



Communicative Action and Post-Public Sphere Phenomenon

Nur Azizah

Celebes Philosophy Club (CPC)

nurazizahfirman1@gmail.com

Abstract

Post public sphere is a conceptual term which derived from the author to describe the emergence of new public spaces called virtual or digital public spaces. The virtual public space appears together with advances of information technology, which not only transforms the communication space of society, but also disrupts communication patterns that take place in the real world into the virtual world. This is a digital era which marked by disruption in various fields of life, in social, cultural, and economic and political life. One of the symptoms that arise is the disruption of public space from the real world to the virtual or digital space. Virtual space becomes a medium where each individual communicates without being limited by space and time. The post-public sphere refers to the phenomenon of change (disruption) in the public space that has led demos to enter a new communication arena that is different and does not even relate to the old public space. The new communication arena operates in a virtual (digital) world that is radiated by social media such as Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, including the massive media currently being is the YouTube media. Thus, the presence of various kinds of social media also provides preference for communication spaces for individual citizens to access and disseminate information independently. In the sense of an individualized information on each subject of citizenship.

Keywords: *Public Sphere; Cyber Space; Post-Public Sphere.*

INTRODUCTION

A dialectical philosopher like Hegel believes that history is always moving towards a certain development, because history has ratio and logic, and leads to certain movements. Today, inevitably, every individual must direct all perspectives and thoughts on the phenomenon of advances in information or digital technology. The failure to understand the logic and the trend in the direction of history today is similar to plunging oneself into the pit of death. A digital era marked by disruption in various fields of life, both in social, cultural, and economic and political life. One of the symptoms that arise is the disruption of public space from the real world to the virtual or digital space. Virtual space becomes a medium where each individual communicates without being limited by space and time. This is what the author means by the *post-public sphere* phenomenon as the writer proclaimed above..

The post-public sphere refers to the phenomenon of change (*disruption*) in the public space that has led demos to enter a new communication arena that is different and does not even relate to the old public space. The new communication arena operates in a virtual (digital) world that is radiated by social media such as Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, including the current massive media the YouTube. The presence of various kinds of social media encourages the birth of a new public space that makes information access and information dissemination more individualized, in the sense that it is more open and belongs to all individuals.

However, on the other hand, the emergence of virtual space as a new public space also gives birth to several paradoxes. Such as the emergence of netizens as well as citizens who transcend the boundaries of the national state, making it easier for individuals to communicate virtually but at the same time alienating humans from communicating with each other directly. In addition, it also makes it easier for individuals to access various kinds of information but at the same time these individuals are also confused in choosing information that suits their condition, even many of them are consumers of fake news (*hoax*) as well as spreaders and makers of fake news. Therefore, this study focuses on Habermas' basic concept of public space which is then compared with the emergence of virtual / digital public spaces as new public spaces that mediate communication, debate, and critical dialogues between individuals regarding a particular discourse, both political and social, culture, as well as dialogue about a country's economic policies. Without being limited by space and time, namely beyond nationality, in this case the communication in the virtual space takes place independently, freely, and globally.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNICATIVE ACTION

Before discussing the Habermas concept of public space and the *post-public sphere* phenomenon, it is better to first explain Habermas's concept of communicative action. Habermas started his intellectual project on the concept of communicative action by criticizing the problem of rationality, more precisely what is called the instrumental ratio.

For Habermas, rationality does not only belong to certain knowledge, but rather to how subjects speak and act to acquire and use knowledge. The theory of communicative action reconstructs rationality by using language as the foundation, which is called the "performative attitude" of language. Language is one medium for coordinating action. Coordination through the speakers of the language demanded to adopt the attitude of a praxis oriented towards achieving a common understanding or consensus which is the inherent purpose of a utterance(*speech*).When speakers of each other use this kind of praxis, they are doing what is

called *communicative action*. Thus, here Habermas reconstructs the concept of practical ratio into the concept of communicative ratio (Harnowo, 2020: 57).

