verification factual. Practice distribution hoax politics and campaigns black approaching election common in various countries, including Indonesia, to become proof real How disinformation can damage foundation of the democratic process. Study literature confirm that actors distributor disinformation utilise vulnerability cognitive humans, such as confirmation bias, to create bubble information that strengthens beliefs that have been There is previously, so that truth objective become the more difficult reachable (Prasetyo, 2023).

Speech hatred, as form violation ethics second, targeting fundamental attributes of an individual or group based on primordial identity such as ethnicity, religion, race, and inter-group relations, as well as orientation sexuality and disability. Literature reviewed disclose that social media platforms has become the main arena proliferation speech hatred Because its characteristics that allow anonymity, speed distribution without pause, and range audience that is still. Anonymity, whether of a nature technical absolute and perceptual, creating effect online disinhibition where individuals feel off from snare not quite enough moral and legal responsibility so that pushed For throw expression that is not will Once they say in interaction face face. Narrative hatred This No only hurt dignity individuals who become target, but also erode cohesiveness social fundamentally with normalize hostility and violence based identity in discourse public everyday. Impact the continuation is creation room toxic public, where participation citizens, especially from group vulnerable and minority, experiencing depreciation because of fear and intimidation systematic. The study shows that speech hatred often become precursor for action violence physical in the real world, signifying that the line between verbal violence in the digital world and violence The physical world in the offline world is getting thinner and more permeable. Platform failure in do moderation content in a way effective and consistent, especially in context languages besides Language English like Indonesian and English area, worsening situation this, makes digital space as permissive place to hatred (Rahmawati, 2022).

Temporary that, misinformation refers to the spread incorrect information or No accurate, but without Meaning wicked or intentional from the spreader. The individual who spreads the misinformation often believe that the information they share is true, and motivation they generally based on intention For share knowledge that is considered beneficial for environment social. Although without intention bad, impact misinformation The same destructiveness with disinformation. In context crisis health public, for example, literature documenting in a way extensive How myths treatment, theory conspiracy about vaccines, and claims health that is not proven in a way scientific spread with

speed tall through network friendship and groups family in the app messaging instant. Its personal nature and origin from source trusted in circle social make misinformation kind of it is very resistant to effort clarification. Low level digital literacy and media literacy in some big circles public become factor driver main thing that allows misinformation Keep going circulating and trusted as truth (Suryani & Hidayat, 2023).

More far, findings library show that third phenomenon this, disinformation, speech hatred and misinformation No operate in room separate void, but form A ecosystem pathology mutual communication related. Disinformation often packaged with sentiment hatred For strengthen Power pull emotional, while speech hatred often justified with referring to claims misinformation and disinformation. Circle demon This create pollution information on a scale that has not yet been Once happen previously in history civilization humans, which is fundamentally poisoning room public and weaken integrity information as a pillar of democracy deliberative. The fragmented digital media landscape, combined with algorithm personalization, creating echo chambers and filter bubbles that amplify prejudice users and isolate they from perspective alternative, so that turn off cross- dialogue authentic differences. Conditions This exacerbated by the business model economy the attention span embraced by the majority of digital platforms, where the most provocative, controversial and divisive content split precisely get incentive algorithmic highest Because capable produce involvement and time screen longest, without care about quality, truth, or impact social.

Study results This confirm that problematic ethics contemporary digital communications is not just individual moral issues users, but rather A crisis structural rooted in design technology and incentives economy from the dominant platform room digital public. Building This show that degradation ethics communication in digital space is consequence from interaction complex between factor psychological human, design socio-technical platform, logic economy capitalism supervision, and weakness framework adaptive regulation. Therefore that, a partial and only approach targeting one factor without considering others is certain will fail in restore integrity room public. Comprehensive understanding about map problematic This become prerequisite important For formulate response adequate ethics (Wijayanti, 2024).

