

Review Article

Open Access

Technology is Global, Accountability is Not: Platform Asymmetry, AI Disinformation and Linguistic Justice in Asia

Debarati Guha

DW Deutsche Welle, Kurt-Schumacher Street no 3, Bonn-Beuel, Germany

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence is transforming the global information environment by reshaping how information is produced, distributed and verified. While debates on AI governance have largely focused on technological innovation, regulation and geopolitical competition, less attention has been paid to how protection against AI-generated disinformation is distributed across linguistic communities. This article argues that a central inequality of the AI era lies not only in unequal access to digital technologies but also in the uneven distribution of platform accountability and verification capacity.

Drawing on scholarship on platform governance, surveillance capitalism, digital colonialism and journalism studies, the article develops the concept of **platform asymmetry** to explain how global technology platforms allocate moderation resources, safety infrastructures and accountability mechanisms unevenly across linguistic communities. It also introduces the concept of the **asymmetry of verification**, referring to the widening gap between the democratization of synthetic content production and the unequal distribution of resources required to authenticate information.

Using qualitative comparative case studies of Myanmar, India and Indonesia, alongside policy analysis and insights from multilingual journalistic practice, the article examines how linguistic inequalities in platform governance affect journalism's democratic role. It argues that AI-generated disinformation should be understood not only as a technological challenge but also as a challenge of information justice, because unequal platform protections create unequal conditions for verification and public knowledge production.

The article proposes **language equity** as a normative principle for AI governance. It argues that digital justice requires a more equitable distribution of multilingual moderation systems, verification infrastructures and accountability mechanisms. Unless accountability becomes as global as the technologies themselves, artificial intelligence risks reinforcing existing inequalities within the global information order and weakening journalism's capacity to sustain informed democratic communication.

*Corresponding author

Debarati Guha, DW Deutsche Welle, Kurt-Schumacher Street no 3, Bonn-Beuel, Germany.

Received: August 25, 2026; **Accepted:** August 29, 2026; **Published:** September 08, 2026

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, AI-generated Disinformation, Platform Asymmetry, Asymmetry of Verification, Journalism Studies, Platform Governance, Digital Colonialism, Surveillance Capitalism, Linguistic Justice, Language Equity, South Asia, Southeast Asia

Introduction

Technology is Global. Accountability is Not

Artificial intelligence is transforming the global information environment at a speed that challenges established assumptions about communication, journalism and democratic accountability. The rapid expansion of generative AI has intensified long-standing concerns about misinformation and disinformation by enabling the production of convincing synthetic text, images, audio and video at unprecedented scale and relatively low cost.

Much of the current debate surrounding AI governance, however, remains concentrated around technological innovation, regulatory competition and geopolitical rivalry among major centres of

technological power, particularly the United States, China and the European Union. These debates are important, but they often overlook a fundamental question:

Who is Protected from AI-Generated Disinformation, and in Which Language?

This question is particularly important for journalism. The challenge posed by generative AI is not simply that false information can be produced more easily. Falsehood, propaganda and manipulation have always existed within public communication. The deeper challenge lies in the changing relationship between information production and information verification. When synthetic content can be created rapidly and distributed across multiple languages, societies require stronger institutions capable of establishing authenticity, providing context and maintaining public trust.

Journalism has traditionally performed this verification function. Through editorial processes, source evaluation and professional standards, journalists help citizens distinguish credible information

from misinformation and manipulation. Generative AI places increasing pressure on this role by dramatically expanding the quantity, speed and sophistication of content requiring verification.

This article argues that one of the defining inequalities of the AI era is not simply unequal access to technology, but unequal access to protection and verification capacity.

Global platforms such as social media networks and search engines operate across linguistic and national boundaries. Yet the systems designed to reduce digital harms — including content moderation, fact-checking partnerships, trust and safety teams, transparency mechanisms and AI detection tools — are not distributed equally across languages. Users communicating in globally dominant languages frequently benefit from more developed safety infrastructures, while many communities using under-resourced languages remain more vulnerable to harmful content, coordinated manipulation and AI-generated deception.

This issue is especially significant in Asia. The region contains some of the world's largest digital populations and some of the most linguistically diverse societies. Countries such as India and Indonesia have experienced extraordinary growth in internet and social media use, while Myanmar demonstrates the consequences of weak platform governance during periods of political crisis. Across these contexts, digital participation has expanded faster than the development of multilingual accountability mechanisms.