Habermas believes that actions between humans in a society do not happen arbitrarily, but are rational in nature. The rational nature of this action in Habermas's view is instructive. It assumes that participants in communication orient themselves towards achieving understanding for each other. Comprehension means understanding a language expression. Understanding can also be interpreted as agreement or consensus. The communicative ratio guides communicative actions to reach mutual agreement in the form of consensus about something. This consensus does not just happen. The main prerequisites for consensus are mutual understanding and perspective borrowing. One party must try to understand the other's problems or try to play the role of the other in order to know the problems facing the other person..

According to Habermas, "when saying something in the context of everyday life, the speaker refers not only to something in the objective world (as a whole or perhaps a case), but also to something in the social world (as a whole of legitimate interpersonal relationships) and to something owned in the speaker's world (as a whole experience which can be manifested and have access to privileges).

Speech, is said to be speech in a large community of native language users. Each speaker is situated and all speech in the beginning weaves the three worlds; every utterance is meant to be understood, to be communicated — attributing the act of speaking to situations in such a way as to invite uniquely grounded understanding to one of the three worlds.

According to Habermas in Tobing, the three worlds provide or renew interpersonal relationships in cases where the speaker makes a reference that refers to something in the social world from a legitimate social order. Not only that, the three worlds provide a process of self-representation in cases where the speaker makes reference to something in the subjective world, where he has access to privileges. In other words, according to Habermas, the occurrence of an agreement in daily communication practices lies simultaneously in intersubjectivity that shares proportional knowledge on normative conformity and mutual trust (Tobing, 2017: 7).

Habermas distinguishes between communicative action with strategic and instrumental action and tries to show that the second thing (strategic and instrumental action) is inherent and dependent (like parasites) on communicative action: *First*, an action plays a role when an individual agent does something as a means of bringing about the end which are desired; Strategic action is a type of instrumental action that involves getting other people to do things as a means of realizing one's own goals. The important point is that they are different from communicative actions. Instrumental action is the practical result of instrumental reasoning, the calculation of the best means for a given ending. Habermas argues that two criteria for action of play a role: that the end of the action is *antecedently* and independent where its means of

realization, and it is manifested by causal intervention in the objective world. Communicative action does not meet these criteria, for its inherent purpose - recognition and acceptance of validity claims - cannot be determined independently of its means of realization, speech, and is not something that can be given causally.

Second, communicative action itself, according to Habermas, requires language as a medium to reach understanding as long as participants through that language relate to the world reciprocally will create validity claims that can be accepted or contested with one another. Furthermore, he said that the communicative action model does not equate action with communication. Language is a communication medium that provides understanding where actors come with an understanding from one another to then coordinate actions to pursue their specific goals (Tobing, 2017:10-11).

The concept of communicative action leads to relationships with at least two subjects who are able to speak and act which form interpersonal relationships (both in verbal and extra-verbal terms). Actors try to reach an understanding of their action situation and plan of action so that they can align their actions in an agreed manner. The basic concept of interpretation relates to the first example of negotiating a definition of a situation agreed by consensus. As we will see, language is a prominent part of this model (Nuris, 2016: 55). The communicative action model takes language as a communication medium that is not limited by speakers and listeners, outside the context of their pre-understanding of their worldly life, leading simultaneously to something in the objective world, the social world and the subjective world in order to negotiate a definition of the situation in general. This translates the concept of language behind many attempts to develop a formal pragmatic.

In this context, according to Nuris, Habermas tried to introduce the concept of communication action while explaining: (a) the character of independent action and (b) the relationship between the world of actors in the process of understanding. He begins by trying to characterize the degree of complexity of speech that simultaneously states the content of the proposition, the offer of interpersonal relations, and the goals of the speaker while still resting his investigations on the philosophy of Wittgenstein's language and explaining them with the meaning of the concept of desire based on the rules of consciousness at a time when linguistic conventions are based on a rule follower perspective (Nuris, 2016: 56).

