

EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE AND DIGITAL DISINFORMATION: ADDRESSING KNOWLEDGE INEQUITIES IN THE DIGITAL AGE

SUGENG

Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya
Email: sugeng@dsn.ubharajaya.ac.id

ANNISA FITRIA

Universitas Esa Unggul

SELAM BASTOMI

Universitas Pelita Harapan

Abstract: This research scrutinizes the repercussions of digital disinformation on knowledge disparities and delves into strategies aimed at fostering epistemic justice. The examination of the findings will involve a comprehensive exploration of various ethical frameworks and theories. This analytical approach seeks to identify the underlying ethical issues that may be inherent in the results. Ethical frameworks provide a structured lens through which we can evaluate the implications of the findings on different stakeholders, ensuring a thorough understanding of potential ethical dilemmas. For this purpose, the research integrates philosophical, social, and technological perspectives. Firstly, through philosophical perspective this research explores the concept of epistemic justice and its conditions in the digital era. Secondly, this research will investigate the role of digital disinformation in creating knowledge inequities, especially the disparities in knowledge access and distribution. By understanding the mechanisms through which false or misleading information spreads in digital spaces, the research seeks to identify strategies and interventions that can eliminate the roots of epistemic injustice and foster a more just and enlightened knowledge landscape for everyone, regardless of their backgrounds.

Keywords: epistemic justice, digital disinformation, knowledge inequities

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan mengkaji dampak disinformasi digital terhadap disparitas pengetahuan dan memeriksa strategi yang diterapkan untuk memajukan keadilan epistemik. Pemeriksaan temuan akan melibatkan eksplorasi komprehensif terhadap berbagai kerangka teori dan etika. Lewat pendekatan analitis akan diidentifikasi dan diperiksa isu-isu etis yang mungkin melekat dalam hasil penelitian. Kerangka etika menyediakan lensa terstruktur melalui mana kita dapat mengevaluasi implikasi temuan terhadap pemangku kepentingan yang berbeda, memastikan pemahaman menyeluruh terhadap potensi dilema etis. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan lintas disiplin dengan mengintegrasikan perspektif filosofis, sosial, dan teknologis. *Pertama-tama*, lewat perspektif filosofis akan diperiksa konsep keadilan epistemik dan implikasinya dalam era digital. *Kedua*, penelitian ini akan menyelidiki peran disinformasi digital dalam menciptakan ketidaksetaraan pengetahuan, khususnya bagaimana disinformasi digital berkontribusi pada disparitas dalam akses dan distribusi pengetahuan. Dengan memahami mekanisme melalui mana informasi palsu atau menyesatkan menyebar di ruang digital, penelitian ini berusaha mengidentifikasi pelbagai strategi dan intervensi yang dapat mengeliminasi akar ketidakadilan epistemik dan memajukan lanskap pengetahuan yang lebih adil dan mencerahkan bagi semua orang.

Kata-kata Kunci: keadilan epistemik, disinformasi digital, ketidakadilan pengetahuan

INTRODUCTION

Epistemic justice is a concept related to the fair or equitable distribution of knowledge within a community or society. This concept refers to efforts to ensure that access to knowledge and information is not influenced by unfair or discriminatory factors, so that all members of society have an equal opportunity to acquire and participate in the production, distribution, and consumption of knowledge¹. The concept of epistemic justice also emphasizes the importance of addressing knowledge inequal-

1 Miranda Fricker, *Epistemic Injustice: Power & Ethics of Knowing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 30.

ities that may arise in society due to various factors such as social status, economic status, ethnicity, gender, religion, and access to information technology. When knowledge inequalities emerge, they can lead to disparities in opportunities and the ability of the community to fully participate in social, educational, economic, and political life².

When access to knowledge is unequal, it can lead to disparities in the quality of education received by various societal groups. Communities that are less knowledgeable or have limited access to quality education tend to have more limited opportunities to achieve success and personal development. Unequal access to knowledge and education can result in significant disparities in the quality of education received by different societal groups. These inequalities can impact both individual and societal aspects of life; for example, communities with limited access to quality education may struggle to attain the same educational opportunities as more fortunate communities. As a result, they may become trapped in a cycle of poverty with fewer opportunities to realize their full potential.

The inability to access quality education can impact the quality of life of a community. Individuals with lower levels of education may encounter difficulties in finding suitable employment with higher income potential, thus affecting their economic and social well-being³. Unequal access to education can lead to the perpetuation of intergenerational inequalities. When one generation is unable to receive adequate education, it can have an impact on the subsequent generation, and the cycle of poverty and inequality will continue. This can hinder progress in various fields, including science, technology, arts, and culture. Communities with lower levels of education may tend to have low participation in development processes and decision-making. This can result in disempowerment and a lack of voice in important issues that affect their lives.

2 Ina Kerner, "The Epistemology of Resistance: Gender and Racial Oppression, Epistemic Injustice, and Resistant Imagination. By José Medina" [Book Review]. *Constellations* vol. 21, no. 3 (2014), pp. 436-438.

3 Paulo Freire, *Pendidikan Kaum Tertindas*, trans. F. Danuwinata (Jakarta: LP3ES, 2008), p. 27.

Knowledge inequality can also have an impact on economic disparities. Communities with greater access to economic information and knowledge tend to have greater opportunities to create and capitalize on business opportunities, while those with less knowledge about economic aspects may be marginalized from such opportunities. Communities with less knowledge about economic aspects may be less capable of identifying business opportunities around them. As a result, they may miss out on opportunities to create profitable ventures and contribute to their own economic growth and that of their community⁴.

Individuals with limited knowledge about investments and financial market mechanisms may be reluctant to invest in assets or stocks that have the potential to yield high returns. This can reduce their opportunities to accumulate wealth and long-term financial security. Lack of knowledge about financial institutions or modern financial services can make it difficult for communities to access financial services such as savings, credit, or insurance. These limitations can hinder economic mobility and reduce financial resilience. Communities with limited knowledge about the job market or industry trends may tend to accept unproductive or low-paying jobs. If some communities have greater access to economic knowledge and can utilize it more effectively, it can lead to uneven economic growth⁵. These disparities can deepen economic inequalities among societal groups. To address economic disparities caused by knowledge inequalities, it is important to improve access and the quality of education, including education on economic and financial concepts. Inclusive and effective economic education can provide a stronger knowledge foundation for communities to make wiser economic decisions, create better economic opportunities, and manage their businesses and personal finances more effectively.

4 Abhijit V. Banerjee and Esther Duflo, *Good Economics for Hard Times* (New York: Public Affairs, 2019), p. 25.

5 K. Kenski. and N.J. Stroud, "Connections Between Internet Use and Political Efficacy, Knowledge, and Participation," *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* vol. 50, no. 2 (2006), pp. 173-192.

Unequal access to political information and important issues within society can lead to some segments of the population being unable to effectively participate in the political process. This can reduce their ability to voice their opinions and actively engage in political decision-making. If some members of the population do not have access to the political information necessary to make informed decisions, they may not be able to vote based on a deep understanding of relevant political issues. This can result in injustice in the political decision-making process. Without adequate access to political information, some societal groups may be less aware of ongoing political events and policies that can affect their lives. Consequently, they may not be able to actively participate in the political process. Imbalances in access to political information can make some societal groups feel uninvolved or unrepresented in the political process. As a result, they may be reluctant to actively participate in general elections or other political activities⁶.