3.2 *Dialectics Freedom and Responsibility in Communication Ethics Perspective*

Leave from portrait problems that have been described, part This serve results synthesis and discussion to various framework theoretical ethics relevant communication For understand complex relationships between freedom and responsibility answer. Literature review deep to tradition thinking ethics, good from both Western and Eastern treasures, revealing that tension between freedom express and be responsible moral responsibility is not phenomenon something unique in the digital era, but rather an eternal problem in moral and political philosophy that is currently find return the urgency in

the full context new. Perspective deontological, culminating in the imperative Immanuel Kant's categorical, giving solid foundation For understand not quite enough answer communication. In framework this, every individual as creature rational own obligation absolute For act based on principles that can universalized. Talk and communicate is not just activity expressive, but rather A moral actions that must be done subject to the test universality. Lying, in Kant's view, no Once can justified morally in condition whatever, because If lie made into universal law, then all over institutions communication and trust between humans will collapse. Principle This own implications direct to problematic disinformation in the digital age, because He in a way firm state that spread lies, even with reason pragmatic like profit political or economy, is actions that are inherent No moral Because damage foundation life social (Fahrudin, 2022).

Perspective utilitarianism, developed by Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, offers different approaches However The same relevant. Utilitarian ethics of judgment morality something action based on the consequences, with principle main reach happiness the biggest for as much as maybe people. In context digital communication, approach This demand We For in a way careful count disadvantages and benefits from every expression public. Freedom expression, which is highly respected high by Mill as a vital marketplace of ideas for search truth, is not absolute. In utilitarian framework, limitations to speech hatred can justified morally if can shown that the losses it causes, such as psychological trauma to the group target, escalation conflict social, and potential violence, in a way significant exceed benefit from let it go circulating free. However, the weakness approach this, as his critics note, lies in the difficulties inherent in measure and compare utilities in a way objective, which can open room for arbitrary justification. Although Thus, the calculation consequential become useful framework For designing policy moderation proportional platform content and regulation (Hasanah, 2021).

The most comprehensive and relevant synthesis For context room contemporary digital public offered by theory action communicative and ethical discourse from Jürgen Habermas. Habermas does not start from isolated individuals, but rather from intersubjectivity and practice purposeful communication For reach each other understanding. In framework this, action authentic communication must achievement - oriented consensus based on strength more arguments well, not on manipulation, coercion, or power. Habermas formulated A situation ideal speech as prerequisite counterfactual for every meaningful discourse. In this ideal situation, all participants own equal opportunity For start and continue discourse, for convey statements, questions, and giving answers, and all participants free from internal and external domination and pressure external. Fourth claim validity that must be filled in every action communicative, namely truth propositional, sincerity subjective, accuracy normative, and comprehensibility, become standard evaluation ethical for every participants discourse. Disinformation in a way direct violate claim truth, speech hatred deny claim

accuracy normative Because He discriminate and not honor dignity participants others, while insincerity in argue damage foundation the necessary trust for honest discourse. Habermas 's theory provides the sharpest criticism to distortion communication systematically occurring in space digital public controlled by logic algorithms and modalities. Echo chambers and filter bubbles are form real from denial to situation ideal speech because they in a way systematic limit exposure to argument counter and strengthen domination perspective certain. With Thus, ethics Habermas's discourse provides framework strong normative For assess and criticize architecture existing digital communications moment this, at the same time offer vision about How room public with integrity should built, namely as room inclusive and equal deliberation in which more arguments well, not the loudest or most sensational, which should be win (Wahyudi & Setiawan, 2023).