The problem is therefore not simply whether citizens can access digital platforms. Increasingly, the critical question is whether they receive comparable levels of protection once they are connected.

Existing scholarship has provided important insights into the political economy of digital communication. Research on surveillance capitalism has demonstrated how platform business models rely on extracting and monetizing user attention and behavioural data [1].

Studies of digital colonialism have examined how contemporary digital infrastructures reproduce patterns of dependency and unequal power between technology-producing and technology-consuming societies [2]. Scholarship on platform governance has shown how technology companies increasingly shape the circulation of information through moderation policies, ranking systems and algorithmic decisions [3,4].

Journalism studies have similarly documented how digital platforms have transformed news production and distribution. Platforms have become essential intermediaries between news organizations and audiences, yet their commercial incentives often prioritize engagement and visibility rather than verification and public accountability [5,6].

Despite these contributions, insufficient attention has been paid to the linguistic distribution of platform accountability. Existing discussions of AI governance and digital inequality frequently examine regulation, algorithmic bias or technological access. Less attention has been given to whether users speaking different languages experience fundamentally different levels of protection within the same global communication systems.

To address this gap, this article introduces two concepts.

First, platform asymmetry refers to the unequal distribution of platform governance capacities across linguistic communities.

These capacities include moderation resources, fact-checking partnerships, transparency mechanisms, safety investments and crisis-response systems. The concept shifts attention from traditional questions of digital access towards the unequal distribution of protection within digital environments.

Second, the article introduces the concept of the asymmetry of verification. This refers to the growing imbalance between the widespread ability to produce synthetic information and the concentrated capacity to verify it. Generative AI has made content creation increasingly accessible, but authentication continues to depend on specialized technologies, institutional expertise and financial resources that remain unevenly distributed.

Together, these concepts provide a framework for analysing how AI-generated disinformation affects journalism in multilingual societies. The central concern is not merely the existence of false information, but whether journalists and citizens possess sufficient institutional resources to identify, challenge and contextualize increasingly sophisticated forms of manipulation.

The article makes three contributions. First, it develops platform asymmetry as a framework for understanding unequal distributions of digital protection across linguistic communities. Second, it introduces the asymmetry of verification to explain how generative AI is changing the relationship between information production and authentication. Third, it contributes to journalism studies by demonstrating how these inequalities affect journalism's democratic function in multilingual digital environments.

The argument proceeds as follows. The next section reviews scholarship on journalism, platform governance, surveillance capitalism, digital colonialism and AI-generated disinformation. A methodology section then explains the qualitative comparative case study approach used in this article. The article subsequently develops the concepts of platform asymmetry and verification asymmetry before examining Myanmar, India and Indonesia as comparative cases. The final sections discuss implications for journalism and propose language equity as a principle for more inclusive AI governance.

Literature Review: Journalism, Platform Governance and Unequal Information Infrastructures Journalism, Verification and Platformised Communication

Journalism's democratic legitimacy has historically rested on its capacity to verify information, establish context and provide accountability within public communication. Through professional norms, editorial procedures and institutional routines, journalists have acted as intermediaries between events and public understanding, helping societies distinguish evidence-based reporting from rumours, propaganda and misinformation [7,8]. Verification is therefore not merely a professional practice but a central democratic function of journalism.

The digital transformation of communication has fundamentally altered the conditions under which journalism performs this role. The rise of digital platforms has changed how news is produced, distributed and consumed. News organizations increasingly depend on platforms for audience access and visibility, while platform infrastructures increasingly influence the circulation and prioritization of information [5,6].

This relationship has created a structural tension. Journalism is organized around principles of accuracy, accountability and public value, whereas platforms are largely optimized around

engagement, attention and user retention. Algorithmic systems often reward content that generates interaction rather than content that has been carefully verified or socially valuable [9]. As a result, journalism increasingly operates within communication environments where professional verification competes with commercial and algorithmic logics.

Generative artificial intelligence intensifies this tension. The ability to produce convincing synthetic text, images, audio and video at low cost has expanded the volume of content requiring verification while simultaneously weakening traditional indicators of authenticity.

Images, voices and videos can no longer automatically function as evidence because technological tools can reproduce increasingly realistic forms of synthetic communication.

For journalism, this transformation creates a paradox. At precisely the moment when verification becomes more important, the resources required to perform verification become more demanding. Journalists must increasingly combine traditional reporting skills with digital forensic capabilities, technological expertise and cross-platform monitoring.

