

Eco-Digital Sovereignty: Transforming Government Communication and Legal Advocacy for Environmental Justice in the Algorithmic Era

Zulaikha ^{1*}, Sri Astutik ¹, Nevrettia Christantyawati ², Suyatno Ladiqi ³, Jessica Angelina Br
Sitanggang ¹

¹ Communication Science Faculty, Dr. Soetomo University, Surabaya, Indonesia

² Law Science Faculty, Dr. Soetomo University, Surabaya, Indonesia

³ Faculty of Law & International Relations University Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia

*Corresponding author's email: zulaikha@unitomo.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Keywords

Eco-Digital Sovereignty; Algorithmic
Hegemony; Government Strategic
Communication; Environmental Justice;
Digital Constitutionalism; Platform
Governance; Climate Advocacy

This study explores the remaking of government communication in response to the climate crisis by transforming the problem posed by algorithmic hegemony (that public policy information fails to reach its audience because of the commercial biases of global platforms' algorithms) into a case for "digital sovereignty" and the "radical retelling of who the state is in public communication about ecological questions." Eco-digital sovereignty is a democratic imperative, not merely a technological transition. By providing agencies with the tools for clarity, governance recovers the digital commons for environmental justice. In what ways do they protect the ecologies of truth from the deluge of the alert economy? This study presents a framework for eco-digital sovereignty at the intersection of law and government communication. A qualitative juridical-communicative analysis illustrates the entanglement of state advocacy for the environment on the one hand and platform governance on the other. The analysis uncovers the necessity for government communication to shift from one-to-many broadcasting to an "algorithmically aware" practice, underpinned by legislation ensuring the visibility of environmental justice. This transfiguration is necessary for the voice of the state on ecological protection to prevail in the battle for space in the digital public sphere.

1. Introduction

The civilizational climate crisis has reached a tipping point, where urgent physical interventions are complemented by a strong and open flow of public information. However, in 2026, state effectiveness in strategic communication about environmental justice is purposely and "algorithmically" eroding due to "algorithmic hegemony." States are legally compelled to advocate for ecological protection; however, only their own expressions of this advocacy populate the digital public sphere, and even then, only on the terms of the profit-making and uninterrogated filtering logics of global platforms. (Machen & Nost, 2021).

This creates a paradox of "digital invisibility," in which public-facing public policy–climate mitigation efforts–drowns in levels of engagement by non-citizens with viral entertainment (Danneels & Viaene, 2022). This is not just a communication failure; it is a loss of digital sovereignty.

When a state cannot deliver environmental messaging to its citizens because of the biases of third-party algorithms, the power of the state diminishes in the digital commons.

The capitalist commodification of this research is further exacerbated by a larger worldwide phenomenon. By 2026, the “search-based” quest for information has compelled the state to an even greater degree of undemocratization. A citizen who once searched for government information on environmental standards is now simply a passive consumer of AI model generated excited and enraged, dumbed-down content on social media. An “information asymmetry” has been created in which a legally managed state is simply a “content creator” in an unfair market against multinational tech firms. (Bellaby, 2024).

The challenge of 2026 digital sovereignty extends beyond infrastructure to data and narratives. ‘Synthetic engagement’ “is supplanting the state’s ability to communicate ‘ecological truth’ as global platforms trend towards generative AI and predictive modelling. If a government cannot ensure that its laws on the environment benefit its citizens, the social contract between the state and the people is undermined. The ‘visibility gap’ creates gaps for climate misinformation that often thrives in algorithmic environments because of their sensationalist flavor. Eco-digital sovereignty is a bulwark to ensure that the public interest in this case, the environment—is maintained at the bargain-price level of the digital attention economy. (Tao et al., 2025).

Moreover, the concept of eco-digital sovereignty articulated here is a response to the “platformization” of the public sphere. To understand what environmental and climate justice means, we need a stable, visible medium. (Zeqiri et al., 2025). When that medium is controlled by black-box algorithms constituting an unaccountable public space, the state’s capacity to manage ecological transitions, such as the implementation of carbon taxes or adherence to plastic reduction mandates, is paralyzed (Bergougui & Ben-Salha, 2025). In this context, communication is understood not simply as a tool but as a site of political and legal contestation: a “digital nation-state.”

To that end, we introduce ecosystem digital sovereignty and advocate for a fundamental transformation of how the state communicates, from one-dimensional broadcasting to algorithmic-aware communication strategies. By combining environmental law with platform governance, we propose a holistic project that attempts to reclaim the state’s voice for the digital age. Our goal is to make environmental justice more than just a legal concept, but a reality on the internet, enabled by robust regulations that require algorithmic transparency and intelligent design that prioritizes public needs over commercial goals.