In this case of communication action, a finalized interpretation of the collaborative interpretation process must be based on the description of the mechanism in coordinating the action; the act of communication is not exhausted by the act of reaching understanding in a translation style. If we take our unit of analysis a simple speech-act performed by S, at least one participant in the interaction can take "Yes" or "No", we can explain the state of coordination of

the communication act by initiating what it means for a listener to understand what has been said. However the act of communication signifies the type of interaction that has been coordinated through speech acts and is not similar to them.

To avoid communication distortions, according to Habermas, the public must immediately develop an ethical discourse, which is a normative justification for achieving a conformity of interests between members (generalizable interest). By the communicative action with its best arguments can be understood by "rational beliefs"

In order to achieve these "rational beliefs", Habermas then formulated the communicative requirements as summarized in *the ideal speech situation* (situation ideal conversation), namely:

1. All participants have the same opportunity to start a discussion and in that discussion have the same opportunity to put forward the arguments and criticize the arguments of other participants;
2. Among the participants there was no power difference which would have avoided that possibly relevant arguments were actually being put forward as well; and finally:
3. All participants expressed their thoughts sincerely, so that it was impossible for one to manipulate the other without realizing it (Nuris, 2016: 65).

Habermas' theory of communicative action rests on the idea that social order ultimately depends on the capacity of actors to recognize the validity or inter subjective validity of the various claims on which social cooperation is based. Thus, cooperation through communicative action is obtained by claiming validity which can be justified through communication, including by means of criticism. The theory of communicative action relies on justification, namely the theory of argument or discourse. Therefore, discourse by Habermas is called a "reflective form" of communicative action.

B. THE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC SPHERE

The concept of public space is a concept introduced by Habermas. According to him, the public sphere is a discourse that allows debates and opinions to take place in conditions of equality. Habermas as quoted by Tobing illustrates that this space includes real infrastructure and norms that support and allow political criticism to be discussed. Where the guide is rational argumentation and critical discussion, which makes the strength of the argument more important than the identity of the speaker (Tobing, 2017: 25).

Public space is all areas of life that allow us to shape public opinion. According to him, this area must be free from domination and censorship. Basically, all citizens can enter such a space because each individual is basically a private citizen who, because of the nature of their

conversation involving the public interest, then they enter the public domain. Such a situation requires guarantees to assemble freely and express opinions freely as well.

According to Budi Hardiman in Ibrahim, the public sphere is characterized by the state of access by all people and confuses the inclusive character. Habermas understands the public sphere as a network for communicating themes and attitudes. Public space is everywhere because it is plural. Habermas connects his concept of public space with the concept of citizen society. According to him, citizen society is formed when citizens are free to reach an agreement to achieve their socio-political goals and form an autonomous association, independent of bureaucratic and market interests. Private actors in society jointly build discursive space. These actors take part in the reproduction of the public space. Private humans involve themselves in the process of critical rational debate and then give birth to a universality which becomes the basis of majority thought and opinion afterwards. In this case, communicative action to achieve understanding naturally presupposes an agreement that is driven by rational motivation among participants and can be measured based on claims of validity that can be criticized (Ibrahim, 2010: 2).

In Habermas's view, as quoted by Tobing, the public sphere is formed along with the emergence of money-capitalism and *early finance and trade capitalism*, where merchants need an exchange of information and published news. The term 'public' is actually narrowly synonymous with 'anything to do with the state'. In line with its development, the private persons under it as the target of the public authority's fire, it is they who actually shape the public. Habermas stated that the public sphere was formed in bourgeois groups in the arenas of meeting between them, such as the clubs or salons at that time. In the public sphere, where deliberation in the exchange of arguments is very important, what he calls public opinion is formed (Tobing, 2017).

Furthermore, according to Habermas, in the liberal model of public space, the mass media plays an important role in informing and guiding public opinion, especially since society simultaneously begins to eliminate gender / class / race boundaries but instead makes direct communication between constituents become difficult. But on the other hand, the commercialization of the mass media makes the public space an area of rhetoric and the missions of public relations and advertising are prioritized. Commercial interests, economic capitalization, and mainstream media contain compromised public spaces and colonized public discourse, with television as the front line. Deliberation of public relations in the public sphere becomes delayed when the public wants to express their approval and disapproval because the media often frames political issues that are indeed priorities, rather than encouraging rational

deliberation. Research has shown that this results in misinformation on important political issues, which in turn raises skepticism from the public.