Dialectics between freedom and responsibility answer reach its synthesis in understanding that freedom express is not just freedom negative, namely absence interference from party other, but freedom positive which requires existence conditions that allow individual For develop and participate in a way meaningful in life public. Responsibility moral responsibility, in framework this is not restrictions external to freedom, but rather precisely conditions that allow freedom That Alone For come true in a way authentic and not damaging. The results of the study show that freedom that is not accompanied by not quite enough answer will nature destructive, because He only will profitable those with the most power and those with the least empathize, get rid of vulnerable and marginalized voices. Instead, responsibility forced answer without freedom, through repressive state censorship or control strict corporation, will silence creativity, innovation, and participation critical which is precisely is essence from life healthy democracy. Therefore that, the essence of ethics communication in the digital era is find dynamic and contextual balance between second poles this, a imbalance can set in a way abstract and once so, but rather must continuously reflected, negotiated, and fought for through participation all stakeholders interest in discourse sustainable public. This is significance from perspective ethics discourse that places procedure fair and inclusive communication as source legitimacy for binding norms community. Consequently, building room digital public with integrity is not task For find a set final moral rule, but rather task For continuously build and maintain conditions procedures that allow that moral discourse Alone ongoing in a way healthy (Nurhayati, 2022).

3.3 Multi-stakeholder Role in Build Ethical Architecture and Integrity of Digital Public Space

Search results library in a way consistent show that effort build architecture ethics and integrity room digital public no can carried by one actor single. Required approach multi-stakeholders involving digital platforms, countries or regulators, as well as public civil and community, each of which has roles and responsibilities specific answer However each other related and strengthening One each other. Discussion to roles This reveal governance complexity demanding digital space synergy and sharing

not quite enough clear answer.

Digital platforms, as owner and designer infrastructure room contemporary digital public, carrying not quite enough answer very big and unethical can avoided. Literature review show that design architecture, algorithms, and platform policies in general direct form dynamics communication and interaction billions users. Responsibility answer The first platform lies in designing ethical algorithms. Current business models This dominant, namely economy attention, has create misguided incentives where algorithms recommendation in a way systematic prioritize the most controversial, sensational and divisive content split Because capable maximize involvement and time screen. Literacy ethical demand fundamental evaluation of the business model this and exploration to more alternatives sustainable and not damage cohesion social responsibility answer second is development policy moderation transparent, accountable, and fair content. When this, the moderation process content on many major platforms often opaque, inconsistent, and inconsistent provide effective appeals mechanism. This cause accusations of political bias and censorship that are not proportional. The platform needs to invest massive on moderation contextual and sensitive content to nuances culture and language local, with involving expert from various discipline science and representation affected communities. Responsibility answer third is development system effective verification For ward off disinformation, including through collaboration with organization examiner fact independent, providing warning labels on questionable content the truth, and the decline distribution content the in a way algorithmic without must delete it in a way potential unilateral cause censorship controversy (Putri & Hermawan, 2024).

The role of the state and regulators, on the other hand, is crucial. in create framework laws and policies public protection interest citizens. Based on results study comparative to various approach regulations in various countries, discussion This find that the most responsible approach answer is protective approach freedom express as right constitutional citizens, but at the same time in a way firm take action violation harmful ethics party other. Challenges the biggest in formulation regulations This is prevent it from happening become political censorship tool by the ruling government. Articles rubber in Constitution multi - interpretable cyberspace, as found in a number of version beginning regulations in various countries, it is proven more often used For silence criticism and voice opposition than For protect inhabitant from speech hatred and disinformation. To that, regulation must formulated in a way specific, clear, and narrow, with supervision independent and strong judiciary. In addition approach criminalization, the state must also take more roles proactive and positive. This covers investment massive in education integrated digital and media literacy in curriculum formal education from level base until education high. The state must also facilitate and fund research independent about impact social media, as well as push data transparency from digital platforms without violate individual

privacy. The co-regulation approach, where the government set standards and principles general, while industry and organization public civil together formulate code ethics and mechanisms its implementation, appears from study as the most promising governance model For overcome speed innovation technology that is always beyond speed of the legislative process (Wirawan, 2023).