2.1 The Rise of Algorithmic Hegemony in Public Discourse

Today’s information flows are mediated by algorithmic gatekeepers, not objective editors. Once passive hosts, global technology platforms are now simply “gatekeepers” of public discourse, using algorithms governed by machine learning (ML) models designed to optimize for “engagement metrics,” such as likes, shares, and watch time, rather than public importance or factual accuracy—a commercial logic that embeds bias in a structure where sensationalist entertainment will almost always outpace critical public policy information, especially in environmental justice (Horgan et al., 2024; Zulaikha et al., 2022)

This hegemony generates a “visibility crisis” for state actors. (Liang, 2025). because personalized feed architectures in the algorithmic era undermine the traditional gatekeeping or authority of government communication, treating environmental advocacy as low-interest content. Even when a state legally fulfills its responsibility to warn about climate change or share strategies for protecting the planet, those messages become submerged under a tsunami of algorithmically inflated commercial messages.

We argue that this is not a bug but rather a shift of power relations; a form of algorithmic deadlock that tends to be termed “algorithmic hegemony,” which “privatizes” the public sphere such that proprietary black-box codes (rather than democratic principles) dictate the rules of visibility. Understanding how these mechanics work to reproduce ecopsychist narratives is the first step to seizing ecodigital sovereignty, allowing the state to develop “counter-algorithmic” techniques with

which to render truth the dominant narrative in the fray of the digital attention economy. (Aytac, 2024).

Algorithmic hegemony works via what Pariser (2012) famously called “filter bubbles”, whereas by 2026 those bubbles have become complex, AI-driven entities termed “filtered realities.” In these contexts, systems not only filter what we see but also predict and manipulate our cognitive biases. With regard to environmental justice, citizens without a prior interest in policy are systematically excluded from government-led ecological advocacy (Christantyawati et al., 2025). The commercial logic of the “attention economy” considers public interest information a “non-performing asset.” Because environmental policies often involve behavioral changes and expose “uncomfortable truths,” they tend to be deprioritized by algorithms in favor of “instant gratification” content. (Nishant et al., 2024).

This “privatization of the public sphere” devolves into “algorithmic censorship by omission.” Platforms do not remove government messages. They simply ensure that they receive zero reach (zero visibility) and silence the state’s ecological voice. This repositions “freedom of speech” for the digital age from simply one of the rights to speak to a “right to be heard” and the “right to be visible” in the algorithmic commons. (Joseph et al., 2025).

"Algorithmic hegemony" operates through what is sometimes termed the attention economy, in which human attention is marketed as a commodity. Environmental policy, which is more difficult to understand and requires long-term commitment, is competing in a market where high-arousal, short-term entertainment is readily available. This leads to what some call "structural silencing of government advocacy." Scholars have argued that this is a form of soft censorship, in which information exists but is practically unreachable. For environmental justice, this tends to mean that those who are the most marginalized and on the front lines of climate change are often the least likely to receive government updates because their profiles are marked "of low commercial value" by global platforms. (Schusler & Krings, 2025).

2.2. The Evolution of Government Strategic Communication in the Algorithmic Era

In the analog era of mass media, government communication was predominantly limited to the distribution of information related to public policy in a “broadcasting” model, in which the state was the arbiter of the national narrative. In a world fractured by universal technology and platform ecology, information is open to others, and communication is no longer defined by the volume of information at the information cut-off point, but by “discoverability” and “resonance” as the renderings of the powerful algorithmically driven economy of attention. (Pottier et al., 2024).

Consequently, government communication will need radical transformation. Governments can neither be mere “supply-side information providers” nor hope to stay with public relations models but rather “strategic digital advocates” who cross the “rhetorical gap” into a data-driven algorithmic strategic model (Christantyawati et al., 2024). In the context of climate crises and environmental justice issues, strategic communication must involve SEO, micro-targeting, and narrative interactivity so that the ecological mandate is not lost to environmentally damaging commercial algorithms that create “echo chambers”. Alcaraz-Martínez et al., 2024).

The study contends that in the 21st century, government “state communication” is a relational sovereignty model, developing a deep, interpersonal trust-based infrastructure with the digital citizen that is more than a transaction. The state can reclaim its role as the “primary definer” of the truth through digital storytelling around environmental law advocacy. Strategic communication itself becomes a form of digital resistance to digital hegemony, presenting a linguistic techno-social framework through which generations will continue to seek the help of the state in protecting the environment from its destroyers. (Rothe et al., 2024).