The public space according to Habermas presupposes an inclusive and pluralist arena for everyone to be able to participate in that arena. Rationality becomes a measure of the implications of the presence of a public space in society which then creates a critical and independent society from the state. Conceptually, the public space is formed and actualized in the space of civil society (*civil society*).

The same thing was also expressed by Budi Hardiman in Supriadi, the concept of public space presupposes interests that are related to common affairs or common interests. The concept of public space is etymologically in German; *Offentlichkeit* which means "a condition that allows it to be accessed by all people" and the condition of the space refers to the open and inclusive characteristics (Supriadi, 2017: 16).

The explanation from Habermas in Raharjo Jati regarding the preconditions for the formation of this public space can be explained as follows:

1. How strong is the market power that is the foundation for the establishment of the public space. This is related to the values of individual liberalism that are carried in bourgeois society. The public sphere itself grew out of the transition process from liberal capitalism to organized capitalism, at which time the need for public space increased for the public in the dynamics of life which was mechanical and mercantilist. That is why democracy was chosen as a way to ensure that expressions of freedom and individuals receive legal protection;
2. How independent the public space is free from political intervention by the state and the market. This is important considering the transition from government to governance itself requires a degree of independence between state, market and civil society actors. The position of this public space is interesting because it is *in-between* the three actors which allows each of these actors to advocate and negotiate with each other (Jati, 2016: 27).

According to Raharjo Jati, quoting McCharty, rationalization is an important benchmark in constructing public sphere institutions in the context of democratic politics, which are not solely occupied by several private interests on behalf of the public interest. On that basis, rationalization in the public sphere is at stake between the *willie* (the will of general rationality) and the *will* (the aggregation of special interests) (Jati, 2016: 28). Two things, according to Subijanto in Raharjo Jati, are critical points in understanding the public space. Although the public space is considered an inclusive, egalitarian space, and is considered an important foundation in democracy, there is a segregation (*sectionalism*) as well as possible (*conditions of possibility*) to create a public space in society (Jati, 2016).

The development of the public space shows a community process towards collective communication skills. Habermas (1989) in Supriadi divides public space into two types; (1) political public space, and (2) literary public space. Political public space not only shows the openness of accessible space, but also shows how the social structure of society is changing. The social classes formed from the feudal system were gradually untenable. Meanwhile in the literary public sphere, the awareness of public literacy began to increase in line with the emergence of publications, public discussions about art, aesthetics, and literature spread throughout Europe (Supriadi, 2017: 6).

The public sphere as referred to above, in which critical discourses both concentrate on politics and literature come from various groups and groups, including from civil society associations such as Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Community Organizations and the students movement. Coffee shops, for example, can become public spaces that not only function as critical discussion spaces, but also function as “spaces of resistance” from spaces that are inaccessible to the general public such as the state palace, parliament building, and the aristocratic art theater..

Therefore, a public space is said to be ideal if it is able to accommodate various kinds of groups and the various complexities of interests that exist in a society. In addition, the ideal public space presupposes a critical dialogue based on equality, inclusiveness and freedom without any pressure from state agents or capitalist market actors.

C. POST PUBLIC SPHERE PHENOMENON

Post public sphere is a conceptual term derived from the author to describe the emergence of new public spaces called virtual or digital public spaces. The virtual public space appears together with advances in information technology, which not only transforms the communication space of society, but also disrupts communication patterns that take place in the real world into the virtual world. Not only that, the presence of social media such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, WhatsApp, and so on also provides preference for communication spaces for individual citizens to access and disseminate information independently. In the sense of an individualized information on each subject of citizenship.