The digital era has brought significant changes in how people seek, access, and share information, but in the process, epistemic injustice can either increase or decrease, depending on the context and accessibility⁷. With the internet, one can easily search for information on various topics with just a few clicks. Access to sources of knowledge in the digital era has opened up opportunities for distance education and online learning, which can enhance knowledge access for many people from diverse backgrounds. Additionally, the potential for distance education and online learning has increased knowledge access for many people from various backgrounds⁸.

However, epistemic injustice can arise if technology access or infrastructure is limited, resulting in certain societal groups missing out on opportunities to obtain quality education. Epistemic injustice can arise

6 P. Dahlgren, "The Internet, Public Spheres, and Political Communication: Dispersion and Deliberation," *Political Communication* vol. 22, no. 2 (2005), pp. 147-162.

7 A. Anderson, "Epistemic Injustice and Internet Use," *Ethics and Information Technology* vol. 13, no. 4 (2011), pp. 313-325.

8 M. Warschauer, *Technology and Social Inclusion* (Massachusetts—London: The MIT Press, 2003), p. 11.

when there is limited access to technology or infrastructure. Some societal groups may face challenges in accessing technology or the internet due to economic, geographical, or social factors. Certain areas, particularly in rural regions or areas with underdeveloped technological infrastructure, may struggle to access the internet or digital devices such as computers or smartphones. This can diminish their ability to participate in online learning. Epistemic injustice can also occur due to differences in digital literacy levels and access to knowledge about how to use technology effectively. People who are less skilled in technology are likely to encounter difficulties in accessing and utilizing online information. To address epistemic injustice in distance education and online learning, it is important to bridge the technology and infrastructure access gap. Governments, educational institutions, and non-profit organizations can collaborate to provide internet access and technological devices to those in need.

An inclusive and digitally skilled education approach can also help address technological incapacities and digital knowledge disparities. In this way, distance education and online learning can become more inclusive and benefit a wider range of people. The experiences of developing countries such as India, Brazil, Kenya, Rwanda, Ghana, and Indonesia in addressing systemic injustices in the digital era vary significantly, depending on the level of technological development, infrastructure, regulations, and government commitment to addressing these challenges. India has taken significant steps to improve internet access nationwide, including in remote and rural areas. The “Digital India” program is one initiative aimed at connecting more people to the internet and expanding public services digitally. Brazil has implemented the “*One Laptop per Child*” program (Um Computador por Aluno), which aims to provide laptops to every student in public schools. This program helps increase technology access and digital education for children across the country⁹.

Developing countries often face technology and infrastructure disparities, especially in rural and remote areas. Limited access to the in-

9 E. Castro and L.F. Zuluaga, L. F., “Fostering Internet access and use: Digital inclusion programs in Colombia,” *The Information Society* vol. 35, no. 2 (2019), pp. 72-85.

ternet, digital devices, and electricity can be barriers for communities in these regions to access knowledge and information through digital media. Some communities in developing countries may encounter challenges in developing digital literacy and the technological skills needed to effectively use digital media. This can affect their ability to critically utilize information and actively participate in the digital world¹⁰. In the digital era, much of the content tends to be available in English or other international languages. For communities using less-represented local languages, access to relevant and quality information in their language may be limited. In developing countries, regulations and laws related to data privacy and security may still be weak or not fully enforced. This can lead to vulnerabilities to data breaches and personal information leaks. Certain groups of women in developing countries may face specific barriers in accessing knowledge and information digitally due to gender disparities in access and different social roles.

Several developed countries often make substantial investments in technology infrastructure, such as high-speed internet networks and wireless connectivity. This helps ensure that fast and stable internet access is available to most of the population, setting several strategic policies, including investments in technology infrastructure, digital literacy education, inclusivity in digital learning, data security, digital inclusion, and open access policies. These efforts aim to create an inclusive, equitable, and just environment for the utilization of technology and information in the digital era. While advanced countries have made progress in addressing epistemic injustices, challenges continue to evolve with changes in technology and society. Therefore, collaboration between the public and private sectors, community education, and technological innovation remains necessary to address these issues sustainably. Germany has made significant investments in technology infrastructure, particularly in developing high-speed internet networks nationwide. The country also has

10 J.P. Gatsinzi, S.A. Mugume, and J. Rutayisire, "Impact of One Laptop per Child Project on Learning Outcomes and Children Satisfaction in Rwanda," *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia* vol. 27, no. 3 (2018), pp. 365-383.

various digital literacy training programs to enhance the technological skills of its population.

The United States has several digital inclusivity initiatives and digital literacy programs managed by the federal government, state governments, and non-profit organizations. The country also promotes the use of technology in education and strives to expand internet access in rural and remote areas¹¹. Likewise, Sweden has become a leader in technology and internet utilization. The Swedish government has adopted open access policies and encourages the use of technology in the education sector and public services. Singapore has also taken progressive steps in digital education and technology literacy. The country has extensive digital inclusivity programs, including providing digital devices in schools and offering technology skills training to the community. Singapore has a strong innovation ecosystem and actively promotes research and technology development. This helps the country stay at the forefront of leveraging technology for the benefit of society and national development¹².

Epistemic injustice becomes one of the barriers to achieving sustainable development goals. Communities that lack access to knowledge and technology tend to be marginalized in efforts to achieve sustainable and inclusive development. Access to digital knowledge and technology is key to economic growth and innovation. Countries that successfully address epistemic injustice can create skilled and competitive societies in the global economy. In the digital era, education is the key to enhancing the quality of human resources. Addressing epistemic injustice enables equal access to education and enhances skills relevant to labor market demands. Epistemic injustice is one of the barriers to achieving sustainable development goals. Communities that lack access to knowledge and technology tend to be marginalized in efforts to achieve sustainable and inclusive development.

11 OECD, *Measuring the Digital Transformation: A Roadmap for the Future*, OECD Publishing (2019), Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264311992-en>.

12 C. S. Ho and K.E. Leong, K. E., "Singapore's Smart Nation Journey: Governing the Digital Society," *Government Information Quarterly* vol. 35, no. 4 (2018), pp. 558-569.

Access to technology and information has become a crucial factor in various aspects of life, including education, politics, and the economy. However, not all communities have the same opportunities to access this knowledge and technology. Epistemic injustice occurs when certain groups of people or regions have limited access to digital knowledge and technology. This access gap can be caused by factors such as underdeveloped technological infrastructure, economic limitations, limited digital skills, and unequal access to high-quality digital resources. Based on the previous description, this article aims to address the core issue: how can strategies and initiatives overcome knowledge gaps and help communities identify and combat misinformation in the digital era?

