

## Civil Liberties in the Midst of the Threat of Disinformation: Protests and Constitutional Law Challenges in the Post-Truth Era

Rino Dedi Aringga<sup>1\*</sup>, M. Amin El-Walad Meuraksa<sup>1</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Pamulang, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: [dosen02171@unpam.ac.id](mailto:dosen02171@unpam.ac.id)

**Abstract:** This study addresses the growing problem of disinformation in the digital public sphere, which directly affects civil liberties, particularly the right to express opinions through demonstrations. Disinformation in the post-truth era not only intensifies social polarization but also poses new challenges for constitutional law in balancing the protection of fundamental rights and public order. The objective of this research is to analyze the impact of the post-truth era on civil liberties and to examine the implications of constitutional law in regulating demonstrations amid the threat of disinformation. The study applies a normative juridical method with a conceptual and statutory approach, using primary sources such as the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 9 of 1998, the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, and Constitutional Court decisions, complemented by secondary sources including academic literature on disinformation and democracy. The findings reveal that the post-truth era shifts the meaning of civil liberties by prioritizing subjective opinions over facts, leading to the restriction of public expression. Inconsistencies in regulations and weak legal instruments exacerbate constitutional challenges in addressing this issue. The implications highlight the urgency of reformulating balanced and adaptive regulations to respond to digital dynamics, ensuring the protection of civil liberties while preventing the harmful effects of disinformation.

**Keywords:** civil liberties, disinformation, post-truth, constitutional law, demonstration

Received: September 6, 2025

Accepted: October 4, 2025

Published: October 5, 2025

To Cite this Article: Aringga, R. D., & Meuraksa, M. A. E.-W. . (2025). Civil Liberties in the Midst of the Threat of Disinformation: Protests and Constitutional Law Challenges in the Post-Truth Era. *Abdurrauf Social Science*, 2(2), 159–184. <https://doi.org/10.70742/arsos.v2i2.373>



Copyright © 2025 by Author(s)

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

## Introduction

The phenomenon of disinformation has become increasingly prominent in the digital era, particularly through social media, which has transformed into a new public sphere for society. The ease of access to information enables individuals to disseminate news without undergoing adequate verification processes. This condition generates an overwhelming flow of information, making it difficult to distinguish between facts and opinions, especially when certain narratives are emotionally charged and persuasive (Diantini & Purwanti, 2025). Disinformation not only influences individual perceptions but also systematically shapes public opinion on a larger scale (Akbar & Fahlevi, 2023). Within the democratic context, such an uncontrolled flow of information often poses serious challenges to the legitimacy of government policies and the stability of national politics (Kusman, 2018).

Social media, which was originally designed as an instrument of public participation, has now evolved into a contested arena of discourse laden with competing interests. Political actors, interest groups, and even ordinary individuals can exploit digital platforms to mobilize support or spread provocation (Randyca et al., 2024). This phenomenon is evident in various demonstrations, where unverified issues frequently become catalysts for mass mobilization. Erroneous or misleading information can escalate tensions, transforming initially peaceful protests into chaotic confrontations (Budiyono, 2015; Khatimah et al., 2024). Such circumstances illustrate how disinformation can intrude upon the democratic sphere safeguarded by the constitution.

Civil liberties—particularly the right to express opinions in public—have become one of the fundamental rights threatened by the proliferation of disinformation. The Indonesian Constitution, especially the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, explicitly guarantees citizens' rights to assemble, associate, and express opinions (Bakhtiar et al., 2020). However, in practice, this freedom often collides with issues of security and public order. Disinformation further complicates this situation, as freedom of expression may turn into a channel for disseminating falsehoods. Consequently, the state faces a normative dilemma: whether to restrict freedom in order to maintain informational order, or to uphold liberty at the risk of escalating misuse of digital space (Bahram, 2023).

The paradox between freedom and restriction is inseparable from the fundamental principles of constitutional democracy. Democracy inherently presupposes freedom of expression as a manifestation of popular sovereignty; yet, at the same time, it requires a set of legal frameworks to prevent that freedom from descending into anarchy. The rise of disinformation has further complicated the attainment of this equilibrium, as its effects not only disrupt public order but also undermine the quality of public deliberation. When the public communication sphere is saturated with false information, discourse becomes unhealthy and tends to generate deep polarization within society (Arikson, 2024). This condition reinforces the urgency of constitutional law scholarship to re-examine the position of civil liberties in the context of the post-truth era.

The post-truth era is characterized by a shift in public orientation from the pursuit of objective truth toward the dominance of subjective opinions and emotions (Harsin, 2018). Facts have become less relevant than narratives capable of attracting attention and evoking collective sentiment. In the context of public demonstrations, this tendency becomes evident when the masses are easily provoked by viral news that has yet to be verified for accuracy (Mofferz, 2020). The post-truth phenomenon not only weakens society's rational reasoning but also degrades the quality of collective political decision-making. At this point, the threat to civil liberties becomes tangible, as the right to express opinions can be manipulated by the irresponsible circulation of disinformation (Modreanu, 2017; Hendricks & Vestergaard, 2019).

From the perspective of constitutional law, civil liberties possess two principal dimensions. First, such liberties are fundamental rights inherent in every citizen, which the state must protect as a manifestation of the rule of law. Second, they require normative boundaries to ensure that the exercise of freedom does not harm the broader public interest. When disinformation develops into a systemic threat, constitutional law faces the challenge of finding a balance between constitutional guarantees and regulatory necessity. This complexity becomes even more apparent as existing legal instruments—such as Law No. 9 of 1998 on the Freedom to Express Opinions in Public—must interact with the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law),

which often gives rise to multiple interpretations and juridical debates (Rahmadani et al., 2024).

The implementation of regulations in practice often reveals inconsistencies in the protection of civil liberties. On one hand, public demonstrations are legally guaranteed as a legitimate means for citizens to express their aspirations. On the other hand, law enforcement authorities frequently invoke allegations of spreading false information or hate speech as grounds to restrict such freedoms. This tension between two competing interests reflects that Indonesia's constitutional legal system is not yet fully prepared to respond to the dynamics of the post-truth era. Consequently, citizens often feel that their constitutional rights have been violated, while the state justifies such restrictions as necessary to maintain stability and public order (Likadja, 2015).