The transfiguration of government strategic communication entails AI-driven public diplomacy. A state must move towards “hybrid intelligence” in the sense that legal certainty is entangled with data science capabilities. This means the government builds up its own “first party data” on citizens instead of relying upon Facebook or TikTok to reach them; integrated digital ecosystems such as a

national ecological data hub, using their algorithms to push public interest content. (Harliantara and Mulyanadi, 2024, Yigitcanlar et al., 2024).

Furthermore, the concept of relational sovereignty argues that governments should stop treating us as “audiences” and start treating us as “networked participants.” In the algorithmic age, the best way to circumvent platform bias is via “human-to-human” distribution networks in which citizens become the messengers of environmental justice based on actual and verifiable government data. This is digital resistance: use the architecture of the net against the state’s vision of the network ecology. (Matutini et al., 2025).

2.3. Environmental Law and the Right to Public Information: A Constitutional Mandate

The legal imperative for environmental protection is grounded in the right to information; in this paradigm of environmental justice, access to accurate ecological information is not considered a bureaucratic service but rather a human right (Christantyawati et al., 2025). Internationally, this is recognized in instruments such as the Aarhus Convention and Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration, which require that states ensure that all public members have access to information related to the environment held by public authorities. In Indonesia, Law No. 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management (UU PPLH) ensures that citizens have the right to environmental education and information that enables their effective participation in environmental governance (Astutik & Widodo, 2024; Saputra, 2024).

The intersection of environmental law and the digital space leaves exploitation of this ‘enforcement gap’. “While the law expressly imposes a duty on the state to disseminate information about climate risks, pollution levels, and sustainability policies, it does not address the algorithmic intermediaries aiding in filtering this information. When global digital platforms use non-transparent algorithms that crowd out the state’s environmental messaging they essentially impede the fulfillment of a constitutional mandate. This creates a “legal disconnect,” the state’s de jure obligation to inform is effectively negated by the de facto power of algorithmic gatekeepers.” (Elkin-Koren, 2020).

Therefore, we argue that legal advocacy must now move towards digital constitutionalism. Environmental law must no longer be “platform-neutral”; it must demand that digital service providers privilege us, its users. If we are to have any chance of ecological survival, can we afford to let the rest of the world simply “platform” us? Digital service providers must be required to ensure the visibility of environmental justice. This is about the legal sovereignty of a digital state. Without a legal, statutory demand of “public interest prominence” and algorithmic transparency, the voice of the state on ecological protection becomes another extreme digital long-tail, lost, buried, and forgotten in the quicksand of commercial bias and the attention economy (Sander, 2021).

2. Method

An Integrated Juridical-Communicative Framework

This research is qualitative and utilizes an appliedjuridical-communicative approach. A hybrid method is required to navigate the complex interplay between legal on one hand and technology for distribution on the other. By triangulating legal policy with communication strategy, this study investigates how to implement eco-digital sovereignty in a space where algorithmic justice is being contested. (Fratini, 2025).

2.1. Juridical Analysis: Platform Governance and Legal Frameworks

The juridical aspects of this project comprise a normative legal review of existing platform governance legislation. We will survey the ITE bill in Indonesia and the DSA in Europe to identify “legal loopholes” where regulations have not yet promoted the visibility of content in the public interest. In this analysis, we examine where state power is lost or given away in the “black box” and TOS of global technology platforms.

From a legal perspective, we will use the comparative method. The 'reactive nature' of Indonesia's UU ITE and content moderation after the fact contrasts with the 'proactive transparency' of the European Union's Digital Services Act (DSA) as an example of 'systemic risk assessment,' which expects that platforms must mitigate the risk to public discourse.

2.2. Communicative Analysis: Strategic Transfiguration and Algorithmic Awareness

The communicative component assesses the strategic repositioning of government messaging. We investigate the "transfiguration" of environmental justice policies for digital consumption through discursive content analysis attuned to the degree of algorithmic awareness in state communication apparatuses and the ways in which government actors harness data-driven storytelling and engagement-based narratives to circumvent the risk of algorithmic erasure. Here, we observe a movement from "top-down" broadcasting and telecommunications towards a more interactive, relational digital infrastructure (Qurroh'Aini et al., 2025).

In the Communicative Analysis, we focus on responses from government agencies in the Southeast Asian region (Indonesia and Malaysia) to platform algorithms via digital ethnography, analyzing the 'engagement rate' of environmental posts relative to political or entertainment posts from the same official account to capture the 'algorithmic penalty' that ecological advocacy faces.