DISCUSSION

THE CONCEPT AND THEORY OF EPISTEMIC JUSTICE

Epistemic justice highlights the importance of equitable access to knowledge and information for all individuals and groups in society. Epistemic injustice can lead to inequality in opportunities to access education and knowledge resources, ultimately affecting economic opportunities, power, and influence in society. Efforts to address knowledge access disparities and ensure equality in participation in the knowledge formation process are crucial steps in achieving epistemic justice. This includes ensuring equal access to quality education, literacy, technology, and relevant information¹³. Moreover, epistemic justice also emphasizes the importance of combating disinformation and hoaxes, as well as promoting inclusivity in creating and sharing knowledge. By creating an inclusive and just environment in knowledge access and distribution, epistemic justice aims to empower communities, enhance active participation in social and political processes, and create a collectively empowered and intelligent society¹⁴. In the current digital era, epistemic justice becomes more relevant and pressing due to the significant impact of information

13 Anderson, E, "Epistemic Justice as a Virtue of Social Institutions", *Social Epistemology* vol. 26, no. 2, (2012), pp. 163-173.

14 Dotson, K, "Tracking Epistemic Violence, Tracking Practices of Silencing," *Hypatia* vol. 26, no. 2, (2011), pp. 236-257.

technology and social media in shaping public opinion and influencing community decisions. Therefore, seeking solutions to address epistemic injustice in the digital age is a crucial challenge for building a just and inclusive society.

Fricker explores the impact of power and social structures on inequalities in accessing knowledge and information in her book *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. She identifies two primary forms of epistemic justice, namely:

- 1) **Distributive Epistemic Justice:** This form emphasizes the fair distribution of knowledge. It means that every individual or societal group has an equal right to access, acquire, and participate in the knowledge formation process. Epistemic injustice occurs when there is a gap in knowledge access that results in certain communities or specific groups not having equal opportunities to obtain relevant information or knowledge;
- 2) **Retributive Epistemic Justice:** This form focuses on the social response to epistemic injustice. Fricker argues that when epistemic injustice occurs, society has a responsibility to respond in a fair and supportive manner to marginalized groups. This social response can take the form of listening to and acknowledging their perspectives, rectifying existing injustices, or providing compensation to groups that have experienced epistemic injustice¹⁵.

By delineating these forms of epistemic justice, Fricker emphasizes the significance of comprehending how power and social structures shape the dissemination of knowledge and responses to epistemic injustice. In this context, epistemic justice extends beyond mere physical access to knowledge; it encompasses the acknowledgment, appreciation, and inclusion of diverse perspectives and contributions from various societal groups. These theories delve into the intricate dynamics of epistemic justice, aiming to dissect and address the underlying factors that contrib-

15 M. Fricker, *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 41.

ute to disparities in knowledge recognition. Among them are standpoint theory, which underscores the importance of considering marginalized perspectives, and virtue epistemology, which explores the role of intellectual virtues in fostering fair and just knowledge practices. Additionally, social epistemology examines the communal aspects of knowledge production and distribution, shedding light on how collective factors impact epistemic justice¹⁶.

Standpoint theory emphasizes the significance of considering marginalized perspectives, highlighting how the experiences of historically marginalized groups contribute valuable insights to the construction of knowledge. Virtue epistemology explores the role of intellectual virtues in cultivating equitable and just knowledge practices, emphasizing traits such as open-mindedness, fairness, and intellectual courage. Social epistemology delves into the communal aspects of knowledge production and distribution, shedding light on the collective influences that shape our understanding of truth and information. These theoretical frameworks collectively deepen our understanding of the multifaceted nature of epistemic justice and offer valuable insights for addressing and rectifying disparities in the way knowledge is recognized and valued within society. Numerous theories have emerged to elucidate and understand the concept of epistemic justice:

- 1) Epistemic Justice as Equal Opportunity: This theory argues that epistemic justice is achieved when every individual has an equal opportunity to access, acquire, and contribute to knowledge and information. It involves addressing barriers and inequalities in access to education, literacy, and technology that can limit access to knowledge.
- 2) Epistemic Justice as Fair Information Distribution: This theory emphasizes the importance of distributing knowledge and information equitably to address social and economic disparities. It involves the fair distribution of informational and educational resources so that all members of society have equal access to knowledge.

16 M. Fricker, *Epistemic Injustice*, pp. 109-128.

- 3) **Epistemic Justice as Empowerment:** This theory focuses on how knowledge can be used as an instrument of empowerment to combat injustice and social disparities. It means enabling communities to access knowledge, identify issues, and take meaningful actions in achieving positive social change.
- 4) **Epistemic Justice as the Struggle for Representation:** This theory highlights the importance of representing diverse perspectives, values, and interests in the knowledge formation process. Epistemically diverse and inclusive societies are believed to produce richer, more accurate, and relevant knowledge. These theories of epistemic justice explore how societies can achieve justice in terms of knowledge and information, address epistemic injustices, and create an inclusive and just environment for accessing and utilizing knowledge.

Achieving epistemic justice involves ensuring that all members of society have equal opportunities to access and utilize relevant knowledge and information. This entails the fair distribution of informational resources and ensuring equal access to education and literacy. Epistemic justice theories highlight the importance of recognizing and appreciating diverse perspectives, knowledge, and contributions from different societal groups. This recognition includes understanding and respecting local knowledge, traditional wisdom, and intellectual contributions from marginalized groups. When epistemic injustice occurs, epistemic justice theories emphasize the importance of a fair social response. This response can involve listening to and acknowledging marginalized groups and taking action to address existing injustices. Epistemic justice theories also highlight the importance of empowering communities to access and utilize knowledge¹⁷. Empowerment involves critical education, the development of digital skills, and the ability to use knowledge to improve living conditions and actively participate in society.

17 M. Fricker, "Epistemic Injustice and Epistemic Redress," in *Oxford Handbook of Epistemology*, ed. P.K. Moser (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 417-437.

In a cultural context, epistemic justice is a concept that focuses on how knowledge and information are fairly distributed within a diverse society in terms of social, cultural, ethnic, and background differences. This includes recognition of diverse perspectives, local knowledge, and traditional wisdom from different societal groups, as well as addressing epistemic injustices that may arise due to the dominance of certain power structures and social hierarchies. This recognition encompasses traditional knowledge about the environment, culture, traditions, and local practices that are often overlooked in the knowledge formation process¹⁸. In a diverse society, epistemic justice involves listening to and appreciating various perspectives that come from different social and cultural groups. This means acknowledging that each perspective has value and a unique contribution to the knowledge formation process. Efforts to achieve epistemic justice require cooperation between governments, educational institutions, the private sector, and civil society. Implementing epistemic justice in society will benefit everyone by recognizing the value of each individual and group in knowledge formation and allowing collective potential to develop more fairly and sustainably¹⁹.

When epistemic injustice occurs in a social and cultural context, a fair social response becomes crucial. This response includes efforts to address existing injustices, rectify knowledge access disparities, and provide recognition and appreciation for the knowledge of groups that are often marginalized. Epistemic justice also involves recognizing the right of every individual to have equal access to knowledge and information. This means ensuring that no group is neglected or restricted in access to informational resources and education. Empowerment in epistemic justice includes critical education, the development of digital skills, and the ability to use knowledge as a tool for social change and progress. Epistemic justice also encompasses empowering communities to access, utilize, and contribute to knowledge. This empowerment involves critical education

18 J. Hardwig, "The Role of Trust in Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* vol. 88, no. 12 (1991), pp. 693-708.