Post public sphere in our view, may be in line with and in tune with what Jones was talking about in Rulli Nasrullah as a *new public space* (Nashrullah, 2012: 38). According to Nasrullah, digitally the characteristics of *public space*, by calling it *virtual space* or *cyber space*, can be interpreted as something general or personal, intercultural or cross-linguistic, to a controlled or free public. It is like a square, where we can find various characteristics including maintaining the background of the entities that are there. Even though anyone can be in the

plaza, that doesn't mean that we automatically become part of the space; we can find entities that are grouped in one corner of the square, but we cannot just enter into their group (Nashrullah, 2012).

Regarding the emergence of the internet as a new public space for the Indonesian middle class, this can actually be seen from the intensity of the use of social media as the main tool for new media in Indonesia. The main social media *trends* among the Indonesian middle class, such as WhatsApp (WA), Facebook, and Twitter, are accessed via devices of smartphone. The majority of the middle class as active or passive netizens in *cyberspace* access social media via smartphones reaching 85 percent compared to access via laptops reaching 32 percent. The percentage intensity of the frequency of use of social media is such as Facebook (14 percent), WhatsApp (12 percent), and Twitter (11 percent) so that then placing Indonesia as '*the social media capital of the world*' (Jati, 2016: 29).

The wide selection of social media features accessed by the Indonesian middle class shows us the phenomenon *over-connected*. This phenomenon shows that there is a high intensity for the Indonesian middle class to communicate and interact with each other online based on common themes, issues and interests. The existence of contact via social media which networks each other produces a networked society (*network society*). The purpose of the networked community is the formation of virtual public spaces and virtual citizenship ties based on common discourse interests and themes. The development of information technology that is increasingly advancing in the era of globalization means that currently placing public communication channels, as well as policy advocacy agents, is no longer in the domestic sphere, but also extends to the international realm (Jati, 2016: 29).

An example of a case in Indonesia is one manifestation of the emergence of public space in new media. The media paradox is shown by the attitude of cynicism which is manifested in the form of parodies appearing on social media and becoming a form of new meaning in communication. The tendency of social media users to use new media as a tool to parody an issue / news has been felt since the 2014 presidential election campaign. The movement of messages sent through social media at that time had begun to show paradoxical symptoms among supporters of the Presidential candidate. For example, after the Public Debate is broadcast on television, social media will circulate heated issues in the forum in the form of parodies. The polemic that occurs in the public sphere shows that paradoxical dynamics in Indonesia are part of the news and issues developed by the mass media. Paradoxal through social media can be said to be an imitation of life in cyberspace, the world of mass media which is distant from the real world. The dissociation of communication that occurs between social media users can also be sharp due to this. The humor that is disseminated is considered not funny to parties with opposing attitudes (Tobing, 2017: 26).

The flood of hashtags (#) is a form of public participation in a topic that was originally the main topic of the mainstream media. The more hashtags that are commented on, the more likely it is that the topic will be of interest. The responses shown include positive and negative forms, in various comments, pictures, audio-visuals that are pros and cons. Regardless of what the media reports on the topic at first, the reactions that emerge are always unexpected. The online digital world is a private medium. It can penetrate areas that can only be entered by the user himself. But at the same time, in a political issue, online media is like a coinage that brings privacy and publicity at the same time. It is the virtual public space that is most in demand today. Users without the need to display their social status can get together and share their opinions. Media is not only an infrastructure, but more than that it is a means of elaborating thoughts from their respective perspectives.

Social media users are 'powerful' agents because they do not always agree with the content of conventional mass media or the parties in dispute, for example. Users can choose their own political issues according to their interests. An issue that becomes a trending topic can last for a long time, even when the issue itself is no longer a priority for conventional media. When conventional media are no longer able to become a channel for the public to convey their opinions to decision makers, virtual media is the only one capable of accommodating these anxieties.