Criticism of this situation is frequently directed at the inadequacy of regulations that have failed to adapt to developments in information technology. Existing legal frameworks tend to be reactive and sectoral in nature, rendering them incapable of anticipating the multifaceted complexity of digital disinformation. The Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law), for instance, is often perceived as a tool for the criminalization of free expression (Asriani et al., 2025). Such conditions exacerbate the democratic climate, as citizens become increasingly reluctant to voice their opinions openly. Conversely, the state's lack of firmness in regulating the digital sphere also creates opportunities for certain actors to manipulate information for political or economic gain (Christie et al., 2024).

In the context of public demonstrations, disinformation influences not only the perceptions of participants but also shapes broader public opinion (Saragih, 2024). Narratives constructed through social media may generate negative stigma toward demonstrations, leading the public to perceive them as threats to public order rather than as manifestations of democratic participation. This condition further narrows the space for civil liberties, as the state gains perceived social legitimacy to curtail mass actions. Therefore, disinformation should not be viewed merely as a matter of public communication but as a constitutional issue that directly affects the quality of democracy and the principle of the rule of law in a modern constitutional state.

The implementation of regulations in practice often reveals inconsistencies in the protection of civil liberties. On one hand, public demonstrations are legally guaranteed as a legitimate means for citizens to express their aspirations. On the other hand, law enforcement authorities frequently invoke allegations of spreading false information or hate speech as grounds to restrict such freedoms. This tension between two competing interests reflects that Indonesia's constitutional legal system is not yet fully prepared to respond to the dynamics of the post-truth era. Consequently, citizens often feel that their constitutional rights have been violated, while the state justifies such restrictions as necessary to maintain stability and public order (Likadja, 2015).

Criticism of this situation is frequently directed at the inadequacy of regulations that have failed to adapt to developments in information technology. Existing legal frameworks tend to be reactive and sectoral in nature, rendering them incapable of anticipating the multifaceted complexity of digital disinformation. The Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law), for instance, is often perceived as a tool for the criminalization of free expression (Asriani et al., 2025). Such conditions exacerbate the democratic climate, as citizens become increasingly reluctant to voice their opinions openly. Conversely, the state's lack of firmness in regulating the digital sphere also creates opportunities for certain actors to manipulate information for political or economic gain (Rohmah, 2023).

In the context of public demonstrations, disinformation influences not only the perceptions of participants but also shapes broader public opinion. Narratives constructed through social media may generate negative stigma toward demonstrations, leading the public to perceive them as threats to public order rather than as manifestations of democratic participation. This condition further narrows the space for civil liberties, as the state gains perceived social legitimacy to curtail mass actions. Therefore, disinformation should not be viewed merely as a matter of public communication but as a constitutional issue that directly affects the quality of democracy and the principle of the rule of law in a modern constitutional state.

## Method

This study employs a normative juridical approach, which focuses on the study of law as a written norm that governs society. Its primary focus is to examine the positive law regulating civil liberties, particularly the right to express opinions in public, in relation to the phenomenon of disinformation. This approach was chosen because the study does not merely investigate empirical practices but rather interprets the constitutional principles and regulatory frameworks that form the basis for protecting civil freedoms. Accordingly, this research seeks to explore the substantive meaning of constitutional law in systematically and contextually responding to the challenges of the post-truth era.

A conceptual approach is also employed to understand civil liberty not merely as a legal text but as a living and evolving concept within the discourse of constitutional legal theory. The concepts of post-truth, disinformation, and deliberative democracy serve as analytical frameworks that broaden the study's normative perspective. Through this approach, civil liberty is positioned in a dual context: as a fundamental right that must be guaranteed by the state, and as a dynamic public sphere that remains vulnerable to the influence of digital technological developments. The conceptual approach thus allows the research to connect legal norms with philosophical values and the broader principles of constitutional democracy.

A statutory approach is utilized as an instrument to systematically analyze the relevant body of regulations. The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD 1945), as the supreme source of law, serves as the primary reference, particularly the articles guaranteeing freedom of expression, assembly, and association. In addition, Law No. 9 of 1998 on the Freedom to Express Opinions in Public and the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law) are examined to observe how statutory regulation delineates the boundary between freedom of expression and responsibility in digital spaces. Moreover, Constitutional Court decisions are reviewed to capture judicial interpretations concerning civil liberties within contemporary socio-political contexts.

The data in this research are divided into two categories: primary legal materials and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials include statutes and court decisions possessing binding authority, such as the 1945

Constitution, Law No. 9 of 1998, the ITE Law, and relevant Constitutional Court rulings. These primary sources serve as the foundational framework for assessing the extent to which legal norms provide protection for civil liberties while simultaneously anticipating the threats posed by disinformation. The strength of primary legal materials lies in their authoritative and binding nature, which offers a clear normative foundation for legal analysis.

Meanwhile, secondary legal materials serve as analytical support, encompassing academic literature, journal articles, books, research reports, and other scholarly documents. Studies on post-truth, disinformation, and constitutional democracy are utilized to broaden the analytical context of modern constitutional law issues. Secondary literature assists in interpreting legal norms within theoretical frameworks while also offering comparative perspectives with constitutional practices in other countries facing similar challenges. Consequently, secondary materials function as a bridge linking legal norms with dynamic social realities.

Data analysis is conducted qualitatively through the method of legal interpretation grounded in constitutional legal theory. This analytical technique does not aim to produce quantitative findings but rather to uncover the meanings, principles, and legal logic contained within the relevant regulations. The interpretative process involves examining statutory texts and judicial decisions through the lenses of constitutionalism, democratic principles, and human rights concepts. This qualitative approach provides flexibility in exploring the interrelation between **law, civil liberties**, and disinformation challenges within the framework of a democratic rule-of-law state.

## **Result and Discussion**

### **Civil Liberties and the Constitution**

Civil liberties constitute one of the fundamental pillars in the administration of a democratic constitutional state. In Indonesia, the guarantee of civil liberties is explicitly enshrined in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which affirms the right of every citizen to express opinions, assemble, and associate. These rights are not merely understood as individual freedoms but also as the foundation for the realization of active citizen participation in

national and state life. The Constitution provides a strong normative legitimacy ensuring that civil liberties cannot be arbitrarily reduced, restricted, or disregarded by state authority (Fahturosi, 2021).