These challenges become particularly complex in multilingual societies. Information flows increasingly cross linguistic boundaries, with false narratives moving between languages, platforms and communities. Verification therefore requires not only technical capacity but also linguistic and cultural expertise. Yet these capacities are unevenly distributed across media systems.

Understanding AI-generated disinformation therefore requires attention not only to technological developments but also to the institutional conditions under which journalism attempts to maintain trustworthy communication.

AI Governance Beyond Technological Competition

The rapid development of artificial intelligence has transformed debates about technology governance. Existing research has examined questions of transparency, accountability, algorithmic bias, safety and regulatory oversight [4,10]. Governments and international organizations have increasingly developed frameworks intended to address the social consequences of AI, including the European Union's regulatory approach and emerging governance initiatives in Asia [11-13].

However, much of the global AI governance debate remains dominated by actors that either develop advanced technologies or possess significant regulatory influence. Public discussions frequently focus on competition among major technological powers, particularly the United States, China and Europe.

This focus creates an important analytical limitation. It privileges the perspectives of societies that design, regulate and commercialize AI systems while paying comparatively less attention to societies that primarily consume and adapt these technologies.

Across much of South and Southeast Asia, AI governance is experienced less through participation in global rule-making and more through dependence on technologies developed elsewhere. Citizens increasingly rely on global platforms for communication, political participation and news consumption, while having limited influence over the systems that determine how information is moderated, ranked and distributed.

This creates a form of governance asymmetry. The societies most affected by AI-mediated information systems are not always the societies shaping their design or accountability frameworks.

The issue becomes particularly significant when considering linguistic diversity. AI systems, moderation tools and verification technologies often perform best in languages with extensive datasets, commercial incentives and established research infrastructures. Consequently, linguistic inequality becomes embedded within technological systems themselves.

The question is therefore not only whether AI systems are transparent or regulated, but whether their protections are distributed equitably across linguistic communities.

Surveillance Capitalism and the Political Economy of Information Integrity

To understand why platform accountability is unevenly distributed, it is necessary to examine the economic structures underlying digital platforms.

Zuboff's (2019) concept of surveillance capitalism highlights how contemporary technology companies generate economic value through the extraction, analysis and monetization of behavioural data. Within this model, human attention becomes a central resource, and engagement becomes a key measure of platform success.

This economic logic has important consequences for information integrity. Content that produces strong emotional responses often generates greater interaction than carefully verified information. As a result, platform systems may amplify content based on its capacity to attract attention rather than its reliability or public value.

Generative AI increases these pressures. Synthetic content can now be produced, personalized and distributed at a scale previously impossible. Political actors, commercial organizations and coordinated influence networks can generate persuasive material rapidly, while the resources required to verify such content remain limited.

Surveillance capitalism also helps explain why platform safety investments vary across languages. Developing sophisticated moderation systems, maintaining multilingual fact-checking partnerships and employing language specialists require significant financial resources. However, these investments do not always correspond to the scale of potential social harm. Instead, they are frequently shaped by commercial priorities, regulatory pressure and reputational risk.

Languages associated with economically powerful markets often receive greater investment because failures create higher institutional costs. By contrast, communities using less commercially significant languages may remain comparatively under-protected despite facing significant risks.

Platform asymmetry therefore cannot be understood only as a technological problem. It is also a consequence of economic incentives embedded within contemporary digital capitalism.

Digital Colonialism and Global Information Inequalities (Revised Paragraph)

While surveillance capitalism explains the commercial logic of digital platforms, the concept of digital colonialism situates

these developments within broader structures of global power. Recent scholarship has examined how digital infrastructures reproduce unequal relationships between technology-producing and technology-consuming societies. Rather than representing a complete historical rupture, digital colonialism extends earlier debates on media imperialism, information dependency and technological inequality into the contemporary era of platforms, data extraction and artificial intelligence [14].

Drawing on postcolonial theory argue that contemporary digital systems reproduce forms of extraction and dependency through the concentration of technological power, data resources and decision-making capacities among a relatively small number of corporations and geopolitical actors. Digital colonialism does not imply a simple repetition of historical colonial structures; rather, it describes how digital infrastructures can reproduce asymmetries of power through control over data, platforms, algorithms, labour and technological standards [2,14,15].

Digital colonialism operates through multiple interconnected mechanisms. AI development depends upon global supply chains involving natural resources, computational infrastructure, data extraction and human labour. Content moderation, data annotation and model evaluation frequently rely on workers located in lower-income regions who remain largely invisible within dominant narratives of technological innovation [16-18]. At the same time, data generated by users across the world is consolidated by a limited number of technology companies and transformed into strategic resources for artificial intelligence development.