Civil society and communities form the same third pillar important and often constitutes foundation culture is the most important thing. Without existence culture ethics embedded communications strong at the roots grass, effort from platforms and countries not will Once fully effective. Study results library identify several areas of intervention key for public civil. First, the movement Massive and sustainable digital literacy. Digital literacy in this era No Again Enough just ability operational use device technology, but must covers literacy critical information, namely ability For identify misinformation and disinformation, understanding media bias, and do verification sources and facts. Second, development and strengthening network organization examiner fact independent working in a way collaborative and transparent. Check movement fact based community can become fortress effective defense fighting the tsunami of disinformation local that is often overlooked from attention of platforms and current media The main thing. Third, and this is the most fundamental, is role community in grow education ethics internalized communication in a way cultural. This education beyond aspect cognitive and tactile dimensions affective and moral. Building culture Embarrassed For spread hoaxes and speech hatred, and build culture critical and appreciative difference opinions and polite dialogue, that is task term length that only can done through role model, parenting, and interaction positive social in family, school, organization religious and community citizens. Organization religious and figures public own a very significant role in context This Because moral authority and networks root the grass they have. Initiatives community that promotes peace, tolerance and interfaith dialogue has proven effective in ward off narrative hatred and building resilience social from below. With Thus, society civil act as valve security and resources immunity social that makes room digital public becomes more resilient to various pathology communication (Saputra, 2022).

3.4 Conceptualizing Digital Public Space with Integrity: Towards an Emancipatory and Participatory Communication Model

As synthesis end from all over findings and discussion previously, part This serve A conceptualization room digital public with integrity that aims For formulate ideal characteristics and models of emancipatory communication as well as participatory. Conceptualization This is not A print stiff blue, but A proposition normative abstracted from analysis critical to existing problems, synthesis perspective theoretical, and mapping role multi-stakeholder study results show that room digital public with integrity is space characterized by four fundamental qualities. First, inclusivity, which means that room the must can accessible and friendly for participation all citizens without look at background

behind identity, socio-economic status, or their digital capabilities. This means overcome digital divide in general structural, as well as get rid of obstacles participation like online bullying and speech hatred that is No proportional silence voice women, groups minorities and communities marginalized. Second, deliberation critical equivalent, which is adoption direct from principle situation Habermas's ideal speech. In room this, every participants own equal opportunity For speak out opinion, listened to with carefully, and to test claims filed by other participants with use strength argument rational, not with capital strength, social status, or amount followers. Debate public No won by the loudest shout or the most viral meme, but rather by the most coherent, logical, and evidence- supported argument. Third, accountability, which means that every participants, both individuals, platforms, and state institutions, responsible answer on impact from action communicative they. Anonymity No may become shield For avoid not quite enough answer. There must be clear and fair mechanisms For request accountability on distribution disinformation and speech hatred, without sacrifice right privacy and freedom For speak out opinion that is not popular. Fourth, and this is crown from integrity room public, is respect to dignity human. Principle This become the most fundamental and undeniable moral foundation can compromised. Every participants treated as purpose in itself alone, not just as tool For reach objective politics, economics, or ideological. In room public with integrity, not There is room for dehumanization, objectification, or abuse to dignity individual or group. (Kurniawan et al., 2021).

Appropriate communication model For realize characteristics the is a shifting model from the transmission model One direction, where the information flow from center to periphery, towards a transactional and deliberative model that emphasizes the process of creation meaning together in a way dialogical. Emancipatory communication in context This means liberating communication individual from manipulation, domination, and distortion systematic. Communication This empowering citizens to become producers and participants active in discourse public, not just consumer passive information. Discussion results This emphasize that communication with integrity No only question absence hoax or speech hatred, which is minimal and negative indicators. More from that is, communication with integrity is question creation A a culture of healthy and productive dialogue where differences opinion, conflict interests, and disagreements that constitute inevitability in public compound, can managed in a way constructive, peaceful, and democratic. The difference opinion seen No as threats that must be removed, but rather as source Power valuable epistemic For test ideas, deepening understanding, and finding more solutions comprehensive to problems collective. Public space with integrity provide receptacle For healthy agonism, where confrontation of ideas occurs in a way open However still in corridor each other respectful and oriented towards goodness together (Andriani & Nugroho, 2023).