The guarantee of freedom of expression is explicitly stipulated in **Article 28E** paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution, which declares that “Every person shall have the right to freedom of association, assembly, and expression of opinion.” This constitutional formulation underscores that civil liberty is an inalienable human right inherent in every individual. Such recognition reflects the view that, within Indonesia’s constitutional framework, civil liberties hold a strategic position as an integral element of constitutional democracy (Effendi et al., 2023). Consequently, the state is obligated to safeguard and protect the exercise of this right, including its collective expressions such as peaceful public demonstrations.

The right to assembly also serves as a vital instrument for maintaining democratic dynamics and strengthening the mechanisms of social control over power. Through the freedom of assembly, citizens are able to voice aspirations, organize collectively, and perform oversight functions toward public policy. The Constitution not only formally acknowledges this right but also positions it as a primary means of nurturing a deliberative public sphere. In the absence of freedom of assembly, democracy risks being reduced to a mere procedural system—devoid of the participatory substance that constitutes its very essence. Within this framework, freedom of assembly is viewed as a tangible manifestation of popular sovereignty and as a moral expression of a civilized legal system (Farida, 2022).

Civil liberties as enshrined in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia are inseparable from the principle of constitutional democracy. This principle affirms that citizens’ freedoms must be exercised within the limits of law so as not to conflict with the public interest. Constitutional democracy recognizes freedom as a fundamental right of every individual while simultaneously emphasizing the necessity of restrictions to prevent the violation of others’ rights. In this context, the constitution functions as an instrument that balances individual liberty with collective welfare (Fahturosi, 2021).

Restrictions on civil liberties are not intended to abolish such rights but rather to ensure that freedom is exercised responsibly. Article 28J paragraph (2)

of the 1945 Constitution stipulates that in exercising their rights and freedoms, every person shall be subject to the restrictions established by law to guarantee the recognition and respect of the rights and freedoms of others. This provision underscores that civil liberties in Indonesia are always situated within a framework of social responsibility. Accordingly, the state possesses constitutional authority to regulate the exercise of civil liberties without undermining democratic principles.

From the perspective of constitutional democracy, civil liberties are not absolute rights. Their exercise must take into account moral and religious values, public order, and national interests. This concept aligns with the rule of law, which places legal supremacy at the foundation of state governance. Without clear regulation, civil liberties risk devolving into anarchic acts that may disrupt social order (Pelokilla, 2023). Therefore, constitutional restrictions must be understood as instruments designed to safeguard the sustainability of democracy.

Beyond providing formal guarantees of civil liberties, the Constitution also establishes mechanisms for protection through state institutions. The Constitutional Court holds a pivotal role in ensuring the conformity of legislation with constitutional principles through its authority to conduct judicial review. This function ensures that every regulation enacted does not violate citizens' constitutional rights. Hence, civil liberties are not merely textual norms within the 1945 Constitution but are realized in the practical governance of the nation (Muhlashin, 2021).

Civil liberties within Indonesia's constitutional framework are also closely intertwined with the recognition of human rights. The amendment to the 1945 Constitution that introduced Chapter XA on Human Rights strengthened the position of civil liberties as an integral component of the national legal system. This provision demonstrates that Indonesia upholds human rights as an inviolable constitutional foundation. Consequently, civil liberties not only embody political dimensions but also reflect profound moral and legal values, consistent with the state's commitment to protecting human dignity and promoting social justice.

Civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution encompass the right to express opinions, including the right to criticize the government. Criticism

represents an active form of public participation in overseeing state administration and serves as a concrete manifestation of the principle of popular sovereignty. Within a constitutional democracy, criticism is not regarded as a threat to state stability but as a corrective mechanism to improve public policy and strengthen governmental accountability (Rahmawati et al., 2021). Therefore, constitutional guarantees of freedom of expression must be preserved and consistently respected, particularly when citizens exercise this right through lawful demonstrations.

Demonstrations, as one of the manifestations of civil liberties, hold a strategic position within the democratic system. Collective action enables citizens to channel their aspirations and express dissent openly, especially when formal mechanisms fail to accommodate all public interests. The Constitution provides explicit protection for such freedom, as long as it is exercised peacefully, orderly, and in accordance with the prevailing legal provisions. This constitutional protection reflects the state's commitment to substantive democracy—one that ensures public participation free from threats or intimidation (Arnapi et al., 2024).

The constitutional principle of civil liberty requires the state to remain neutral, proportional, and non-repressive in responding to citizens' expressions. A democratic state must guarantee a safe, open, and inclusive public sphere in which every citizen can express opinions freely. Repressive actions against freedom of expression are not only contrary to constitutional principles but also erode the legitimacy of the state as the guardian of citizens' rights. Accordingly, the Constitution serves as both an ethical and juridical boundary to prevent the abuse of power for the suppression of public criticism.

Civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution also reflect respect for Indonesia's pluralistic social fabric. In a diverse society, freedom of expression plays a crucial role in maintaining social cohesion and fostering intergroup dialogue. The Constitution explicitly protects the rights of every citizen regardless of religion, ethnicity, race, or cultural background. This principle reaffirms that civil liberty is a universal right that must not be compromised on any discriminatory grounds; instead, it must be upheld as a foundation for social justice and equality.

Beyond the national dimension, civil liberties in Indonesia's constitutional framework also carry international significance, reflecting the state's responsibility toward its global commitments. As a member of the international community, Indonesia has ratified several human rights instruments, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). This ratification strengthens the state's constitutional obligation to protect civil liberties in accordance with international legal standards (Riski, 2023). Consequently, the protection of civil liberties is not merely a constitutional mandate but also a moral and legal commitment of Indonesia at the global level.