For multilingual societies, these dynamics have particular significance. Digital infrastructures often embed assumptions about language, knowledge and cultural context that reflect the priorities of dominant technology ecosystems. Languages with limited commercial value or smaller digital footprints frequently receive fewer resources for natural language processing, content moderation and safety mechanisms. Consequently, digital colonialism is not only an economic or infrastructural phenomenon; it is also an epistemic and linguistic one.

For journalism, these dynamics are highly consequential. The infrastructures through which information increasingly circulates are frequently governed by institutions situated outside the societies most affected by their decisions. Local media systems therefore operate within communication environments where they depend upon platforms over which they exercise limited influence. This dependence becomes especially problematic in the age of generative AI, where unequal access to verification technologies and linguistic resources can intensify existing inequalities in information integrity.

Platform Governance and the Missing Language Dimension

Research on platform governance has demonstrated that technology companies increasingly perform functions traditionally associated with public institutions. Through content moderation, recommendation systems, ranking mechanisms and enforcement policies, platforms shape what information becomes visible and how public discourse develops [3].

Existing scholarship has examined platform governance through questions of transparency, accountability, freedom of expression and algorithmic power. These contributions have significantly advanced understanding of how platforms influence contemporary communication.

However, one dimension remains insufficiently explored: the linguistic distribution of platform protection.

Although global platforms operate across hundreds of languages, moderation systems and safety infrastructures are not equally developed across linguistic communities. Research has shown that under-resourced languages frequently face weaker automated detection systems, fewer moderation resources and limited availability of language-specific expertise [19].

The consequences are particularly significant in Asia, where linguistic diversity intersects with rapidly expanding digital populations. Languages such as Burmese, Bengali, Hindi, Tamil, Urdu, Pashto and numerous regional languages represent large communities of digital users, yet they often receive less technological and institutional support than dominant global languages.

Language inequality in platform governance should not be understood merely as a technical translation problem. It reflects broader decisions about where resources are invested, which communities receive attention and whose information environments are considered priorities.

This has direct consequences for journalism. News organizations working in under-resourced languages often face greater challenges in verifying information, identifying manipulated content and responding to coordinated disinformation campaigns. They operate within information environments where platform safeguards may be weaker and verification resources more limited.

Existing literature therefore provides important insights into platform power, AI governance and digital inequality, but it offers insufficient conceptual tools for understanding why protection against digital harms is unevenly distributed across languages.

This article addresses this gap by introducing platform asymmetry and the asymmetry of verification as frameworks for analysing how linguistic inequalities shape information integrity and journalism in the AI era.

Research Methodology and Case Selection

This article employs a qualitative comparative case study approach to examine how linguistic inequalities in platform governance shape exposure to AI-generated disinformation and influence journalism's capacity to perform its verification function. Rather than seeking to measure the prevalence of AI-generated disinformation quantitatively, the study investigates the institutional and structural conditions that determine why some linguistic communities experience greater vulnerability than others.

The methodological approach combines three analytical components: (1) a review of existing scholarship on journalism, platform governance, AI governance, surveillance capitalism and digital colonialism; (2) qualitative analysis of policy documents, institutional reports and documented cases of platform-related information harms; and (3) reflexive insights derived from multilingual journalistic practice in Asian information environments.

The article adopts a comparative case study design because AI-related information challenges cannot be understood independently from their political, linguistic and media contexts. Platform infrastructures may be globally standardized, but their

consequences are shaped by local conditions, including language diversity, regulatory environments, media systems and institutional capacity.

Case Selection

The cases of Myanmar, India and Indonesia were selected through purposive sampling. They represent different configurations of linguistic diversity, digital platform dependence and AI-related information challenges across South and Southeast Asia.

The purpose of selecting these cases is not to suggest that they represent all Asian experiences, but rather to illuminate different dimensions of the broader theoretical argument developed in this article.

Myanmar represents a case of severe platform governance failure in a context where digital platforms became central infrastructures of political communication. The country demonstrates how insufficient linguistic and contextual moderation capacities can contribute to information environments where harmful narratives spread rapidly and where journalism faces significant challenges in providing verification and accountability.

India represents a case of AI-enabled political communication within one of the world's largest democracies and most linguistically diverse societies. The country illustrates how generative AI complicates electoral communication by enabling synthetic content to be produced and adapted across multiple languages and political contexts. India therefore provides insight into the relationship between AI-generated content, linguistic diversity and verification challenges at democratic scale.