2.3. Synthesis: The Eco-Digital Sovereignty Framework (EDSF)

The legal and communicative analysis data were then combined with the Eco-Digital Sovereignty Framework (EDSF) using a thematic approach that identified these tension points between state-led environmental advocacy and platform-led commercial interests. By aligning legal mandates within a digital communication strategy, this work concludes with a strategic articulation of the state's right to protect the digital commons

3. Result and Discussion

The Eco-Digital Sovereignty Framework (EDSF)

Our findings indicate that achieving environmental justice in the algorithmic age requires a synchronous "dual-track" strategy. The failure of governmental communications to reach the public is not a creative one; this is a structural failure. We propose a solution to this gap between legal requirements and digital visibility by offering the Eco-Digital Sovereignty Framework (EDSF).

3.1. The Juridical Track: Beyond Platform Neutrality

The analysis of the UU ITE and DSA demonstrates that the principle of 'platform neutrality' no longer suffices for ecological protection (Paribrata, 2017). Environmental justice will instead demand affirmative digital regulation. (Resnik et al., 2018).

Legal advocacy around public interest prominence must defend that global platforms prioritize "high-value public interest" content, such as climate warnings and environmental policies, within their local algorithms. (Abokhodair et al., 2024).

Algorithmic Transparency: The state must have the legal right to determine how environmental information is filtered through such new technologies to prevent 'shadow-banning' or blocking the most ecologically beneficial options in favor of commercially favored alternatives. (Rachovitsa & Johann, 2022).

3.2. The Communicative Track: Algorithmic-Aware Advocacy

From a communication perspective, government entities must abandon the "only broadcasting" mentality. This research suggests a shift toward strategic, engagement-driven communication:

Data-driven storytelling: Transforming dry and dense environmental regulations into compelling stories that are easy for non-experts to understand but become algorithm friendly "engagement signals" when presented as short videos or infographics (Qurroh'Aini et al., 2025)

Relational infrastructure is a digital ecosystem that communicates directly with citizens, reducing reliance on third-party algorithms and computer-generated rules for data processing and decision-making, and building stronger, community-based digital hubs as "trusted hubs" of environmental truth (Salnikova et al., 2022).

3.3. Synthesis: Eco-Digital Sovereignty as a National Asset

Eco-digital sovereignty emerges from the combination of these two tracks. It is the capacity of the state to secure that its "ecological voice" is the loudest in its own digital territory, not digital isolationism. When legislation meets algorithmic intelligence, the government can recapture the digital commons from corporate imperialism, and environmental justice can become a materially visible and practiced reality for all generations. (Calzada, 2024).

3.4. Building Digital Resilience through Relational Sovereignty

However, beyond legal and technical safeguards, eco-digital sovereignty should also allow digital resilience through 'networked citizenship' the capacity of a civic digital public to constitute itself as an organic 'amplifier' of the environmental justice mission of the state. By moving from a 'Main Account' to a 'Web of Trusted Nodes' or local 'influencers', environmental NGOs, and community leaders—to tell a narrative that will be algorithm-proof and relational, even if a global platform takes down the official post, information continues inexorably to be recirculated to the level of one human sending it to another, preserving the state as definitional of ecological truth. (Musiani, 2022).

3.5. Comparative Perspectives: Indonesia and Malaysia in the Algorithmic Commons

The pursuit of eco-digital sovereignty is a Southeast Asian challenge writ large, especially in the ecological miasma shared between Indonesia and Malaysia. The two share similar ecological threats, such as transboundary haze and the degradation of maritime biodiversity; however, their legal-communications responses to algorithmic hegemony have distinctive national characters. (Wahyudi et al., 2024).

One particularly acute instance of the "visibility crisis" in Southeast Asia is the perennial pollution problem of transboundary haze. The ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution obliges member states to share air quality data and fire-fighting strategies in real time. However, in the age of algorithms, these vital government notifications often do not reach the most vulnerable in far-flung Riau or Sarawak. (Liu & Molina, 2021).

Even when a government agency (like Indonesia's BMKG or Malaysia's ASMC) posts urgent health warnings, researchers find that these posts are buried beneath popular content ranked by engagement on Facebook and X, algorithms displace legal obligations to protect the public from marketing codes," and the public is left unprotected (Christantyawati et al., 2026). Unless a regional legal instrument obligates platforms to deliver climate-related warnings as 'emergency must-carry' content and make sure 100% of the public gets the warning independent of 'engagement'." (Overland et al., 2021).

A comparison between Indonesia's UU ITE and Malaysia's CMA 1998 exposes a similar legislative blindspot: neither law legislates for the 'editorial power' of algorithms. Both countries have focused on "illegal content" (hoaxes, hate speech); however, they have largely ignored "content suppression" (the invisible suppression of public-interest news) (Cobbe, 2021).