In practice, the implementation of civil liberties often faces a dilemma between protecting individual rights and maintaining national security. This challenge underscores the necessity of clear, consistent, and unambiguous derivative legislation to ensure that constitutional guarantees are effectively operationalized. Legal uncertainty or regulatory inconsistency may create opportunities for abuse of power, thereby diminishing the essence of civil liberty. Hence, strengthening the constitutional legal framework and consolidating democratic institutions are imperative to safeguarding the constitutional rights of citizens (Ilham, 2024).

Constitutionally guaranteed civil liberties serve as a key indicator of the quality of democracy in Indonesia. The stronger the protection of the rights to expression and assembly, the greater the state's legitimacy in the eyes of its citizens. Conversely, any form of violation of civil liberties undermines public trust and weakens the democratic foundation of the nation. Therefore, the enforcement of civil liberties is not merely a legal obligation but also a moral and political investment in the sustainability of Indonesia's constitutional

### **Disinformation as a New Threat**

Disinformation represents a rapidly evolving phenomenon in contemporary digital communication. Conceptually, it refers to the deliberate dissemination of false or misleading information intended to influence public opinion or achieve specific political or economic goals. This definition distinguishes disinformation from misinformation, which typically occurs without deliberate intent. Within the framework of constitutional law, disinformation poses a

serious threat because it distorts the public sphere—an arena that should ideally serve as the foundation of rational discourse in a democratic system (Muttaqin, 2024).

The post-truth era has introduced new challenges to modern democratic life. In this context, objective truth is no longer the primary basis for shaping public opinion; rather, it is replaced by emotions, perceptions, and political affiliations. Disinformation thrives in such conditions because individuals tend to believe information that aligns with their pre-existing beliefs and identities, even when such information lacks factual grounding. This shift transforms democracy from one based on rational deliberation to one driven by emotion and perception (Walangarei & Sitorus, 2023).

Social media has become the most effective medium for the dissemination of disinformation in the post-truth era. Its fast, interactive, and algorithm-driven nature turns digital platforms into massive arenas for public opinion formation. The algorithmic design of social media creates echo chambers that reinforce users' biases toward similar content, accelerating the virality of misleading information compared to factual but less provocative news (Naik, 2025).

In Indonesia, the interaction between social media and public demonstrations illustrates the tangible impact of disinformation on civil liberties and democratic expression. Social media serves a dual function—as a catalyst for mass mobilization and as a conduit for spreading false information that can heighten social tensions. This duality is evident in numerous protests, where hashtags and online narratives unite public aspirations but simultaneously ignite conflict due to manipulated information (Fuadi, 2020).

Various protest incidents in Indonesia reveal that disinformation often triggers social polarization. Demonstrations related to legislative reforms or public policy are frequently colored by misleading narratives on social media, intensifying public unrest. Although many of the people's demands are constitutionally legitimate, conflict escalation is often driven by the dissemination of unverified information. This situation produces tension between the state and society, weakening the essence of civil liberties, which should be exercised responsibly.

Disinformation also aggravates social tension by exploiting identity-based issues. Misleading narratives manipulate public perception, deepen divisions along ethnic, religious, or political lines, and ultimately erode social cohesion and national unity (Syahdan, 2024). From a constitutional law perspective, disinformation is not merely a communication problem but a direct threat to constitutional stability and the sustainability of democracy.

The involvement of political actors further complicates the dynamics of disinformation. False information is often employed to construct political imagery, discredit opponents, or fabricate artificial support. In such circumstances, the public faces difficulty distinguishing between authentic information and political manipulation. From the standpoint of constitutional law, this condition raises a normative dilemma: on one hand, the state must safeguard freedom of expression; on the other, it must curb the spread of harmful information that threatens national stability and public order.

Law enforcement agencies responsible for maintaining order during demonstrations are also affected by the influence of disinformation. The spread of negative narratives on social media often shapes biased public perceptions of law enforcement, portraying them as inherently repressive. This undermines public trust in state institutions and ultimately erodes the legitimacy of legal authority in balancing security and civil freedom.

From a constitutional perspective, disinformation tests the boundaries between civil liberties and the public interest. The state is required to maintain a delicate balance between ensuring constitutional freedoms and preventing the dissemination of destructive information. However, repressive actions taken under the pretext of combating disinformation are often perceived as violations of freedom of expression. This dilemma underscores the need for proportional, transparent, and due process-based legal policies.

The legal framework governing disinformation in Indonesia—particularly the Law on Electronic Information and Transactions (UU ITE)—continues to face sharp criticism for its ambiguous interpretation and inconsistent enforcement. The law is often viewed as an instrument for the criminalization of citizens' expression, thereby constraining substantive democracy (Sari, 2023). Consequently, there is an urgent need to reformulate regulations that are more adaptive to digital dynamics without undermining civil liberties.

The proliferation of disinformation also highlights the lack of digital literacy among the public. Many individuals tend to believe and disseminate information without verification. From a constitutional standpoint, this indicates that regulation alone is insufficient; a cultural and educational approach is necessary to raise public awareness. Digital literacy is an integral component of the state's constitutional responsibility to protect citizens from the adverse effects of technological advancement (Putra, 2022).

In addition to improving digital literacy, state institutions play a pivotal role in maintaining equilibrium between civil liberty and the control of disinformation. The Constitutional Court has the authority to interpret legal norms to ensure their relevance in the digital era, while the legislative and executive branches bear responsibility for formulating adaptive yet non-repressive policies. Institutional synergy is essential for building an effective, fair, and constitutional legal mechanism.

Overall, disinformation in the context of public demonstrations must be understood as a fundamental constitutional law issue. The systematic dissemination of false information not only erodes public trust in state institutions but also undermines the foundations of constitutional democracy. Therefore, strategies to address disinformation should not focus solely on punitive measures but must aim to preserve the sustainability of a democratic constitutional state.

This analysis demonstrates that disinformation represents a new and pressing threat in the post-truth era. The dominant role of social media in shaping public opinion makes this threat increasingly tangible, particularly in the context of public protests. Cases of disinformation that fuel polarization and social conflict affirm that civil liberties are under serious strain. Consequently, constitutional law must respond with a balanced approach—protecting constitutional rights while ensuring social order to preserve the quality and resilience of Indonesia's democracy.