Indonesia represents a case of increasing normalization of synthetic media within everyday political communication. As one of the world's largest social media markets and Southeast Asia's largest democracy, Indonesia demonstrates how the challenge of AI-generated content is evolving beyond isolated instances of deception towards a broader transformation of political communication practices.

Together, these cases reveal different manifestations of the same structural problem:

- Myanmar illustrates the consequences of inadequate platform accountability in vulnerable information environments.
- India demonstrates the challenge of verifying AI-generated content within a highly multilingual democratic system.
- Indonesia highlights the normalization of synthetic media and the growing importance of verification infrastructures.

The comparative approach allows the article to move beyond individual incidents and examine the broader relationship between platform governance, linguistic inequality and journalistic verification.

Sources and Analytical Approach

The analysis draws upon four categories of sources.

First, the article engages with academic literature from communication studies, journalism studies, political economy, artificial intelligence governance and digital sociology. This literature provides the conceptual foundation for analysing platform power, information disorder and technological inequality.

Second, the article examines institutional and policy documents produced by international organizations, governments and research

institutions. These include reports on AI governance, platform accountability, digital rights and information integrity.

Third, the study considers documented cases of AI-generated content, misinformation campaigns and platform governance challenges reported by journalists, researchers and civil society organizations. These cases are analysed not as isolated examples of technological misuse but as indicators of broader structural conditions.

Fourth, the article incorporates reflexive insights from multilingual journalistic practice. This perspective is particularly relevant because the study examines journalism not only as an object of analysis but also as an institution experiencing the practical consequences of unequal verification environments. Professional experience within multilingual media environments provides contextual understanding of the challenges faced by journalists working across languages and regions.

The analytical framework developed in this article focuses on three interconnected questions:

- **Distribution of Protection:** How are moderation resources, safety mechanisms and accountability structures distributed across linguistic communities?
- **Distribution of Verification Capacity:** Who possesses the technological, institutional and professional resources required to authenticate increasingly sophisticated synthetic content?
- **Consequences for Journalism:** How do these inequalities affect journalism's ability to perform its democratic role as a verification institution?

These questions guide the interpretation of the cases and connect empirical observations to the concepts of platform asymmetry and the asymmetry of verification.

Limitations

This study has several limitations.

First, the qualitative approach does not attempt to quantify the exact scale of AI-generated disinformation or measure platform performance across all languages. Instead, it examines structural patterns that shape unequal information environments.

Second, the selected cases represent specific experiences within Asia and cannot capture the full linguistic, political and technological diversity of the region. Other contexts, including smaller linguistic communities and non-democratic information environments, may reveal additional dimensions of platform asymmetry.

Third, access to platform data remains a significant limitation. Technology companies generally do not provide comprehensive language-specific information about moderation systems, enforcement decisions or investment priorities. As a result, analysis of platform accountability often relies on transparency reports, external research and documented cases of harm.

Despite these limitations, the comparative qualitative approach is appropriate for examining emerging phenomena where institutional structures, technological developments and social consequences continue to evolve. The purpose of this article is not to provide a complete measurement of AI-related information inequality, but to establish a conceptual framework for understanding how unequal accountability and verification capacity shape the future

of journalism in multilingual digital societies.

Platform Asymmetry and the Asymmetry of Verification: A Framework for Understanding Linguistic Inequality in Digital Journalism

The previous sections have demonstrated that existing scholarship provides important insights into digital inequality, platform power, AI governance and information disorder. Research on surveillance capitalism explains the economic incentives shaping digital platforms; studies of digital colonialism reveal broader structures of technological dependency; and scholarship on platform governance examines how technology companies influence public communication.

However, these approaches leave an important question insufficiently examined:

Why do users and journalists communicate in different languages experience fundamentally different levels of protection and verification capacity within the same global digital infrastructures?

This article argues that answering this question requires moving beyond traditional understandings of digital inequality. Earlier discussions of the digital divide focused primarily on access to technologies, connectivity and digital skills (van Dijk, 2020) [20]. While these remain important, they do not fully capture the inequalities emerging within highly connected societies. In contemporary information environments, participation in digital systems does not guarantee equal protection within those systems.

To address this gap, this article introduces two interconnected concepts:

- Platform Asymmetry – the unequal distribution of digital protection and accountability across linguistic communities.
- The Asymmetry of Verification – the unequal distribution of the capacity to authenticate information in an environment where synthetic content production is rapidly expanding.