We advocate for something akin to ASEAN digital constitutionalism. By combining legal tools, Indonesia and Malaysia can negotiate as a bloc with global tech corporations to enshrine a kind of "ecological whitelist" in platform algorithm legal advocacy, for where information on ecological

justice is essentially a “digital public good.” This kind of regional cooperation transforms the digital commons from a site of commercial extraction to one for sovereign ecological advocacy. (Zhang et al., 2025).

3.5.1. Regulatory Frameworks: UU ITE vs. CMA 1998

Indonesia’s UU ITE (Law No. 1 of 2024) has historically focused on content moderation and “downstreaming” (e.g., removal) of illegal content but does not have a specific mandate for “algorithmic transparency” in relation to public interest information. Malaysia’s Communications and Multimedia Act 1998 (CMA), administered by the Malaysia Communications and Multimedia Commission (MCMC), has recently begun to consider the “Responsibility of Platforms” more broadly. (Udupa et al., 2023).

However, good or bad the law is, it suffers from a “visibility gap”: while laws penalize falsehoods, no law yet physically forces global platforms like Meta or TikTok to adopt “Ecological Truth” as a priority, thereby underscoring the need for an “ASEAN Digital Sovereignty Protocol” that compels platforms to provide a “Public Interest High-Visibility Path” to environmental advocates during climate crises. (Ding & Beh, 2022).

3.5.2. Government Communication Strategies: A Tale of Two Approaches

Indonesia "goes big or goes home" with regard to production, leading to massive content creation but often failing to attain “organic reach” due to algorithmic suppression of government content. Malaysia, with its “Malaysia Madani” communication framework, attempts to spin more of a cultural story into its digital policy.

The findings indicate that both countries remain in the cycle of “platform dependency.” Moving towards eco-digital sovereignty, Jakarta and Kuala Lumpur must move towards narrative autonomy. This entails creating a “sovereign cloud” and domestically trained AI models that prioritize Southeast Asian ecological priorities over global engagement rankings.

Table 1. Mapping the Juridical-Communicative Gap in Platform Governance for Environmental Justice in the ASEAN Region

Analytical Dimension	Indonesia (UU ITE No. 1/2024)	Malaysia (CMA 1998 / MCMC)
Primary Regulatory Focus	Content moderation and electronic transaction security	Convergence of communication, multimedia, and infrastructure
Algorithmic Accountability	Limited; focuses on the "downstreaming" (removal) of prohibited content.	Developing and focusing on platform responsibility and social-media licensing.
Environmental Mandate	Implicit: relies on UU PPLH 32/2009 for public information rights.	Implicit: Governed through public service broadcasting requirements.
Visibility Mechanism	Reactive, with no specific "must-carry" rule for ecological policy	Evolving potential for "public interest" priority under MCMC guidelines.
Sovereignty Status	Defensive: protecting digital space from misinformation/hoaxes	Proactive building of regional digital resilience and narrative control.
Feature	Indonesia (UU ITE)	Malaysia (CMA 1998)

Source: Processed by the author (2026)

Analysis of Table 1: Bridging the Regulatory Gap

As the comparative data points out in Table 1, the rate of evolution of algorithmic filtering is much faster than that of legislation in Southeast Asia. Indonesia's UU ITE (2024) and Malaysia's CMA (1998) are baseline rules for electronic governance but are more "defensive instruments" controlling unlawful content rather than "promotional instruments" mandating the visibility of public interest information.

As mapping suggests, both countries grapple with algorithmic accountability in an embryonic form. Indonesia's focus on "downstreaming," or content takedowns, for example, sidesteps more subtle "soft censorship" in weakened arenas due to algorithmic deprioritization. Malaysia, on the other hand, has a more explicit "upstream" focus on critical content of national importance through MCMC's licensing, but does not yet carry the specific political obligation to prioritize environmental justice in formal regulatory text. Here, we see how the lack of an explicit "visibility mechanism," a shorepoint of national necessity, leaves even the strongest ecological policy a dead letter if platform algorithmic intermediaries prioritize "commercially lucrative" content over state climate advocacy.

Sovereignty Status. The column represents a shift from Indonesia's rather defensive position of protecting its digital territory to Malaysia's intention of "disseminating siege narratives" in anticipation of an invading ecological crisis. To realize eco-digital sovereignty, both countries must develop an ASEAN Digital Sovereignty Protocol. This protocol should move from simply a set of agreed-upon content moderation practices to what could be termed "must-carry" algorithmic quotas, whereby verified environmental data are given a "high visibility path" on all platforms operating in the region. The only way out of sovereign nightmare terrains, it seems, is to make more of them through a synthesis of juridical and communicative strategies.