### **Constitutional Law Challenges**

The challenges of constitutional law in the digital era are becoming increasingly complex, particularly in addressing issues of civil liberties and disinformation. The constitutional right to freedom of expression often intersects with the

state's obligation to maintain public order. This condition generates an unavoidable regulatory dilemma, as any form of restriction on public expression may be perceived as a violation of citizens' fundamental rights. Such tension represents a central issue within the dynamics of contemporary constitutional law (Nurhayati et al., 2024).

Freedom of expression constitutes one of the fundamental pillars of democracy, as guaranteed by Article 28E of the 1945 Constitution. In practice, this right encompasses freedom of speech, assembly, and public expression. However, this right is not absolute, since the Constitution also obliges citizens to respect the rights of others and to preserve national interests. This creates a conceptual tension between individual rights and collective welfare, where drawing a proportional boundary between the two remains a constant legal challenge (Fatma, 2018).

Public demonstrations serve as a concrete manifestation of civil liberties within the framework of constitutional law. Although legally protected, their implementation frequently triggers problems when intersecting with public security and order. The state often faces a dilemma between allowing demonstrations at the risk of instability or imposing restrictions at the risk of being labeled repressive. This reflects the classical challenge in the practice of constitutional democracy in Indonesia.

One of the root causes lies in the inconsistency of regulations governing freedom of expression. Law No. 9 of 1998 on the Freedom to Express Opinions in Public provides broad space for citizens to channel their political aspirations. However, the existence of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (UU ITE) is often viewed as restrictive, as it contains ambiguous provisions that can be exploited to criminalize critical voices. The divergent orientations of these two laws indicate a lack of harmony within the national legal system.

Law No. 9 of 1998 is a reform-era product that embodies the state's commitment to strengthening civil liberties. Conversely, the ITE Law—initially designed to regulate digital behavior—has frequently been used as a tool to limit free expression. This inconsistency creates legal uncertainty, as citizens lack clear guidance on the distinction between legitimate criticism and unlawful acts.

The disharmony between these two regulations has serious implications for the exercise of civil liberties. Numerous cases demonstrate that the ITE Law

has been applied repressively to silence public criticism, while the spirit of Law No. 9 of 1998 is to protect citizens' voices. This situation exposes the weak coordination and harmonization among legal instruments that should, ideally, support the principles of constitutional democracy.

Regulatory inconsistency further complicates legal interpretation. Law enforcement officers often find themselves in a dilemma between enforcing positive law and protecting citizens' constitutional rights. These conflicting paradigms contribute to legal uncertainty and widen the trust gap between the state and society (Rismayani, 2023).

Within this context, the Constitutional Court (Mahkamah Konstitusi, MK) holds a strategic role as the guardian of the Constitution. Through its judicial review authority, the Court can assess whether a regulation aligns with the principles of civil liberties and proportionality in human rights. Several MK rulings have emphasized the necessity of limiting interpretations of provisions that are prone to misuse, particularly those in the ITE Law. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of these rulings remains questionable due to inconsistent implementation in law enforcement practices.

Criticism toward the Constitutional Court persists, as it is often perceived as insufficiently progressive in responding to the challenges of the digital era. Some scholars argue that the Court remains conservative and inadequately adaptive to social transformations driven by disinformation and post-truth phenomena. Yet, the challenges of modern constitutional law demand a more contextual and innovative constitutional interpretation to ensure that civil liberties are not diminished by repressive legislation.

Implementation issues also arise in practical enforcement. Law enforcement officers frequently face difficulties managing demonstrations influenced by waves of disinformation. Excessive actions may violate constitutional rights, whereas inaction could jeopardize social stability. Thus, clearer legal guidelines are needed to ensure that enforcement actions remain proportionate and consistent with the rule of law (Vonnie K & Romadhon, 2025).

Weak oversight mechanisms in the enforcement of regulations exacerbate the problem. Although the Constitutional Court has the authority to review legislation, there remains no effective mechanism to ensure consistent

implementation on the ground. Consequently, a gap emerges between constitutional norms and the legal practices carried out by state apparatus.

The tension between safeguarding civil liberties and maintaining public order directly affects the legitimacy of the state. When the state acts repressively, public trust in legal institutions declines; conversely, excessive permissiveness toward the misuse of freedom can threaten national stability. This dilemma represents a true test of the endurance of Indonesia's constitutional democracy.

Constitutional law must therefore respond to these challenges in an adaptive and progressive manner. Legal harmonization is urgently needed to prevent regulatory overlap, while the Constitutional Court's interpretive approach must become more responsive to social and technological developments. In this way, constitutional law can function effectively as an instrument to balance the protection of civil liberties with the preservation of public order.

Overall, the challenges of constitutional law in the post-truth era highlight the urgent need to reinforce the principles of constitutional democracy. Regulatory inconsistency, disharmonious law enforcement, and the limited role of judicial institutions must be addressed to prevent the erosion of civil liberties by repressive policies. Strengthening constitutional supremacy and ensuring fair legal enforcement constitute the foundational pillars for realizing a substantive and dignified democracy in Indonesia.

### **The Post-Truth Perspective and Its Legal Implications**

The post-truth era reflects a socio-political condition in which objective truth no longer serves as the primary reference in shaping public opinion. Facts, which should form the foundation of rational discourse, are often displaced by emotions, personal narratives, and group interests. This shift has serious implications for the meaning of civil liberties, as the public sphere is no longer characterized by evidence-based debate but by the manipulation of information that obscures truth. Such a situation poses a major challenge to the constitutional legal system (Sihombing et al., 2024).

Civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution are fundamentally intended to strengthen democratic participation. However, in the post-truth era, these liberties are often misused as tools for spreading disinformation or hate speech.

This practice distorts the meaning of civil freedom, transforming it from a medium of healthy public deliberation into an instrument of provocation. The resulting shift undermines the essence of constitutional democracy, which should rest upon honesty and the validity of information.

Social media has become the primary instrument accelerating the distortion of civil liberties in the post-truth age. Digital platforms that should promote civic participation are more often used to disseminate emotional opinions without factual verification. Consequently, constitutional freedom of expression is reduced to the freedom to spread narratives devoid of epistemic responsibility. This condition challenges the sustainability of legal rationality within a democratic state governed by the rule of law.