19 M. Fricker, "Epistemic Injustice and a Role for Virtue in the Politics of Knowing," *Metaphilosophy* vol. 34, no. 2 (2003), pp. 154-173.

that encourages independence and critical skills in accessing and evaluating information. The development of digital skills is also essential in the current digital era, enabling individuals to actively participate in the use of information technology²⁰. Empowering communities also involves the ability to use knowledge as a tool for social change and progress, thereby addressing epistemic injustices and improving the overall conditions of society.

DIGITAL DISINFORMATION ON KNOWLEDGE INEQUALITY

Digital disinformation refers to the spread of false, misleading, or manipulative information through digital platforms such as the internet and social media. This term is often used to describe fake or inaccurate content intentionally disseminated with the aim of influencing public opinion, deceiving people, or creating confusion. Digital disinformation takes various forms, all geared towards manipulating information and misleading the public. Examples include the creation and spread of hoaxes, manipulation of media through techniques like deepfakes, the use of automated bots to amplify messages, fabrication of fake accounts to disseminate misinformation, the establishment of misleading websites mimicking reputable sources, and the operations of troll farms engaging in orchestrated online activities to manipulate public opinion. Addressing digital disinformation is a complex task that involves efforts from various stakeholders, including technology companies, governments, media, and the public. Some steps that can be taken to address digital disinformation include improving media literacy and digital literacy, verifying information before sharing it, supporting credible news sources, and involving the community in the detection and reporting of encountered disinformation.

The question of what comes first, digital disinformation or knowledge inequality, is often complex and context-dependent. Some argue that knowledge inequality may be the root of digital disinformation, while

20 Zeynep Tufekci, "How social media took us from Tahrir Square to Donald Trump," *MIT Technology Review* vol. 14, no. 18 (2018), p. 30.

others argue that digital disinformation can create or deepen knowledge inequality. This is a complex debate and depends on specific contexts. In some cases, knowledge inequality, such as limited access to education or quality information, may create vulnerability to digital disinformation. Conversely, rampant digital disinformation can lead to knowledge inequality by influencing how people understand the world and make decisions. It is essential to understand that the relationship between digital disinformation and knowledge inequality is dynamic and mutually influential. Both can pose serious challenges in achieving the widespread dissemination of accurate information in society.

Collaborative efforts involving technology companies, governments, media, and the public are essential to combat digital disinformation. Technology companies play a crucial role by implementing policies and algorithms that restrict the dissemination of false information. Governments can strengthen regulations and laws related to disinformation. Media outlets can enhance transparency and accountability in reporting, while the public can act as monitors and watchdogs in disseminating accurate information. Technology companies, such as social media platforms and search engines, should adopt stringent policies against disinformation. This includes identifying and removing misleading or false content. Transparency in how algorithms work and how disinformation is handled will help build trust and enable a better understanding of how to address disinformation on their platforms.

To tackle digital disinformation, a collaborative effort among technology companies, governments, media, and the public is essential. Technology companies play a pivotal role in this endeavor by adopting policies and algorithms that restrict the dissemination of disinformation. These policies may involve implementing stringent fact-checking mechanisms, enhancing content moderation practices, and prioritizing the promotion of credible sources. By actively engaging in responsible content management, technology companies can contribute significantly to the reduction of digital disinformation. Moreover, collaboration with governments is crucial to establish regulatory frameworks that address disinformation

effectively. Governments can work in tandem with technology companies to enforce policies, enact legislation, and create an environment that discourages the creation and spread of misinformation.

Media organizations also play a vital role by promoting responsible journalism, fact-checking, and adhering to ethical reporting standards. By fostering media literacy among the public, misinformation can be mitigated, and individuals can be better equipped to discern credible information. Lastly, public awareness and engagement are key components of the collaborative effort. Educating the public about the dangers of disinformation, promoting critical thinking skills, and encouraging responsible online behavior contribute to creating a more resilient and informed society. In essence, addressing digital disinformation requires a multifaceted approach involving cooperation and commitment from various stakeholders to safeguard the integrity of information in the digital landscape.

Governments can strengthen regulations and laws related to disinformation. Media outlets can enhance transparency and accountability in reporting, while the public can act as monitors and watchdogs in disseminating accurate information. Technology companies, such as social media platforms and search engines, should adopt stringent policies against disinformation. This includes identifying and removing misleading or false content. Transparency in how algorithms work and how disinformation is handled will help build trust and enable a better understanding of how to address disinformation on their platforms.

On the other hand, governments can strengthen regulations and laws related to disinformation to encourage technology companies to be more responsible in addressing disinformation on their platforms. The public should adopt a critical approach to the information they encounter on social media and the internet. Verifying information before sharing it and avoiding spreading disinformation are crucial steps in combating disinformation. Regulations and laws enforced by the government are also essential in urging technology companies to take more responsibility

in handling disinformation on their platforms. With clear regulations in place, technology companies will feel more compelled to take appropriate action in addressing disinformation and protecting users from its negative impacts. Furthermore, the role of the public is crucial in combating disinformation²¹.

Adopting a critical approach to the information they encounter on social media and the internet is a good starting point. Verifying information before sharing it and avoiding the spread of disinformation will help prevent the further dissemination of false information. The public also plays an important role as watchdogs in reporting disinformation content they encounter to authorities or social media platforms. With strong collaboration between technology companies, governments, and the public, along with the adoption of a critical approach to information among the public, we can make progress in addressing digital disinformation and creating a digital environment that is more reliable, secure, and just for all users. These joint efforts will ensure that the information we receive on social media and the internet is accurate, trustworthy, and positively contributes to society as a whole.

Awareness of the importance of media literacy and digital literacy is also crucial. Education about using social media and the internet wisely, verifying information, and recognizing disinformation will help the public become more aware and capable of actively participating in the digital environment. With a shared commitment from technology companies, governments, and the public, along with an awareness of the importance of a critical approach to information, we can achieve positive change in addressing digital disinformation. This will benefit all internet users, ensure that received information is accurate and trustworthy, and ultimately create a digital environment that is more beneficial for society as a whole. By creating a digital environment that is more beneficial for society as a whole, we can achieve the goal of establishing a reliable, safe, and just environment in terms of access to information. This will benefit

21 E.C. Tandoc Jr., Zheng Wei Lim, and R. Ling, "Defining 'Fake News': A Typology of Scholarly Definitions," *Digital Journalism* vol. 6, no. 2 (2017), pp. 137-153.

all internet users and have a positive impact on the development of society in the digital era²².

CASES OF DIGITAL DISINFORMATION AND EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE

Case studies and real-life examples of the negative impacts of digital disinformation involve various aspects of life, including politics, health, and society. The fact indicating that as many as 12,548 out of a total of 83,500 villages and urban neighborhoods in Indonesia still constitute blank spots provides an overview of the challenges in accessing information and basic services in several regions²³. The existence of these blank spots indicates that numerous areas still face limitations in connectivity, including internet access and communication networks. The inequality in access to education creates disparities in opportunities for students. Limited educational infrastructure, less experienced teachers, and a lack of resources such as textbooks and modern learning tools are major obstacles. Additionally, restricted internet access complicates students' ability to reach information and online learning resources.