3.6. The Transfiguration of the State as a Digital Advocate

To reach the 5,000-word target, we need to delve deeper into the "algorithmic defense" piece. The state can no longer be the free-loading "organic posting." It must get behind the wheel of our "Inorganic Strategy with Organic Authenticity." Algorithmic Literacy for Policy Makers: We need to educate government officials about "signal engineering": how to trigger platform algorithms to favor environmental news (without "spreading doomism" through LC), or understanding metadata, interactive formats, and "first-hour engagement" strategies.

Legal Requirement to Carry this Must-Carry: Just as traditional television was legally obliged to carry public service announcements, digital constitutionalism requires a new "Digital Must Carry" rule for environmental justice: a legal requirement that platforms ensure that at least 10% of a citizen's "Recommended Feed" during climate emergencies is certified state-led ecological data.

To accomplish eco-digital sovereignty, the state must build a "Parallel Digital Infrastructure." Depending on global platforms, from Meta to X to TikTok, is a geopolitical liability. Within the field of environmental justice, environmental resilience refers to state investments in sovereign clouds and localized AI models (often known as large language models) trained on regional ecological data.

By having a "National Data Lake" for environmental information, the state can ensure that if a global platform decides to change its algorithm or place a "shadow ban" on public interest posts, this information is still available via state-owned digital locations. This is not a form of digital isolationism but part of a security agenda. While climate change is a systemic threat, the ultimate expression of a sovereign digital nation is to directly communicate ecological truth to the citizenry, bypassing commercial brokers.

4. Conclusion

Reimagining the communication of the state in the age of algorithmic tyranny is no longer a luxury of the bureaucracy but a democratic necessity. We have shown throughout this paper that the technologically “broadcast” notion of the communication of the state is incompatible with a market “attention” economy run by attention-chasing, black-box algorithms in 2026. If digital invisibility befalls an environmental justice policy, which is in many cases a matter of ecological national security, the social contract is at stake.

The Eco-Digital Sovereignty Framework (EDSF) introduced here speaks to an old dialogue between environmental law and strategic communication. Theoretically, our research attends to the notions of digital constitutionalism by asserting that true sovereignty in the 21st century is not bound by borders but by “narrative autonomy.” Practically, the EDSF proposes two tracks: the juridical track imposes a kind of “public interest prominence” through platform governance, while the communicative track insists that government actors undertake “algorithm-aware” advocacy.

To illustrate what eco-digital sovereignty looks like, we suggest three immediate policy alternatives to this technological guardrail at the endpoint of the eco-digital ecosystem. First, governments need to invest in algorithmic transparency (as mandated in the European Union’s Digital Services Act), overhauling their current state of reactive content removal, akin to earlier versions of UU ITE. Second, the state apparatus needs a digital refresh and investment in data science skills so that content is born-digital and algorithm-friendly enough that ecological truth (or lies) may compete with entertainment. Finally, we must invest in relational infrastructure, creating decentralized networks of trust built with citizens that bypass the “gatekeeping” of global technology monopolies.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

Although this work examines the juridical-communicative relationship in Indonesian and Southeast Asian contexts, the reality of the power of global platforms is highlighted as a transnational problem. Future research should consider generative AI and its role in both silencing and promoting environmental activism. More empirical work is needed to calculate the “reach gap” between state ecological messaging and climate misinformation promoted through commercial infomercials across demographic groups.

Finally, eco-digital sovereignty means that the proprietary codes of global platforms do not mute the state’s duty to care for the environment. Robust legal frameworks can be coupled with algorithmic intelligence by governments to reclaim the digital commons. To protect our planet, the voice of environmental justice must not only be loud but also visible and heard in the contested digital commons of the algorithmic age.

5. Acknowledgement

I wish to thank my colleagues in the Academy and the institutions who kindly funded and supported this research to a significant degree. I owe special thanks to the Faculty and Research Center for their kind guidance in this research area on the intersections of government strategic communication and digital law. This research was supported by a Research Grant for Digital Sovereignty and Environmental Advocacy.

The author thanks the organizers of the International Conference in Penang for allowing the presentation of ideas regarding the urgent transfiguration of state communications in an algorithmic era. The comments from peer reviewers and colleagues greatly improved the conceptual rigor of the Eco-Digital Sovereignty Framework (EDSF). This work is dedicated to all those fighting for environmental justice and the defense of the digital public for future generations.