The post-truth phenomenon also affects the quality of public demonstrations as one of the manifestations of civil liberty. Mass mobilization, which ideally emerges from authentic social aspirations, is now often triggered by misleading narratives circulating on social media. As a result, demonstrations may shift from genuine advocacy for public interests to emotional responses to transient issues. Such transformation weakens the role of protest as a constructive mechanism of social control within democracy.

Constitutional law faces a significant challenge in maintaining deliberative democracy amid the post-truth wave. Deliberative democracy requires public discourse that is rational, inclusive, and fact-based. When public opinion is dominated by disinformation, deliberation loses its moral and rational legitimacy. The state is therefore compelled to balance the protection of civil liberties with the responsibility to ensure a public discourse grounded in reason and ethics (Mihradi, 2020).

The concept of deliberative democracy developed by Habermas underscores the importance of an open, honest, and truth-oriented public sphere. Yet, in the post-truth era, the public sphere is increasingly dominated by manipulation and emotional interests. When data-driven argumentation is replaced by emotional rhetoric, deliberative processes lose their epistemic legitimacy. In this context, constitutional law must remain adaptive to safeguard the substantive values of deliberative democracy.

Another major challenge lies in defining the boundary between restricting civil liberties and protecting democracy. State efforts to combat

disinformation require firm regulation; however, excessive restrictions risk suppressing citizens' constitutional rights. This issue raises a normative question: to what extent may the state intervene without violating constitutional principles? Achieving equilibrium between freedom and order thus becomes an essential requirement.

The post-truth era also highlights the importance of procedural justice in regulatory formation. Every provision designed to counter disinformation must be formulated proportionally, clearly, and without ambiguity. Vague regulations risk being exploited to silence public criticism, contradicting the spirit of the Constitution. Therefore, constitutional law must ensure that all digital regulations remain consistent with the principles of a democratic rule of law.

The need for regulatory reformulation becomes increasingly urgent as disinformation disrupts national political stability. The Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law), for instance, has often been criticized for its overly elastic and potentially repressive provisions. This underscores the necessity of redefining legal norms that are more contextually aligned with digital dynamics (Respati, 2024).

Regulatory reformulation should not be limited to normative revisions but must also integrate the principles of deliberative democracy into positive law. Regulations designed with an emphasis on information verification and the protection of civil liberties will enhance public trust in state legitimacy. Thus, post-truth should not be viewed solely as a threat but also as an opportunity to renew the commitment to substantive democracy.

The Constitutional Court (Mahkamah Konstitusi, MK) plays a pivotal role in this reformulation process. It holds a strategic mandate to ensure that all legislation aligns with the spirit of the Constitution. Through judicial review, the Court can correct legal norms that potentially violate citizens' constitutional rights. In the post-truth context, the Court's interpretive function becomes crucial, as it must be capable of reading the Constitution in a progressive and contextual manner (Rasji et al., 2025).

Beyond the normative dimension, reformulation must also take into account the public's level of digital literacy. Well-designed regulations will remain ineffective without citizens' capacity to distinguish between accurate and misleading information. Therefore, constitutional legal policy must be

integrated with public education strategies aimed at enhancing digital awareness and civic responsibility (Salsabila et al., 2025).

From a constitutional law perspective, regulatory reformulation must also ensure public participation in the legislative process. Civic involvement not only strengthens the legitimacy of legal norms but also ensures that regulations reflect the social realities of the digital era. Such participatory mechanisms embody the genuine implementation of deliberative democracy (Sofwan, 2022).

The post-truth era demonstrates that law cannot be understood merely as a static normative text. Constitutional law must be conceived as a dynamic system that interacts with social, political, and technological realities. Consequently, every legal policy should aim to protect civil liberties while maintaining state stability. This new paradigm provides an essential foundation for formulating adaptive regulations suited to the complexities of the post-truth age.

## **Conclusion**

Civil liberties constitute constitutional rights explicitly guaranteed by the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, particularly through the recognition of the rights to express opinions, assemble, and convey aspirations through public demonstrations. However, the development of the digital era presents new challenges in the form of the widespread dissemination of disinformation across the public sphere, especially through social media. This phenomenon generates informational distortion that undermines the substantive meaning of civil liberties, as public opinion is often shaped by inaccurate or misleading narratives. Consequently, civil liberty today faces not only the threat of state-imposed restrictions but also the pervasive influence of manipulative and unverified information flows.

The post-truth era has exacerbated this situation by prioritizing emotion and subjective opinion over objective fact. In the context of public demonstrations, such conditions frequently lead to social polarization, horizontal conflicts, and even criminalization resulting from misunderstandings rooted in disinformation. For constitutional law, this represents a serious challenge, as the state must maintain a delicate balance between protecting citizens' fundamental rights and preserving public order. The lack of regulatory

coherence—such as the overlap between Law No. 9 of 1998 on the Freedom to Express Opinions in Public and the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law)—further exposes the legal system’s weakness in responding to post-truth dynamics.

This condition underscores the urgency of establishing proportional legal policies—that is, regulations that safeguard freedom of expression as a central pillar of democracy while simultaneously providing effective instruments to mitigate the adverse impacts of disinformation. Reformulating constitutional law has thus become imperative to ensure alignment with the evolving digital ecosystem while strengthening deliberative democracy grounded in rationality and factual accuracy. Therefore, the reinforcement of legal frameworks should not aim at repressive restrictions but rather at developing a just, adaptive, and responsive legal system capable of addressing the challenges of disinformation in the post-truth era.