Together, these concepts explain how linguistic inequality affects both exposure to AI-generated disinformation and journalism’s ability to respond to it.

While platform asymmetry focuses on the unequal distribution of protection within platform governance systems, the asymmetry of verification focuses on the unequal distribution of society’s capacity to establish trusted knowledge.

Positioning Platform Asymmetry Within Existing Research
Platform asymmetry builds upon existing scholarship on platform governance but shifts analytical attention towards the distribution of protection.

Existing research has demonstrated that platforms act as powerful intermediaries shaping information visibility, moderation and public discourse [3]. However, discussions of platform governance have often focused on questions such as.

- Who controls content moderation decisions?
- How transparent are platform policies?
- How should governments regulate technology companies?
- How do algorithms influence public communication?

These questions remain essential. Yet they often examine platforms as unified global systems rather than examining whether different communities experience those systems differently.

Platform asymmetry addresses this missing dimension.

The concept refers to the unequal allocation of governance capacities across linguistic communities within global digital platforms. these capacities include:

- Content Moderation Resources
- Language-Specific Detection Systems
- Fact-Checking Partnerships
- Trust and Safety Personnel
- Transparency Mechanisms
- Crisis-Response Capabilities.

The central argument is that digital participation may be global while digital accountability remains uneven.

A user posting content in English and a user posting similar content in Burmese, Bengali, Tamil or Pashto may technically participate on the same platform. However, the level of institutional protection available to them may differ significantly.

This difference is not simply a result of technical difficulty. Linguistic diversity undoubtedly creates challenges for automated systems, but the distribution of platform resources also reflects economic, political and regulatory priorities.

Platforms tend to invest more heavily in areas where they face:

- Stronger Regulatory Pressure
- Greater Commercial Importance
- Higher Reputational Risks
- Significant Legal Exposure.

As a result, digital protection itself becomes unevenly distributed.

Platform Asymmetry as a New Form of Digital Inequality
The concept of platform asymmetry expands existing approaches to digital inequality.

Table 1: Platform Asymmetry in Relation to Existing Approaches to Digital Inequality

Existing Concept	Main Concern	Limitation Addressed by Platform Asymmetry
Digital divide	Unequal access to devices, connectivity and digital skills	Does not explain unequal protection after access is achieved
Digital colonialism	Unequal global distribution of technological power and dependency	Does not specifically explain language-based differences in platform protection
Platform governance	Corporate control over online communication and moderation	Often treats platforms as relatively uniform systems across users
Algorithmic bias	Unequal or discriminatory outcomes produced by automated systems	Does not fully account for unequal institutional investment across languages
Information disorder	Creation and circulation of misleading information	Does not explain why verification and protection capacities vary across communities
Platform asymmetry	Unequal distribution of accountability and digital protection across linguistic communities	Focuses explicitly on who receives safety infrastructures and governance protections and who does not

This distinction is important because digital inequality is increasingly shifting from a question of access towards a question of protection.

A society may achieve widespread connectivity while remaining structurally vulnerable to information manipulation if platform accountability mechanisms do not develop at a comparable pace.

This is particularly relevant in Asia, where rapid digital adoption has created some of the world's largest online communities. The expansion of internet access and smartphone usage has not automatically produced equal information environments. In many cases, connectivity has expanded faster than multilingual moderation systems, verification infrastructures and accountability mechanisms.

The Asymmetry of Verification

While platform asymmetry explains unequal protection against digital harms, it does not fully capture the transformation introduced by generative AI.

For this reason, this article introduces the concept of the asymmetry of verification.

The asymmetry of verification refers to the widening gap between the democratization of content production and the concentration of verification capacity.

Generative ai has significantly lowered the barriers to producing persuasive information. individuals, political actors, commercial organizations and coordinated influence networks can now generate:

- Realistic Synthetic Images
- Cloned Voices
- Fabricated Videos
- Automated Text
- Multilingual Persuasive Narratives.

The ability to create content has therefore become increasingly decentralized.

Verification, however, remains highly concentrated.

Authenticating synthetic content often requires:

- Specialized Forensic Technologies
- Large Datasets
- Computational Resources
- Expert Knowledge
- Institutional Credibility.

These capabilities remain concentrated among major technology companies, research institutions, specialized fact-checking organizations and well-resourced media outlets.

This creates a structural imbalance:

Information production is becoming widely distributed, while information verification remains unevenly accessible.

The consequence is not simply an increase in misinformation. It is an unequal distribution of society's ability to determine what information can be trusted.