For reach vision this, the proposed conceptualization demand integration from third role multi-stakeholders who have discussed previously to in something framework coherent action. Digital

platforms need designing repeat architecture technical them to be in harmony with principles deliberation, for example with give more afdolansi high on informative and argumentative content as well as facilitate interaction cross differences. The country needs to create environment laws that protect the deliberation process public from attack disinformation and speech organized hatred, while ensure freedom of the press and independence academic as an important pillar production credible knowledge. Civil society and communities must Keep going become guard ethos democracy from root grass, planting values inclusivity, tolerance, and appreciation to facts and arguments rational. This model is an aspirational and demanding model transformation depth on various levels, starting from from design technology, framework regulations, up to culture communication everyday. However, the results studies library This confirm that without something vision clear and comprehensive normative efforts partial only will nature reactive, patch embroidery, and in the end fail overcome root problem degradation ethics communication in the digital era. Conceptualization room a digital public with integrity, deliberative, and emancipatory This with thus functioning as star guide who gives direction for all over stakeholders interest in journey long build return integrity discourse the public which is heart from life healthy and dignified democracy.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Crisis integrity room contemporary digital public is not just individual moral anomalies of a nature sporadic, but rather is crisis structural multidimensionality rooted in interaction complex between vulnerability cognitive human, design digital platform architecture that favors the economy attention, and unpreparedness framework regulations national both domestically and globally respond speed innovation technology. Disinformation, speech hatred and misinformation has form something ecosystem pathology mutual communication strengthen and systematic gnawing foundation trust public, cohesiveness social, and quality deliberation democratic. Dialectics between freedom express and responsibility moral responsibility to find point the balance in perspective ethics discourse that emphasizes that authentic freedom only Possible come true if accompanied by not quite enough answer that is procedural and internalized, not forced in a way repressive. Therefore that, recovery integrity room digital public necessitates something approach integrated multi-party, where digital platforms must reform fundamentally business models and algorithms recommendation, the country must present as protector fundamental rights of citizens through precise regulation and strengthening digital literacy, while public civil responsible answer build culture ethics communication from root grass as fortress immunity the most robust and sustainable social space. Ultimately, the space digital public with integrity is not sterile room from conflict and differences, but rather capable space manage voltage democratic in a way constructive, making communication as means emancipation and participation

meaningful, not as tool domination and manipulation.

Implementation from results study This demand steps concrete in nature synergistic and sustainable from all over stakeholders interests. Digital platforms must quick conduct an ethical audit to algorithm recommendations and policies moderation the content, with involving independent auditors and representatives community affected, as well as invest in a way Serious in development technology sensitive moderation to context linguistic and cultural local, especially Indonesian and English regions in the archipelago. The country, through ministry related, necessary speed up compilation regulations protection specific and free digital space from articles multiple interpretations, at the same time integrate education critical digital literacy in a way must to in curriculum national from level education base until college tall as project term long formation character responsible digital citizens answer. Civil society, organizations religious and community root grass must strengthen movement check fact based citizens, building network solidarity For protect group prone to from attack speech hatred, and in a way consistent promote culture Embarrassed spread hoaxes and culture critical that values healthy dialogue and differences opinion through exemplary behavior figure community and campaign touching social dimensions affective and moral. Coherent and simultaneous implementation of all three line This is prerequisite absolute for realization room a digital public that is integrated, emancipatory, and participatory, not just as ideals abstract normative, but rather as reality that can felt by everyone citizen.