## References

- Akbar, M. I., & Fahlevi, M. R. (2023). Cegah Penyebaran Misinformasi di Media Sosial Menggunakan Peralatan dan Fitur Literasi Digital. *RENATA: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat Kita Semua*, 1(1), 15–20. <https://doi.org/10.61124/1.renata.2>
- Arikson, A. (2024). KRISIS DEMOKRASI DAN DAMPAKNYA TERHADAP HAK ASASI MANUSIA DI ERA DIGITAL STUDI KASUS PEMBATAAN MEDIA SOSIAL DALAM PENGAWASAN PEMILU 2024. *Journal of Social and Economics Research*, 6(2), 436–446. <https://doi.org/10.54783/jser.v6i2.624>
- Arnapi, Karnaji, Abidin, I. K. R., & Arsyada, R. M. (2024). Paradigma Hukum Kedudukan Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Dalam Pengamanan Aksi Unjuk Rasa. *Media Iuris*, 7(1), 31–50. <https://doi.org/10.20473/mi.v7i1.43709>
- Asriani, A., Irvita, M., Tribuana, R. R., & Pawari, R. R. (2025). Pembangunan Hukum di Era Digital: Tantangan dan Peluang bagi Negara dalam Menghadapi Transformasi Teknologi. *Jurnal Bisnis Mahasiswa*, 5(1), 164–174. <https://doi.org/10.60036/jbm.v5i1.324>
- Bahram, M. (2023). TANTANGAN HUKUM DAN ETIKA (REKAYASA SOSIAL TERHADAP KEBEBASAN BERPENDAPAT DI DUNIA DIGITAL). *SENTRI: Jurnal Riset Ilmiah*, 2(12), 5092–5109. <https://doi.org/10.55681/sentri.v2i12.1895>

- Bakhtiar, N. Y., Husen, L. O., & Bima, M. R. (2020). Pemenuhan Hak Kebebasan Berpendapat Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 9 Tahun 1999 Tentang Kemerdekaan Berpendapat Di Muka Umum. *Journal of Lex Theory (JLT)*, 1(1), 41–58. <https://doi.org/10.52103/jlt.v1i1.43>
- Budiyono, B. (2015). Fenomena Komunikasi Politik dalam Media Sosial. *JURNAL IPTEKKOM : Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan & Teknologi Informasi*, 17(2), 143. <https://doi.org/10.33164/iptekkom.17.2.2015.143-160>
- Christie, R., Michaela, M., & Tuasikal, N. R. (2024). Peran Mahkamah Konstitusi Dalam Menjaga Supremasi Hukum dan Kedaulatan Negara di Indonesia. *Journal of Accounting Law Communication and Technology*, 2(1), 207–215. <https://doi.org/10.57235/jalakotek.v2i1.4485>
- Diantini, N., & Purwanti, P. (2025). Berpikir Kritis Dalam Menghadapi Tantangan Disinformasi di Era Digital. *AT-TAKLIM: Jurnal Pendidikan Multidisiplin*, 2(1), 830–837. <https://doi.org/10.71282/at-taklim.v2i1.110>
- Effendi, S. F., Arsyah, N. A., & Faradila, M. (2023). AMBIVALENSI HAK KEBEBASAN BERPENDAPAT DALAM KONSTELASI HUKUM MODERN DI INDONESIA. *Realism: Law Review*, 1(3), 37–55. <https://doi.org/10.71250/rlr.v1i3.19>
- Fahturosi, D. (2021). KEBEBASAN HAK DAN PARTISIPASI WARGA NEGARA DALAM SISTEM DEMOKRASI DI INDONESIA. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/csn2u>
- Farida, E. (2022). Kewajiban Negara Indonesia Terhadap Pemenuhan Hak Kebebasan Berpendapat Dan Berekspresi. *QISTIE*, 14(2), 39. <https://doi.org/10.31942/jqi.v14i2.5590>
- Fatma. (2018). PARADOKS DEMOKRASI INDONESIA “Merebaknya Intoleransi (Hate Speech dan Hate Crime) dalam Politik Indonesia.” <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/s4kjc>
- Fuadi, A. (2020). Social media power for protest in Indonesia: The Yogyakarta’s #gejayanmemanggil case study. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi (Indonesian Journal of Communications Studies)*, 4(3), 541. <https://doi.org/10.25139/jsk.v4i3.2438>
- Harsin, J. (2018). Post-Truth and Critical Communication Studies. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.757>
- Hendricks, V. F., & Vestergaard, M. (2019). The Post-factual Democracy. In *Reality Lost* (pp. 103–117). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00813-0\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00813-0_6)
- Ilham, M. (2024). PERKEMBANGAN HUKUM TATA NEGARA DALAM MENGATUR HUBUNGAN NEGARA DAN AGAMA DI

- INDONESIA. *Indonesia Journal of Business Law*, 3(1), 8–14.  
<https://doi.org/10.47709/ijbl.v3i1.4146>
- Khatimah, K., Alhamdani, A., Selvia, V., Sugiyarti, A., Maulana, M. G., & Putra, M. L. S. (2024). Pengaruh Media Sosial Terhadap Partisipasi Politik dan Demokrasi di Indonesia. *VOX POPULI*, 7(2), 128–143.  
<https://doi.org/10.24252/vp.v7i2.52688>
- Kusman, A. P. (2018). Islam dan Media: Kontestasi Ideologi dan Ekonomi Politik Media Era Demokrasi. *MAARIF*, 13(1), 3–8.  
<https://doi.org/10.47651/mrf.v13i1.8>
- Likadja, J. A. C. (2015). Memaknai “Hukum Negara (Law Through State)” dalam Bingkai “Negara Hukum (Rechtstaat).” *Hasanuddin Law Review*, 1(1), 75. <https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v1i1.41>
- Mihradi, R. M. (2020). Prospek Penerapan Konsep Demokrasi Deliberatif Dalam Pembentukan Hukum Di Indonesia. *Justicia Sains: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 5(1), 32–47. <https://doi.org/10.24967/jcs.v5i1.677>
- Modreanu, S. (2017). The Post-Truth Era? *Human and Social Studies*, 6(3), 7–9.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/hssr-2017-0021>
- Mofferz, M. W. (2020). Meretas Makna Post-Truth: Analisis Kontekstual Hoaks, Emosi Sosial dan Populisme Agama. *Societas Dei: Jurnal Agama Dan Masyarakat*, 7(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.33550/sd.v7i1.141>
- Muhlashin, I. (2021). Negara Hukum, Demokrasi dan Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia. *Jurnal Al-Qadau: Peradilan Dan Hukum Keluarga Islam*, 8(1), 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.24252/al-qadau.v8i1.18114>
- Muttaqin, M. Z. (2024). *State Administrative Law in Indonesia*. Taylor & Francis.
- Naik, S. N. (2025). THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL MEDIA ON PUBLIC OPINION IN THE DIGITAL AGE. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR)*, 771–774.  
<https://doi.org/10.36713/epra22452>
- Nurhayati, S., Salsabila, L., & Hidayat, R. (2024). Kebebasan berbicara versus pertimbangan keamanan cyber menurut perspektif hukum dan HAM. *TerAs Law Review: Jurnal Hukum Humaniter Dan HAM*, 5(1), 32–47.  
<https://doi.org/10.25105/terasrev.v5i1.19981>
- Pelokilla, J. (2023). UUD 1945 Sebagai Landasan Konstitusional Terhadap Perlindungan Hak Warga Negara Indonesia. *JOCER: Journal of Civic Education Research*, 1(1), 24–28. <https://doi.org/10.60153/jocer.v1i1.11>
- Putra, B. K. (2022). Kontribusi Negara dan Masyarakat dalam Proses Demokratisasi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Publika*, 10(1), 53.  
<https://doi.org/10.33603/publika.v10i1.7091>
- Rahmadani, A., Paramita, M. L., Haura, S., & Firman, F. (2024). REGULASI