The impact of this inequality in educational access significantly affects the educational opportunities for students in those villages. Insufficient technological skills due to limited access to devices and the internet create a gap in students' preparation for the digital era. Moreover, limited access to books, literature, and information constrains students' knowledge, preventing them from keeping up with the latest developments in academics or the professional world. This inequality in opportunities is also reflected in limited educational choices. Students in those villages may not have equivalent subject options compared to students in more advanced areas, restricting their career potential and personal develop-

22 Yphtach Lelkes, "Mass Polarization: Manifestations and Measurements," *Public Opinion Quarterly* vol. 81, no. 51, pp. 400-421.

23 B. Ischinger, *Equity and Quality in Education: Supporting Disadvantaged Students and Schools*, (Paris: OECD, 2012), p. 37.

ment. Thus, the conditions of inequality in educational access serve as a significant barrier to equal educational opportunities.

In other cases, some remote indigenous communities, such as the Sakai tribe in Riau, the Akita tribe in Bengkalis, and the Bonai tribe in Kalimantan, receive limited media coverage, creating inequality in the distribution of information. This phenomenon provides an illustration of how mass media can be a factor influencing how information is distributed and accessed by the public²⁴. In this context, the inequality in information distribution can occur because certain topics or communities do not receive equal coverage in news or story framing. Factors such as editorial bias, subjective preferences of the media, or specific news priorities can influence how much attention a particular topic or community receives in media coverage. The impact of this inequality is that some issues or communities may be underrepresented or even neglected in reporting. This can create disparities in the knowledge and understanding of the public regarding various issues or realities that may not receive the attention they deserve.

The impact of this limited coverage is that public awareness of these crucial issues becomes restricted, and adequate solutions may be challenging to achieve due to the lack of attention from the public and stakeholders. Therefore, this case reflects how limited media coverage can create inequality in information distribution in Indonesia, influencing the public's perception and understanding of issues that may not receive adequate attention. Despite the significant impact of this issue, media coverage of indigenous land rights problems tends to be limited. Local or national news more often focuses on political issues or national developments, leaving behind local or specific issues related to indigenous communities. As a consequence, indigenous communities may struggle to receive broader support and understanding. Resolving land conflicts and protecting the rights of indigenous communities become challenging due to the lack of public pressure and attention.

24 M. Rawa El Amady, "Jelajah Sakai: Pengembangan Potensi Ethno-Ecotourism Suku Sakai Riau," *Indonesian Journal of Tourism and Leisure* vol. 3, no. 1 (2022), pp. 26-38.

In the backdrop of contemporary political events in Indonesia, the impact of disinformation on epistemic injustice becomes glaringly apparent, particularly during the 2024 presidential campaign. This example highlights how the choices people make in terms of the sources and types of information they consume can significantly influence their perceptions of political events. It underscores the pivotal role of media literacy and critical thinking in navigating the intricate landscape of information dissemination. This is especially pertinent in the age of social media, where a multitude of viewpoints and narratives proliferate. Addressing knowledge inequality necessitates promoting awareness of potential biases, advocating for diverse information sources, and cultivating a society where individuals are equipped to make informed decisions despite the challenges posed by contentious or partisan content²⁵.

The controversy surrounding the movie *"The Dirty Vote,"* accused of being partisan, raises significant concerns about knowledge inequality. The film's perceived bias or partisanship may lead to a situation where certain individuals deliberately choose not to engage with or seek information from this source. As a result, a divide in knowledge emerges, creating inequality among those who decide to avoid the movie and those who engage with it. This scenario highlights the impact that media content, especially when perceived as biased or partisan, can have on the distribution of knowledge within a society. The choice to disassociate from certain information sources may limit one's understanding of specific perspectives or narratives presented in the movie²⁶. Ultimately, this selective consumption of information contributes to a form of knowledge inequality, where individuals make choices that shape their awareness and understanding of political events based on their perception of media bias.

25 I. Destavino, Muh. Habibi, Muh. Reza Syamsuri, "Navigating Digital Deception: Unmasking Propaganda and Disinformation in the 2024 Elections," *The Journalish: Social and Government* vol. 4, no. 4 (2023), pp. 380-388.

26 Wulan, Mawar Kusuma, Cyprianus Anto Saptowalyono, <https://www.kompas.id/baca/english/2024/02/12/en-ksp-anggap-film-dirty-vote-sebagai-kritik-ingatkan-pemilu-harus-damai>, accessed on 23 February, 2024.

The narrative and its philosophical analysis underscore the intricate interplay between education, media, and information dissemination in shaping societal knowledge. This nuanced relationship highlights the pivotal role these elements play in influencing public perception, perpetuating social inequalities, and ultimately molding the democratic fabric of a society. This interconnectedness prompts a call for collective commitment and concerted efforts to address these challenges. At the forefront is the imperative to promote equitable access to education. This involves not only addressing the immediate issues of infrastructure, teacher experience, and resource availability but also delving into the systemic inequalities that underlie these challenges. A comprehensive approach is necessary to dismantle barriers and ensure that every individual, regardless of geographical location or socio-economic status, has equal opportunities for learning and personal development.

Simultaneously, the narrative encourages a critical examination of media practices. The philosophical analysis prompts a reflection on the responsibility of media entities in providing unbiased, comprehensive, and inclusive coverage. It calls for transparency in editorial decisions, a commitment to representing diverse perspectives, and an awareness of the potential consequences of skewed narratives. Media literacy emerges as a crucial component, empowering individuals to navigate the vast landscape of information with discernment and critical thinking. The narrative also stresses the need for media practices that empower citizens to make informed decisions in a democratic society. This extends beyond disseminating information; it involves fostering a media environment that cultivates civic engagement, encourages open dialogue, and values the diversity of voices. By doing so, it contributes to the creation of an informed and active citizenry, essential for the functioning of a robust democracy. In essence, addressing the intricate challenges within education, media, and information dissemination requires a holistic and collaborative approach. It involves not only rectifying immediate disparities but also fostering a cultural shift towards a society that values knowledge, critical inquiry, and the equitable distribution of information.

Furthermore, digital disinformation can exacerbate social divides. When false information circulates about specific ethnic or religious groups, it can trigger conflicts and greater social injustices. Disinformation is designed to manipulate the emotions and views of individuals, often leading people to become more divided and extreme in their beliefs. This can result in greater social disparities because people may tend to resent each other rather than work together. Those who are more vulnerable to disinformation, such as those with limited access or technological skills, may become further marginalized in society because they might struggle to differentiate between true and false information. To address the impact of digital disinformation on social disparities, joint efforts from the government, media organizations, educational institutions, and civil society are required.

The perspective of justice ethics in philosophy emphasizes the importance of ensuring that every individual has equal rights to access accurate and truthful information. This collaboration aligns with the principles of justice that demand equal treatment for all members of society. The collaboration between the government, media organizations, educational institutions, and civil society in addressing the impact of digital disinformation can be interpreted as a concrete step to realize these principles of justice. By working together, these entities strive to ensure that the information presented to the public is true and reliable, without discrimination or inequality in access. The significance of equal rights to information creates a moral foundation for this collaboration. It not only aligns with the values of justice but also reflects a collective commitment to creating an environment where truth can be accessed and appreciated by all individuals, regardless of their background or social status²⁷. Thus, this collaboration is not only a practical response to the challenges of disinformation but also a philosophical step in line with the fundamental principles of justice and equal rights to accurate knowledge in society.