Verification Inequality and Linguistic Justice

The asymmetry of verification becomes particularly significant in multilingual environments.

AI systems generally perform better in languages with:

- Extensive Digital Datasets
- Commercial Investment

- Established Computational Research
- Large Online Representation

By contrast, many Asian languages remain underrepresented within natural language processing research and AI development [19].

This creates a cycle of disadvantage.

Languages with limited technological support may experience:

- Weaker AI Detection Capabilities
- Fewer Moderation Resources
- Fewer Verification Tools
- Higher Burdens on Journalists and Local Institutions.

The issue is therefore not merely technological performance. It is also a question of representation and knowledge production.

When certain languages receive less investment, the communities using those languages may have reduced capacity to participate equally in digital knowledge systems.

This is why the article proposes language equity as a normative principle.

Language equity does not require identical moderation approaches across societies with different cultures and legal systems. Rather, it requires that basic protections against coordinated manipulation, election interference, incitement to violence and AI-generated deception should not depend primarily on linguistic visibility or commercial importance.

The Relationship Between Platform Asymmetry and Verification Asymmetry

Although analytically distinct, platform asymmetry and the asymmetry of verification reinforce one another.

Platform asymmetry primarily concerns the governance decisions made by platforms, whereas the asymmetry of verification concerns the broader distribution of epistemic and institutional resources across society. The former addresses how protections are allocated within digital infrastructures, while the latter addresses who possesses the capacity to establish authenticity once information enters the public sphere.

Platform asymmetry concerns the unequal distribution of protection. The asymmetry of verification concerns the unequal distribution of the ability to establish authenticity. Together, they create unequal information environments.

A community may experience greater vulnerability to AI-generated disinformation because:

- Platforms provide weaker moderation support
- Local languages receive fewer technological resources
- Journalists have fewer verification tools
- Media organizations operate with limited capacity.

This produces what may be described as an unequal information infrastructure.

The problem is therefore not simply that false information exists. False information has always existed. The deeper challenge is that societies differ in their ability to identify, challenge and correct it.

Implications for Journalism

These concepts have significant implications for journalism.

Journalism’s democratic function depends upon verification. However, verification is becoming increasingly difficult precisely when journalism faces declining resources and growing platform dependence.

News organizations operating in dominant languages may have access to:

- Advanced verification tools
- Specialist teams
- Ai-assisted investigative technologies
- Stronger institutional networks.

Smaller organizations working in under-resourced languages may lack these resources while facing the same or greater exposure to synthetic manipulation.

Therefore, journalists operating in different linguistic environments do not face equal professional conditions.

The challenge is not only that AI creates more misinformation. It is that the capacity to respond to misinformation is distributed unevenly.

Platform asymmetry and verification asymmetry therefore provide a framework for understanding why AI-generated disinformation represents not only a technological challenge but also a challenge of linguistic justice and democratic communication.

Summary of the Conceptual Framework

The argument developed in this article can therefore be summarized as follows.

Table 2: Summary of the Conceptual Framework		
Concept	Core Question	Problem Identified
Platform asymmetry	Who receives protection?	Unequal distribution of platform accountability across linguistic communities
Asymmetry of verification	Who can establish authenticity?	Unequal distribution of verification capacity and authentication resources
Language equity	What should justice require?	Comparable access to digital protection and verification regardless of language

Together, these concepts demonstrate that the central inequality of the AI era is not only who can access artificial intelligence, but who possesses the institutional capacity to navigate its risks.

The following section applies this framework to Myanmar, India and Indonesia, examining how platform asymmetry and verification inequality operate within different Asian information environments.

Platform Asymmetry in Practice: AI Disinformation and Verification Challenges in South and Southeast Asia

The concepts of platform asymmetry and the asymmetry of verification become particularly visible when examining how AI-generated disinformation operates within multilingual societies. Although global platforms provide similar technological

infrastructures across countries, the institutional resources available to identify, moderate and verify harmful content vary significantly according to language, political context and regulatory capacity.

The following cases from Myanmar, India and Indonesia illustrate different dimensions of the same structural challenge. They demonstrate that AI-generated disinformation cannot be understood only as a technological problem. Its consequences are shaped by the unequal distribution of platform accountability, linguistic resources and verification capacity.

The cases were selected because they represent distinct information environments:

- Myanmar demonstrates how weak language-sensitive platform governance can contribute to severe social harm.
- India illustrates the challenge of verifying AI-generated political communication in a highly multilingual democracy.
- Indonesia demonstrates how synthetic media is becoming normalized within everyday political communication.