- DIGITAL DAN IMPLIKASINYA TERHADAP KEBEBASAN BERPENDAPAT (STUDI KASUS: UU ITE PADA PLATFORM MEDIA SOSIAL DI INDONESIA). *Journal of Social Contemplativa*, 2(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.61183/jsc.v2i1.75>
- Rahmawati, N., Muslichatun, M., & Marizal, M. (2021). KEBEBASAN BERPENDAPAT TERHADAP PEMERINTAH MELALUI MEDIA SOSIAL DALAM PERSPEKTIF UU ITE. *Widya Pranata Hukum : Jurnal Kajian Dan Penelitian Hukum*, 3(1), 62-75. <https://doi.org/10.37631/widyapranata.v3i1.270>
- Randyca, P., Xaverius, F., Pernando, P., & Janson, C. (2024). Media Sosial Sebagai Sarana Komunikasi Massa dan Partisipasi Politik Masyarakat. *ULIL ALBAB: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 3(5), 96-105. <https://doi.org/10.56799/jim.v3i5.3356>
- Rasji, R., Dikjaya, D., Baeha, D. L. I., & Rokhim, A. N. (2025). Efektivitas Peran Mahkamah Konstitusi Dalam Menjaga Konstitusionalitas Undang-Undang. *Journal of Health Education Law Information and Humanities*, 2(1), 91-95. <https://doi.org/10.57235/helium.v2i1.4640>
- Respati, A. A. (2024). Reformulasi UU ITE terhadap Artificial Intelligence Dibandingkan dengan Uni Eropa dan China AI Act Regulation. *JURNAL USM LAW REVIEW*, 7(3), 1737-1758. <https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v7i3.10578>
- Riski, N. (2023). PENTINGNYA PERLINDUNGAN HAK ASASI MANUSIA DALAM SISTEM HUKUM KENEGARAAN. *Mandalika Law Journal*, 1(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.59613/mlj.v1i1.1542>
- Rismayani. (2023). *Hubungan Daya Ikat Konstitusi dalam Negara Hukum*. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/eu2a6>
- Rohmah, E. I. (2023). DINAMIKA OVERLAPPING KEWENANGAN DPR DAN PRESIDEN DALAM PEMBENTUKAN KEBIJAKAN NEGARA. *Jurnal Magister Ilmu Hukum*, 13(1), 48-68. <https://doi.org/10.56943/dekrit.v13n1.137>
- Salsabila, F., Daviza, T. P., Istiqomah, K., Ibadillah, Z., Ikhsan, M., Iryani, E., & Asafri, H. (2025). Membangun Kecakapan Literasi Digital Di Era Disinformasi: Telaah Teoritis dan Implikasinya Pada Perguruan Tinggi. *PESHUM: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 4(5), 7116-7135. <https://doi.org/10.56799/peshum.v4i5.10074>
- Saragih, G. M. (2024). Mahkamah Konstitusi Sebagai The Guardian of Ideology Perspektif Hukum Positif Indonesia. *PUSKAPSI Law Review*, 4(2), 70-88. <https://doi.org/10.19184/plr.v4i2.4375>
- SARI, N. L. A. (2023). PENERAPAN PASAL 28 AYAT (1) UNDANG-

- UNDANG ITE DALAM PERSPEKTIF KEPUTUSAN BERSAMA MENTERI KOMUNIKASI DAN INFORMATIKA, JAKSA AGUNG REPUBLIK INDONESIA DAN KEPALA KEPOLISIAN NEGARA REPUBLIK INDONESIA. *GANEC SWARA*, 17(1), 124. <https://doi.org/10.35327/gara.v17i1.378>
- Sihombing, L. A., Darmawan, I., & Prayuti, Y. (2024). Social Media, Fake News, Information Manipulation and Democracy and The Challenges of Finding Legal Truth in The Post-Truth Era. *Pena Justisia: Media Komunikasi Dan Kajian Hukum*, 23(2), 1263. <https://doi.org/10.31941/pj.v23i2.4797>
- Sofwan, S. (2022). Urgensi Partisipasi Publik Dalam Pembentukan Peraturan Daerah. *JATISWARA*, 37(1), 118-126. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jtsw.v37i1.364>
- Syahdan, M. S. (2024). Pengaruh Politik Identitas dalam Kestabilan Ketatanegaraan di Indonesia. *Siyasah Jurnal Hukum Tatanegara*, 4(2), 180-193. <https://doi.org/10.32332/0tjv3a81>
- Vonnie K, A., & Romadhon, A. H. (2025). Perlindungan Hukum dan Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Terhadap Demonstran Sebagai Korban Kekerasan Oleh Aparat. *Journal of International Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(1), 128-135. <https://doi.org/10.62504/jimr1168>
- Walangarei, A. S., & Sitorus, F. K. (2023). Post-Truth, Democracy, and the Need for Critical Media Literacy. *JKOMDIS : Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi Dan Media Sosial*, 3(3), 802-805. <https://doi.org/10.47233/jkomdis.v3i3.1362>