This, according to Papacharissi, in Tobing, proves that digital technology allows for an open area, which is accessible both publicly and privately, rather than just conventional public spaces. This area accommodates various forms of publicity and privacy, and combines personal interests and public interests together. Public and private spheres are no longer contradicting areas, but have been represented due to technological convergence. But unfortunately the participation aimed at netizens during the period February - March 2015 was very high in quantity, but low in quality. Two hashtags that were the main topics in that period were #SaveHajiLulung and #KoinUntukAustralia (Tobing, 2017: 27). This includes the hashtag #gantiPresiden2019.

Some of these things that are seen in the conversation of the Indonesian middle class through social media are the formation of virtual networks based on friendship ties which then develop into other forms of ties such as ideological ties, bonds of interest in a particular discourse, or interest in other issues, even though previously they were do not know each other. Thus, this also has implications for the process of redefining or redefining the context of citizenship in the public sphere. In the context of Habermas' classical theory, the public sphere is formed based on citizenship based on the place of birth (*ius soli*) and blood relations (*ius sanguinis*). However, the existence of *cyberspace* (virtual space) as a new public space then has

an impact on the *deteroterialisation of citizenship* which in turn gives rise to internet citizenship relations (*netizenship*) or commonly known as netizen

Apart from eliminating the existence of *ius soli* and *ius sanguinis*, an important question in *netizenship* this is the context of *sense of belonging* and also the context of the *token of membership* being carried out. The logic of the public space saves the existence of a context *nation* as a single vessel for the formation of this public space. Various terms have emerged, such as *Twitterland* and *Facebookland*, to negate the meaning and existence of the *nation*, but what kind of identity the cyber space displays. So to answer this question, the most important thing is to focus on the comparison of parameters between Habermas' old conception of public space and public space as *cyberspace* (Jati, 2016)

The following is a simple distinction between public space and *Cyberspace* according to Raharjo Jati:

No	Parameters Public Space Habermas Public	Public Space	Cyberspace
1	Supporting actor for public space	Bourgeoisie Class dan <i>Civil Society</i>	Netizen
2	Citizenship	Based on <i>Ius Soli</i> dan <i>Ius Sanguinis</i>	Beased on common interest and issue
3	Public Space Form	Public facilities e.g cafe, restaurant, campus, radio, printed media, TV, etc	Social Media
4	Public Space Function	Communication and advocacy	<i>Leisure and pleasure</i>
5	Public Space Scope	In a country	Globally

Through the simple distinction above, it is clear that what is called *cyber space* (virtual public space) is not the same as the *public sphere* as intended by Habermas. This is because the internet can be said to be only a medium that can be used for political discussion or debate, the exchange of ideas and ideas, to develop discourse in response to political realities. However, this function is the same as using the internet as a mere virtual means; The internet can be a medium attached to the reality of any society, depending on the users accessing it. So it is necessary to emphasize that "A *virtual space enhances discussion; a virtual sphere enhances democracy*".

The virtual public context can be seen from how internet users make use of facilities such as social media networking sites, *Facebook* or *Twitter*. the existence of a *wall* as a place for users to convey ideas, publish their opinions, or inform a political reality is not necessarily said to be an attempt by the user in a critical debate as is the case in a public space. It is merely a

reflection of the user on a reality; Even though on the wall there is a column where can comment or *retweet* other users, the interactions that occur are normal responses as when users interact in face-to-face communication.

The existence of the internet has expanded and fragmented the context of communication. Although in certain cases it has an influence on intellectual life, on the other hand, the existence of the internet builds non-formal communication, a communication channel that is horizontally connected between entities, and even becomes an alternative in obtaining information other than traditional media. The problem is that the information that passes through the network sometimes becomes information that is less focused, without editing, and in certain circumstances we cannot distinguish which information is genuine and which is fake. Also the existence of intellectuals in the virtual public space is marginalized.

The paradox of new media includes five things that are stated by Papacharissi: the emergence of networked culture and identity, the emergence of new narcissistic forms, the rebirth of satire and subversion, the collaboration and the agnostic plurality offered by digital media. These five things should happen simultaneously to social media users in response to hot issues circulating. Culture and identity with networking allows an issue to snowball that gets bigger in its journey. Social media users can easily share and add more reactions to an issue that is raised (Tobing, 2017:29).