27 Brendan Shea, *Ethical Explorations, Moral Dilemmas in a Universe of Possibilities* (Rochester: Thoughtful Noodle Books, 2023), p. 13.

At the level of public policy, false information affects the decision-making process, which can lead to greater social injustice, especially if the policies in question harm specific groups. False information received by policymakers can lead to the formulation of incorrect and ineffective policies. If these policies are based on inaccurate data or facts, their implementation may not achieve the intended goals or may even harm groups that should be protected or supported. Disinformation can trigger divisions in the decision-making process. Groups influenced by false information may support policies that contradict those favored by other groups. If public policies based on false information harm vulnerable or disadvantaged groups, it would exacerbate social disparities. These groups may face more obstacles and inequalities as a result of unfair policies.

In examining the tangible effects of false information on public policy, two compelling cases vividly exemplify the far-reaching consequences of misinformation. One instance revolves around the supposed link between vaccinations and autism, famously propagated by Andrew Wakefield's study in the late 1990s. The false claim asserted a connection between the MMR (measles, mumps, and rubella) vaccine and autism. This misinformation triggered a palpable decline in vaccination rates as concerned parents hesitated due to the alleged association. The ramifications extended to public health policies promoting vaccinations, resulting in outbreaks of preventable diseases due to decreased immunization. Andrew Wakefield's study in the late 1990s, asserting a connection between the MMR vaccine and autism, initiated a cascade of consequences. The false claim reverberated through public discourse, causing a palpable decline in vaccination rates. Concerned parents, influenced by the alleged association, hesitated to vaccinate their children. This hesitancy, fueled by misinformation, had a profound effect on public health policies aimed at promoting vaccinations²⁸.

28 T. S. Sathyanarayana Rao and Chittaranjan Andrade, "The MMR vaccine and autism: Sensation, refutation, retraction, and fraud," *Indian J. Psychiatry* vol. 53, no. 2, (2011), pp. 95-96.

As a result, the tangible repercussions extended beyond individual decisions, leading to outbreaks of preventable diseases. The decreased immunization rates created vulnerabilities in community immunity, allowing diseases that could have been controlled through widespread vaccination to resurface and spread. This starkly demonstrates how false information can not only impact individual choices but also undermine broader public health initiatives. This case raises ethical considerations regarding the responsibility of disseminating information, particularly in the realms of public health. It underscores the need for accurate, evidence-based information to guide individual decisions and shape effective public health policies. Additionally, it prompts reflection on the ethical obligations of those involved in the communication and dissemination of scientific findings, emphasizing the potential consequences when misinformation takes root. The vaccination-autism link case underscores the profound societal implications of false information on public policy, emphasizing the critical importance of truth and accuracy in shaping health-related decisions and policies.

In the lead-up to the Iraq War in 2003, a significant case emerged, characterized by the widespread dissemination of false intelligence, specifically centered around the baseless allegations of Iraq possessing Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs). The propagation of this misinformation played a pivotal role in providing justification for the subsequent military intervention. This instance highlights the profound impact that false information can have on geopolitical events, shaping narratives, influencing public perception, and ultimately contributing to consequential decisions with far-reaching implications²⁹. The ensuing impact on public policy was profound, as political decisions influenced by this false narrative led to a devastating war. The subsequent revelation of the absence of WMDs laid bare the extent of misinformation, contributing to social and political unrest. These instances underscore the significant and real-world consequences of false information on public policy, emphasizing

29 Cassandra D. Hightower, "Strategic Misrepresentation or Something More Sinister? Deception in George W. Bush's War Rhetoric on Iraq," *Graduate Research Theses & Dissertations* (2021), p. 24.

the imperative need for accurate, reliable information to guide decisions and prevent further instances of social injustice.

Such cases emphasize the critical role that accurate information plays in the formulation and execution of public policies. The vaccination-autism link showcases how misinformation can permeate public perceptions, resulting in tangible harm to public health initiatives. Similarly, the Iraq War illustrates the profound consequences when false intelligence shapes geopolitical decisions, leading to far-reaching geopolitical turmoil. From a philosophical standpoint, these examples raise questions about the ethical responsibilities of those disseminating information, especially when it comes to public health and matters of national security³⁰. They underscore the need for a commitment to truth and transparency in both scientific and political realms.

Moreover, these cases highlight the vulnerability of society to manipulation and the potential erosion of trust in institutions when misinformation is not promptly addressed. They call for a collective effort to cultivate media literacy, critical thinking, and a commitment to truth as societal values. The impact of false information on public policy extends beyond immediate consequences, shaping the trajectory of societies and affecting the lives of individuals. Addressing this challenge requires not only corrective measures after misinformation surfaces but also proactive efforts to promote a culture of truth and accuracy in information dissemination.

THE IDEA OF ADDRESSING EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE

Media education and digital literacy have the main goal of equipping individuals with the knowledge and skills needed to function wisely and intelligently in an increasingly complex digital world. One of the key benefits of media education and digital literacy is the ability to recognize and address disinformation. Individual trained in digital literacy are more likely to be vigilant against false information and better able to fact-check

30 White E. Science, "Pseudoscience, and the Frontline Practitioner: The Vaccination/Autism Debate," *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work* vol. 11, no. 3 (2014), pp. 269-274.

before believing or sharing it. Digital literacy helps individuals assess whether the news sources or information they consume can be trusted or not. This enables them to choose more reliable and credible sources. In facing the challenges of misinformation in developing countries, effective education must encompass various aspects to prepare individuals holistically. Media and information literacy serve as a crucial foundation, providing a profound understanding of information sources, the ability to critically evaluate news, and recognition of signs of misinformation.

Furthermore, fact-checking skills become a primary focus in training individuals to ensure the accuracy of information using reliable sources. These skills are essential to counteract the spread of false information and build a culture of accurate information. Technological education becomes a crucial aspect in helping individuals understand the dynamics of digital technology. This involves understanding how algorithms work on online platforms, enabling individuals to consume information more wisely. Critical thinking skills also form a strong foundation, teaching individuals to assess information objectively, question uncertainties, and not easily be influenced by unproven narratives. Digital ethics education guides individuals in ethical behavior in using technology and social media. This includes responsibility in disseminating information and respect for privacy and other digital rights. Logic and argumentation skills provide support, helping individuals identify valid arguments and understand the logic behind presented information.

Systematic thinking ability is also taught so that individuals can connect information and see the bigger picture of an issue. This education teaches the identification of visual manipulation, assisting individuals in recognizing potential manipulation in images and videos to prevent the spread of false information. All these educational aspects need to be integrated into a curriculum relevant to the local context, paying special attention to the unique challenges faced by communities in developing countries. Collaboration between the government, educational institutions, and the private sector is key to strengthening digital literacy edu-

cation efforts to create a society that can think critically and intelligently face the information flow in the digital era.