REFERENCES

- Adiputra, R. (2021). Model bisnis ekonomi atensi dan dampaknya terhadap kualitas diskursus publik di media sosial. *Jurnal Komunikasi Indonesia*, 10(2), 112-129. <https://doi.org/10.7454/jki.v10i2.14567>
- Andriani, F., & Nugroho, S. (2023). Menimbang etika diskursus digital: Sebuah kerangka kerja untuk ruang publik yang sehat. *Jurnal Filsafat Indonesia*, 6(2), 112-128. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jfi.v6i2.54321>
- Azmi, U., Rosadi, K. I., & Zebua, A. M. (2022). The Urgency of Ihsan and Thinking Systemic in Increasing Motivation and Quality of Education. *Jurnal Ilmiah Teunuleh*, 3(2), 83-92. <https://doi.org/10.51612/teunuleh.v3i2.88>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Fahrudin, A. (2022). *Komunikasi di era disrupsi: Dari etika deontologis menuju tanggung jawab digital*. Penerbit Widya Aksara.
- Hamzah, A. (2024). *Metode penelitian kepustakaan: Kajian filosofis, teoretis, dan aplikatif*. Literasi Nusantara.
- Hasanah, U. (2021). *Paradoks kebebasan berpendapat: Dilema etis di ruang siber Indonesia*. Pustaka Obor Nusantara.
- Kurniawan, A., Maulana, R., & Sari, D. P. (2021). Konseptualisasi ruang publik digital di Indonesia: Antara idealita Habermasian dan realita disrupsi. *Jurnal Komunikasi Indonesia*, 10(1), 45-63. <https://doi.org/10.7454/jki.v10i1.12345>
- Kurniawan, D., Rahayu, S., & Mahendra, A. (2023). Redefinisi tanggung jawab etis komunikasi di era post-truth: Sebuah tinjauan filsafat moral. *Jurnal Filsafat*, 33(1), 45-67. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jf.81234>

- Moleong, L. J. (2023). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* (Edisi revisi). PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Ningsih, P. R., Setiawan, B., & Utami, D. (2022). Eskalasi ujaran kebencian daring di Indonesia selama periode politik: Analisis media sosial. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 20(1), 78-96. <https://doi.org/10.31315/jik.v20i1.5678>
- Nurhayati, S. (2022). *Moralitas publik di era algoritma: Menggali kembali etika komunikasi*. Penerbit Kanisius.
- Prasetyo, B. (2023). *Hoaks dan kebencian: Patologi komunikasi digital dan ancamannya terhadap demokrasi*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Putri, D. A., & Hermawan, R. (2024). *Platform, kuasa, dan etika: Menata ulang tanggung jawab digital*. Kapustakaan Populer Gramedia.
- Rahmawati, I. (2022). *Suara yang terluka: Ujaran kebencian, identitas, dan politik di media sosial*. Penerbit Buku Kompas.
- Saputra, R. E. (2022). Peran komunitas masyarakat sipil dalam menangkal ujaran kebencian daring: Studi kasus di Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Sosiologi Reflektif*, 17(1), 79-98. <https://doi.org/10.14421/jsr.v17i1.2345>
- Sari, D. K., & Prasetyo, F. A. (2023). Krisis literasi digital dan kerentanan terhadap misinformasi kesehatan di kalangan masyarakat Indonesia. *Jurnal Kajian Media dan Komunikasi*, 8(2), 134-152. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um032v8i22023p134>
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D* (Edisi ke-2). Penerbit Alfabeta.
- Suryani, T., & Hidayat, M. (2023). *Literasi di tengah badai informasi: Panduan bertahan di era post-truth*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Wahyudi, A., & Setiawan, B. (2023). Etika wacana Habermas sebagai kritik atas distorsi komunikasi di era post-truth. *Jurnal Filsafat*, 33(1), 24-48. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jf.76543>
- Wahyudi, H. (2022). Dilema regulasi konten digital di Indonesia: Antara perlindungan publik dan kebebasan berekspresi. *Jurnal Hukum dan Masyarakat*, 17(3), 210-228. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jhm.v17i3.34567>
- Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2021). Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policymaking. *Information, Communication & Society*, 24(2), 256-274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1411310>
- Wijayanti, A. (2024). *Ekosistem polusi informasi: Disinformasi, misinformasi, dan krisis kepercayaan publik*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Wirawan, H. (2023). Model ko-regulasi tata kelola platform digital: Jalan tengah antara libertarianisme siber dan otoritarianisme digital. *Jurnal Hukum dan Teknologi*, 1(2), 135-155. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jht.v1i2.67890>
- Zed, M. (2021). *Metode penelitian kepustakaan* (Edisi ke-4). Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.