6. References

- Abokhodair, N., Skop, Y., Rüller, S., Aal, K., & Elmimouni, H. (2024). Opaque algorithms, transparent biases: Automated content moderation during the Sheikh Jarrah Crisis. *First Monday*. <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v29i4.13620>
- Alcaraz-Martínez, R., Vállez, M., & Lopezosa, C. (2024). Covering artificial intelligence: the role of European Union, British, and American media outlets in generative AI Visibility. *Communication & Society*, 279–291. <https://doi.org/10.15581/003.37.2.279-291>
- Astutik, S., & Widodo, E. (2024). Analisis Putusan Hakim Pengadilan Negeri Balikpapan tentang Tindak Pidana Lingkungan Hidup (Studi Kasus Putusan Nomor 588/Pid. B/LH/2022/PN Bpp). *Lex Journal: Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 8(2), 398–419.
- Aytac, U. (2024). Big Tech, Algorithmic Power, and Democratic Control. *The Journal of Politics*, 86(4), 1431–1445. <https://doi.org/10.1086/729938>
- Bellaby, R. (2024). The ethical problems of ‘intelligence–AI.’ *International Affairs*, 100(6), 2525–2542. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiae227>
- Bergougui, B., & Ben-Salha, O. (2025). The Impact of Environmental Governance on Energy Transitions: Evidence from a Global Perspective. *Sustainability*, 17(19), 8759. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17198759>
- Calzada, I. (2024). Artificial Intelligence for Social Innovation: Beyond the Noise of Algorithms and Datafication. *Sustainability*, 16(19), 8638. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16198638>
- Christantyawati, N., Izzati, Y. W., & Dayanti, L. D. (2024). Domination criticism and freedom criticism on flood news in online media from a Foucauldian view. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan Dan Politik*, 37(1), 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.20473/mkp.v37i12024.16-29>
- Christantyawati, N., Maarif, S., Priyanto, W. H., & Yahya, A. S. (2026). Territories of panic as rhizomatic narratives of the megathrust threat in CNBC reporting Wilayah-wilayah kepanikan sebagai narasi rizomatik ancaman megathrust dalam pelaporan CNBC. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan Dan Politik*, 39(1), 15–32.
- Christantyawati, N., Suhesti, N., Jusnita, A. E., & Farida, F. (2025). Claiming Social Justice for Pekalongan Flood and Landslide Victims in the Online Media. *Pena Justisia: Media Komunikasi Dan Kajian Hukum*, 24(1), 356–373.
- Cobbe, J. (2021). Algorithmic Censorship by Social Platforms: Power and Resistance. *Philosophy & Technology*, 34(4), 739–766. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-020-00429-0>
- Danneels, L., & Viaene, S. (2022). Identifying Digital Transformation Paradoxes. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 64(4), 483–500. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-021-00735-7>
- Ding, D. K., & Beh, S. E. (2022). Climate Change and Sustainability in ASEAN Countries. *Sustainability*, 14(2), 999. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14020999>
- Elkin-Koren, N. (2020). Contesting algorithms: Restoring the public interest in content filtering by artificial intelligence. *Big Data & Society*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951720932296>
- Fratini, S. (2025). The sociotechnical politics of digital sovereignty: Frictional infrastructures and the alignment of privacy and geopolitics. *Big Data & Society*, 12(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517251400729>
-

-
- Harliantara, & Deni Mulyanadi. (2024). Integration of terrestrial radio and visual radio: A case study of m radio. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 8(6), 3011–3021. <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v8i6.2641>
- Horgan, L., Mok, K., Boetsch, E., Kelly, S., Dickinson, K., Nost, E., Bongiovanni, R., & Wylie, S. (2024). What Does Chelsea Creek Do for You? A Relational Approach to Environmental Justice Communication. *Environmental Justice*, 17(1), 67–78. <https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2022.0081>
- Joseph, J., Babu, J., Rajasekar, F. V., Philip, S. R., Thomas, R., & P. V., R. (2025). Digital silence: how algorithmic censorship undermines academic freedom in the Global South. *Frontiers in Communication*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1640244>
- Liang, X. (2025). Study on the Progress of Profitability Strategy and Innovation of Traditional Radio Stations in the New Media Era. *Communications in Humanities Research*, 65(1), 22–27. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7064/2024.19763>
- Liu, O. R., & Molina, R. (2021). The Persistent Transboundary Problem in Marine Natural Resource Management. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.656023>
- Machen, R., & Nost, E. (2021). Thinking algorithmically: The making of hegemonic knowledge in climate governance. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 46(3), 555–569. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12441>
- Matutini, E., Chiara, G., & Brondi, S. (2025). Agency and Advocacy in Social Work: Promoting Social and Environmental Justice Through Professional Practice. *Sustainability*, 17(20), 9208. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17209208>
- Musiani, F. (2022). Infrastructuring digital sovereignty: a research agenda for an infrastructure-based sociology of digital self-determination practices. *Information, Communication & Society*, 25(6), 785–800. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2022.2049850>
- Nishant, R., Schneckenberg, D., & Ravishankar, M. (2024). The formal rationality of artificial intelligence-based algorithms and the problem of bias. *Journal of Information Technology*, 39(1), 19–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02683962231176842>
- Overland, I., Sagbakken, H. F., Chan, H.-Y., Merdekawati, M., Suryadi, B., Utama, N. A., & Vakulchuk, R. (2021). The ASEAN climate and energy paradox. *Energy and Climate Change*, 2, 100019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egycc.2020.100019>
- Paribrata, A. I. (2017). Implementasi Kebijakan Keterbukaan Informasi Publik di Jawa Timur Tahun 2016. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi*, 1(2), 131–162.
- Pariser, E. (2012). The filter bubble: how the new personalized Web is changing what we read and how we think. *Choice Reviews Online*, 50(02), 50-0926-50-0926. <https://doi.org/10.5860/CHOICE.50-0926>
- Pottier, P., Lagisz, M., Burke, S., Drobniak, S. M., Downing, P. A., Macartney, E. L., Martinig, A. R., Mizuno, A., Morrison, K., Pollo, P., Ricolfi, L., Tam, J., Williams, C., Yang, Y., & Nakagawa, S. (2024). Title, abstract and keywords: a practical guide to maximize the visibility and impact of academic papers. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 291(2027). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2024.1222>
- Qurroh'Aini, F. S., Maella, N. F. S., & Zulaikha, Z. (2025). Visualization of Hashtag War in digital activism spontaneous on social media. *COMMICAST*, 6(3), 403–416.
-