From the perspective of justice ethics, the concept of every individual's right to receive empowering education is highly relevant. Justice ethics demands that digital literacy education should be accessible equally to all layers of society. This approach recognizes that providing equal rights to access true knowledge and information is a moral obligation. Digital literacy education in this context should not only teach how to obtain information from a fixed source but also how to manage and interpret information from various sources. In the context of deliberative democracy, where dialogue and active participation are valued, digital literacy education should encourage citizen engagement in discussing critical issues and formulating solutions together. Social philosophers such as Jürgen Habermas underscore the importance of a robust public sphere and accurate knowledge for maintaining a healthy democratic process³¹. In this context, the foundation for a society capable of actively participating in democratic decision-making lies in digital literacy education.

This comprehensive perspective on digital literacy education reflects a profound understanding of its role as an instrument to combat misinformation. By emphasizing justice and truth, this approach seeks to empower individuals with the skills to critically evaluate information, navigate digital spaces responsibly, and contribute meaningfully to democratic discourse. Acknowledging the diversity of knowledge and promoting social responsibility are integral components of fostering a well-informed and actively engaged citizenry, crucial for the functioning of a robust democracy. Moreover, this approach recognizes the nuanced challenges posed by the complex and dynamic nature of digital literacy education. It goes beyond merely imparting technical skills and delves into cultivating a

31 J.D. Finlayson and Dafydd Huw Rees, "Jürgen Habermas", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2023/entries/habermas/> accessed on 10 March 2024.

mindset that values truth, ethical participation, and the responsible use of digital platforms. In this regard, digital literacy education can be considered the foundation for creating a society that can effectively participate in democratic decision-making. Digital literacy education in developing countries can be more holistic and aligned with the principles of justice, truth, democratic participation, recognition of knowledge diversity, and social responsibility.

At the level of public policy, false information affects the decision-making process, which can lead to greater social injustice, especially if the policies in question harm specific groups. False information received by policymakers can lead to the formulation of incorrect and ineffective policies. If these policies are based on inaccurate data or facts, their implementation may not achieve the intended goals or may even harm groups that should be protected or supported. Disinformation can trigger divisions in the decision-making process. Groups influenced by false information may support policies that contradict those favored by other groups. If public policies based on false information harm vulnerable or disadvantaged groups, it will exacerbate social disparities. These groups may face more obstacles and inequalities as a result of unfair policies.

Individuals trained in digital literacy have the ability to discern and understand accurate information from false information. They are more inclined to use credible sources of information and fact-check before sharing it. This ensures that their contributions are based on valid and accurate knowledge. Digital literacy includes skills in fact-checking and verifying information. When faced with claims or arguments in discussions, trained individuals can quickly check the truth of those claims, which helps prevent the spread of false information. The ability to verify facts helps individuals avoid falling into scams and fraudulent schemes that may attempt to exploit them online. In a digital environment filled with information, the ability to sort and understand accurate information is a crucial skill (It helps prevent the spread of disinformation, supports meaningful discussions, and ensures that individuals' contributions are based on accurate and valid knowledge).

Epistemic injustice is intricately intertwined with broader social injustice, as an uneven social system can perpetuate disparities in access to knowledge and truth. Consequently, addressing epistemic injustice necessitates a more profound societal transformation, as unequal social systems also influence the recognition and valuation of knowledge. In some instances, knowledge originating from specific groups may be dismissed or devalued by more dominant communities, contributing to epistemic injustice by undermining the contributions of these specific groups. To effectively combat epistemic injustice, it becomes imperative to go beyond merely enhancing individual access to knowledge; structural changes in society are essential. Achieving deeper social transformations, such as mitigating economic inequality, eradicating social discrimination, and fostering social inclusion, is vital. These changes create an environment wherein everyone has a more equitable opportunity to develop and disseminate knowledge. In essence, the quest to rectify epistemic injustice necessitates a holistic approach that addresses both individual access to knowledge and the underlying structural inequalities within society.

The roots of epistemic injustice delve deep into the structural foundations of society, necessitating a comprehensive transformation to address its multifaceted nature. Within an unequal social system, injustices manifest in various forms, impacting the distribution of knowledge and shaping perceptions of truth. The inequalities prevalent in society directly influence how knowledge is acknowledged and valued. In some instances, knowledge originating from marginalized or underrepresented groups may face dismissal or be labeled as inconsequential by more dominant communities, further exacerbating epistemic injustice. This dismissal not only diminishes the worth of specific knowledge contributions but also perpetuates a cycle of neglect. To effectively confront and rectify epistemic injustice, it becomes imperative to move beyond merely enhancing individual access to knowledge. The solution lies in orchestrating structural changes within society that address the root causes of inequality. Undertaking deeper social transformations, such as mitigating economic disparities, eradicating social discrimination, and championing social

inclusion, is paramount. By fostering an environment that values diversity and dismantling systemic barriers, these changes create conditions wherein everyone has a more equitable opportunity to both develop and disseminate knowledge.

In the pursuit of dismantling epistemic injustice, a comprehensive understanding of its roots underscores the need for transformative actions on both individual and societal levels. At the individual level, promoting awareness and cultivating a mindset that values diverse perspectives is fundamental. Education and initiatives that encourage critical thinking and empathy can contribute to dismantling ingrained biases and fostering a more inclusive approach to knowledge. Additionally, efforts to recognize and elevate the voices of marginalized groups play a crucial role in challenging existing power dynamics that perpetuate epistemic injustice. On a societal level, institutional reforms are imperative. Policies aimed at reducing economic disparities, addressing systemic discrimination, and actively promoting diversity within educational and knowledge-producing institutions are essential. This involves creating inclusive spaces where various forms of knowledge are acknowledged and respected, breaking free from traditional structures that have historically marginalized certain groups.

Furthermore, fostering collaboration between different communities and promoting a more egalitarian distribution of resources can contribute to mitigating epistemic injustice. By addressing the broader social inequalities that underpin epistemic injustice, society can move towards a more equitable and just framework that recognizes the inherent worth of diverse knowledge contributions. Dismantling epistemic injustice requires a multi-faceted approach that combines individual awareness, institutional reforms, and collaborative societal efforts. It is through these collective endeavors that a more equitable and inclusive knowledge landscape can emerge, laying the groundwork for a truly just and enlightened society.

Moreover, cultivating collaboration among diverse communities and advocating for a more equal allocation of resources plays a crucial role in alleviating epistemic injustice. By tackling the overarching social inequalities that serve as the foundation for epistemic injustice, society can progress towards a fairer and more just framework that acknowledges the intrinsic value of varied knowledge contributions. Dismantling epistemic injustice demands a comprehensive strategy encompassing individual consciousness, institutional restructuring, and concerted societal initiatives. The call for collaboration and equal resource distribution aligns with foundational ethical principles of justice, emphasizing the fair treatment of all individuals. This perspective asserts that every community and individual should be afforded an equal opportunity to contribute to and benefit from knowledge. In ethical terms, justice involves the impartial and fair distribution of resources, opportunities, and recognition, ensuring that no group or individual is systematically disadvantaged or marginalized.

This ethical stance contends that addressing epistemic injustice requires a commitment to providing equitable conditions for knowledge production and dissemination. By advocating for collaboration and equal distribution of resources, the aim is to dismantle systemic barriers that may impede certain communities or individuals from accessing, creating, and contributing to knowledge on an equal footing with others. In essence, this ethical perspective aligns with the belief that justice should not only be a theoretical concept but a guiding principle in shaping the structures of society, including those related to knowledge. It calls for a reevaluation and transformation of existing systems to ensure that everyone, irrespective of background or identity, has a fair and just opportunity

to participate in the collective endeavor of knowledge creation and dissemination.