The existence of *cyber space* as a virtual public space raises several paradoxes which are then called the phenomenon, *post public sphere* as follows:

1. Public debate not only runs critically but also experiences degradation or silting because it is not supported by the deep knowledge of the netizens involved;
2. The dissemination of information is not only evenly distributed to every individual citizen but also causes massive spread of fake news (*hoaxes*) which can trigger public strife;
3. Communication does not only run across national countries, but communication takes place globally beyond nationalities.
4. The existence of individuals is not only bound by citizenship ties but also creates virtual citizenship which is networked globally via the internet or virtual space.

CONCLUSION

Internet networks and advances in information technology are the main factors in the emergence of *post public sphere* phenomenon. The term is operationally used to describe the symptoms of the emergence of a new public space called a virtual or digital public space. The advancement of information technology, not only transforms the communication space of society, but also disrupts communication patterns that take place in the real world into the virtual world. Not only that, the presence of social media such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, WhatsApp, and so on also provides preference for communication spaces for individual citizens to access and disseminate information independently. In the sense of an individualized information on every citizen's subjects without having to rely on conventional media such as newspapers, radio, television, and so on..

The *post-public sphere* phenomenon also gives birth to several paradoxes such as: Debate and dialogue in the virtual world not only run massively, freely and critically, but also experience degradation or silting because it is not supported by in-depth knowledge of the subjects of the netizens involved; An issue that is no less important is that the information that passes through the virtual space often becomes information that is less focused, without editing, and in certain circumstances, individual citizens have difficulty distinguishing which information is based on facts and which is based on lies (*hoaxes*). In this case, the dissemination of information in the virtual space is not only evenly distributed to every individual citizen but also creates a massive spread of *hoaxes* that can trigger public violence; Communication does not only run across national countries, but communication takes place globally beyond nationalities. Because the existence of individuals is not only bound by citizenship ties but also creates virtual citizenships that network globally and establish relationships via the internet or virtual space based on a common interest in certain discourses regarding politics as well as culture and economy.

REFERENCES

- Harnowo, T. (2020) 'Penerapan Teori Diskursus Habermas Sebagai Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa', *Mimbar Hukum - Fakultas Hukum Universitas Gadjah Mada*, 32(1), p. 55. doi: 10.22146/jmh.45145.
- Jati, W. R. (2016) 'Cyberspace, Internet, Dan Ruang Publik Baru: Aktivisme Online Politik Kelas Menengah Indonesia', *Jurnal Pemikiran Sosiologi*, 3(1), p. 25. doi: 10.22146/jps.v3i1.23524.
- Nashrullah, R. (2012) 'Internet dan Ruang Publik Virtual, Sebuah Refleksi atas Teori Ruang Publik Habermas', *Jurnal Komunikator*, 4, pp. 33–45. Available at: <http://journal.umy.ac.id/index.php/jkm/article/view/188>.
- Nuris, A. (2016) 'Tindakan Komunikatif : Sekilas tentang Pemikiran Jürgen Habermas', *al-Balagh : Jurnal Dakwah dan Komunikasi*, 1(1), p. 39. doi: 10.22515/balagh.v1i1.45.
- Ibrahim. (2010) ' Agama, Negara, dan Ruang Publik Menurut Habermas: Catatan Penting untuk Pluralisme Agama di Indonesia ', *Jurnal Badati II* (3), pp. 1–10.
- Supriadi, Y. (2017) 'Relasi Ruang Publik Dan Pers Menurut Habermas', *Jurnal Kajian Jurnalisme*, 1(1), pp. 1–20. doi: 10.24198/kj.v1i1.12228.
- Tobing, M. M. (2017) 'Jurgen Habermas dan Ruang Publik di IndonesiaJurgen Habermas dan Ruang Publik di Indonesia"', *Jurnal FISIP Universitas Kristen Indonesia*, pp. 1–32. Available at: <http://repository.uki.ac.id/>.