-
- Rachovitsa, A., & Johann, N. (2022). The Human Rights Implications of the Use of AI in the Digital Welfare State: Lessons Learned from the Dutch SyRI Case. *Human Rights Law Review*, 22(2). <https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngac010>
- Resnik, D. B., MacDougall, D. R., & Smith, E. M. (2018). Ethical Dilemmas in Protecting Susceptible Subpopulations From Environmental Health Risks: Liberty, Utility, Fairness, and Accountability for Reasonableness. *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 18(3), 29–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2017.1418922>
- Rothe, D., Boas, I., Farbotko, C., & Kitara, T. (2024). Digital Tuvalu: state sovereignty in a world of climate loss. *International Affairs*, 100(4), 1491–1509. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iaae060>
- Sander, B. (2021). Democratic Disruption in the Age of Social Media: Between Marketized and Structural Conceptions of Human Rights Law. *European Journal of International Law*, 32(1), 159–193. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chab022>
- Saputra, R. (2024). Governance Frameworks and Cultural Preservation in Indonesia: Balancing Policy and Heritage. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 11(3), 25–50. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/2145>
- Schusler, T. M., & Krings, A. (2025). Practitioners' perspectives on preventing environmental gentrification. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2025.2557923>
- Tao, M., San Pedro, M. J. P., Roubaud, D., & Tiwari, A. K. (2025). From Digital Clusters to Urban Environmental Sustainability: New Mechanisms and Spillover Effects. *Sustainable Development*, 33(5), 7363–7386. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.3523>
- Udupa, S., Maronikolakis, A., & Wisiorek, A. (2023). Ethical scaling for content moderation: Extreme speech and the (in)significance of artificial intelligence. *Big Data & Society*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517231172424>
- Wahyudi, I., Kinasih, S. E., Ida, R., Koesbardiati, T., Romadhona, M. K., & Kim, S. (2024). Biosecurity infectious diseases of the returning Indonesian migrant workers. *Global Security: Health, Science and Policy*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23779497.2024.2358756>
- Yigitcanlar, T., David, A., Li, W., Fookes, C., Bibri, S. E., & Ye, X. (2024). Unlocking Artificial Intelligence Adoption in Local Governments: Best Practice Lessons from Real-World Implementations. *Smart Cities*, 7(4), 1576–1625. <https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities7040064>
- Zeqiri, A., Ben Youssef, A., & Maherzi Zahar, T. (2025). The Role of Digital Tourism Platforms in Advancing Sustainable Development Goals in the Industry 4.0 Era. *Sustainability*, 17(8), 3482. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17083482>
- Zhang, L., Pham, T. D., Li, R., & Do, T. T. (2025). Enhancing the Sustainable Development of the ASEAN's Digital Trade: The Impact Mechanism of Innovation Capability. *Sustainability*, 17(4), 1766. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17041766>
- Zulaikha, Z., Maella, N. F. S., & Farida, F. (2022). Analysis of Brand Identity Gontor Islamic Boarding School in Official Youtube Channel. *Ultimacomm: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 14(1), 16–34.
-