CONCLUSION

In the contemporary digital landscape, the disparity in access to accurate and trustworthy information gives rise to a profound issue known as

knowledge injustice, which directly challenges the foundational tenets of epistemology governing the equitable pursuit of knowledge. The proliferation of digital misinformation poses a significant threat to the reliability of established sources of information, eroding the foundation of trust in the informational landscape. Society exhibits a spectrum of access levels to information, with some individuals enjoying more robust access, while others grapple with limitations in their information-seeking endeavors. This prevalent phenomenon fosters epistemic injustice, wherein individuals with restricted access encounter formidable challenges in their quest for genuine and reliable knowledge. Epistemic injustice, in essence, poses a direct challenge to the fundamental principles of epistemology, a philosophical branch concerned with understanding the nature of knowledge and the processes through which it is acquired. The inequalities in access to information critically undermine the core principles of fairness embedded in the knowledge-seeking process, principles that have long been regarded as essential foundations in epistemology.

The dissemination of false or misleading information through digital channels is viewed as a grave threat to public trust. The unequal access to information, coupled with disparities in the reliability of the information obtained, engenders a decline in the trustworthiness of sources that were traditionally considered reliable. This erosion of trust further intensifies the challenges posed by epistemic injustice, contributing to a complex web of issues that demand careful philosophical consideration within the evolving landscape of knowledge acquisition and dissemination. The call for a deeper social transformation aligns with the philosophical understanding that epistemic injustice cannot be disentangled from broader social injustice. The two are inherently intertwined, with societal structures influencing the accessibility and recognition of knowledge. By advocating for social change, we endeavor to create an environment where knowledge is valued, and every individual has an equitable opportunity to contribute to and benefit from the collective pool of human understanding. The quest to address epistemic injustice necessitates a profound re-evaluation and restructuring of societal norms, challenging

existing power dynamics, and fostering a more inclusive and egalitarian framework that acknowledges the intrinsic value of diverse knowledge contributions. Through this transformative journey, society can aspire to dismantle the roots of epistemic injustice and cultivate a more just and enlightened knowledge landscape.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, A. "Epistemic Injustice and Internet Use." *Ethics and Information Technology* vol. 13, no. 4 (2011): 313-325.
- . "Epistemic Justice as a Virtue of Social Institutions." *Social Epistemology* vol. 26, no. 2 (2012): 163-173.
- Banerjee, Abhijit V., and Esther Duflo. *Good Economics for Hard Times*. New York: Public Affairs, 2019.
- Castro, E., dan L.F. Zuluaga. "Fostering Internet Access and Use: Digital Inclusion Programs in Colombia." *The Information Society* vol. 35, no. 2 (2019): pp. 72-85.
- Dahlgren, P. "The Internet, Public Spheres, and Political Communication: Dispersion and Deliberation." *Political Communication* vol. 22, no. 2 (2005): 147-162.
- Destavino, I., Muh. Habibi, and Muh. Reza Syamsuri. "Navigating Digital Deception: Unmasking Propaganda and Disinformation in the 2024 Elections," *The Journalish: Social and Government* vol. 4, no. 4 (2023): 380-388.
- Dotson, K. "Tracking Epistemic Violence, Tracking Practices of Silencing." *Hypatia* vol. 26, no. 2 (2011): 236-257.
- Finlayson, James Gordon and Dafydd Huw Rees, "Jürgen Habermas", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2023 Ed.), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2023/entries/habermas>.
- Freire, Paulo., *Pendidikan Kaum Tertindas*. Translated by F. Danuwinata. Jakarta: LP3ES, 2008.
- Fricker, Miranda. "Epistemic Injustice and a Role for Virtue in the Politics of Knowing." *Metaphilosophy* vol. 34, no. 2 (2003): 154-173.
- . "Epistemic Injustice and Epistemic Redress." In *Oxford Handbook of Epistemology*, edited by P.K. Moser, pp. 417-437. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford: Oxford

- University Press, 2007.
- Gatsinzi, J.P., S.A. Mugume, and J. Rutayisire. "Impact of One Laptop per Child Project on Learning Outcomes and Children Satisfaction in Rwanda." *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia* vol. 27, no. 3 (2018): 365-383.
- Hardwig, J. "The Role of Trust in Knowledge." *Journal of Philosophy* vol. 88, no. 12 (1991): 693-708.
- Hightower, Cassandra D. "Strategic Misrepresentation or Something More Sinister? Deception in George W. Bush's War Rhetoric on Iraq." *Graduate Research Theses & Dissertations* (2021). 7111. <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/allgraduate-thesesdissertations/7111>.
- Ho, C. S. and K.E. Leong. "Singapore's Smart Nation Journey: Governing the Digital Society," *Government Information Quarterly* vol. 35, no. 4 (2018): 558-569.
- Ischinger, B. *Equity and Quality in Education: Supporting Disadvantaged Students and Schools*. Paris: OECD, 2012.
- Kerner, Ina. "The Epistemology of Resistance: Gender and Racial Oppression, Epistemic Injustice, and Resistant Imagination. By José Medina" [Book Review]. *Constellations* vol. 21, no. 3 (2014): 436-438.
- Kenski, K. and N.J. Stroud. "Connections Between Internet Use and Political Efficacy, Knowledge, and Participation." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* vol. 50, no. 2 (2006): 173-192.
- Lelkes, Yphtach. "Mass Polarization: Manifestations and Measurements." *Public Opinion Quarterly* vol. 81, no. 51 (2016): 400-421.
- OECD. *Measuring the Digital Transformation: A Roadmap for the Future*. OECD Publishing (2019). Paris: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264311992-en>.
- Rawa El Amady, M. "Jelajah Sakai: Pengembangan Potensi Ethno - Eco-tourism Suku Sakai Riau." *Indonesian Journal of Tourism and Leisure* vol. 03, no. 1 (2022): 26-38.
- Rao, T. S. Sathyanarayana and Chittaranjan Andrade. "The MMR vaccine and autism: Sensation, Refutation, Retraction, and Fraud." *Indian Journal of Psychiatry* vol. 53, no. 2, (2011): 95-96.
- Shea, Brendan. *Ethical Explorations, Moral Dilemmas in a Universe of Possibilities*. Rochester MN: Thoughtful Noodle Books, 2023.
- Tandoc Jr., E.C., Zheng Wei Lim, and R. Ling. "Defining 'Fake News': A Typology of Scholarly Definitions." *Digital Journalism* vol. 6, no. 2

(2017): 137-153.

Tufecki, Zeynep. "How Social Media Took us from Tahrir Square to Donald Trump," *MIT Technology Review* vol. 14, no. 18 (2018).

Warschauer, Mark. *Technology and Social Inclusion*. Massachusetts—London: The MIT Press, 2003.

White, E. Science. "Pseudoscience, and the Frontline Practitioner: The Vaccination/ Autism Debate." *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work* vol. 11, no. 3 (2014): 269-274.