Taken together, these cases reveal a common pattern: while the capacity to create and distribute synthetic content is expanding rapidly, the institutional capacity to verify and respond to such content remains uneven.

Myanmar: Platform Failure, Linguistic Exclusion and Information Integrity

Myanmar represents one of the clearest examples of how insufficient platform accountability can contribute to severe information harms. Before the military coup of 2021, Facebook had become not merely a social networking platform but a central communication infrastructure through which millions of citizens accessed news, political discussion and public information.

This dependence placed significant responsibility on the platform’s ability to understand local political contexts, linguistic characteristics and harmful narratives. However, multiple investigations demonstrated that Facebook’s moderation systems were insufficiently prepared to address Burmese-language content and local forms of hate speech. The United Nations Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar concluded in 2018 that Facebook had played a significant role in enabling the spread of anti-Rohingya hate speech and inflammatory narratives.

The Myanmar case demonstrates an important dimension of platform asymmetry: global reach does not necessarily correspond to equivalent local accountability.

The issue was not simply that harmful content existed. Harmful content exists in every information environment. The deeper problem was that the institutional mechanisms required to identify and respond to that content were comparatively weak in a linguistic and political context where the consequences of failure were severe.

From the perspective of platform asymmetry, Myanmar illustrates how language becomes a factor in the distribution of digital protection. Moderation systems designed primarily around dominant languages and globalized categories of harm may fail to identify local meanings, coded expressions and politically significant narratives.

For journalism, these failures created an unequal verification environment. Independent journalists and media organizations were required to challenge false narratives in an information

ecosystem where platform interventions were limited and harmful content could spread faster than professional verification processes.

Generative AI increases the importance of these lessons. Synthetic images, fabricated videos and AI-generated narratives can now be produced in local languages with increasing sophistication. In contexts where language-specific moderation and verification infrastructures remain limited, AI-generated manipulation may exploit existing weaknesses rather than create entirely new vulnerabilities.

Myanmar therefore demonstrates a broader principle:

AI-Related Risks are Amplified Where Platform Accountability Infrastructures are Weakest

The case shows that the future challenge of AI disinformation is not determined only by technological capability but also by whether societies possess sufficient institutional protection to respond to that capability.

India: Generative AI, Elections and Verification at Scale

India presents a different but equally significant manifestation of platform asymmetry. Unlike Myanmar, where the central concern involved inadequate moderation during a period of political violence, India demonstrates the challenges of maintaining information integrity within one of the world's largest democracies and most linguistically diverse societies.

The 2024 general election highlighted the increasing role of generative AI in political communication. Political actors, campaign organizations and digital consultants used AI-generated audio, synthetic video and digitally altered content to communicate with voters across multiple linguistic communities.

The significance of this development lies not only in the existence of deepfakes, but in the changing nature of political communication itself. Generative AI has blurred traditional distinctions between authentic communication, political messaging and manipulated content.

In several cases, synthetic media was not necessarily designed to deceive. Some AI-generated content was used by political actors to communicate in languages they did not personally speak. This created a new verification challenge for journalists: determining not only whether content was manipulated, but whether the manipulation changed the meaning, intention or authenticity of political communication.

India's linguistic diversity makes this challenge particularly complex. The country's digital information environment includes numerous languages, dialects and regional media ecosystems. A verification system capable of functioning effectively in one language may not perform equally well in another.

This illustrates the asymmetry of verification.

The ability to generate synthetic content can now be scaled rapidly across linguistic communities. A political message can be produced in one language, translated, adapted and distributed across multiple regions within a short period of time. However, verification requires linguistic expertise, contextual knowledge and technological resources that remain unevenly available.

Journalists therefore face a growing imbalance:

- Synthetic content can be produced at machine speed
- Verification remains dependent on human expertise and institutional capacity.

This creates particular challenges for regional and local news organizations. While large media organizations may have access to specialist verification teams and digital forensic tools, smaller newsrooms often operate with limited resources while serving communities where platform protections may be weaker.

India demonstrates that even highly developed democratic information systems can experience verification inequality when technological capacity expands faster than institutional support.

The central challenge is therefore not simply detecting deepfakes. It is ensuring that all linguistic communities have comparable access to the resources required to establish what is authentic.

Indonesia: Synthetic Media and the Normalization of AI in Political Communication

Indonesia provides a third perspective on the relationship between AI-generated content, platform governance and journalism. As Southeast Asia's largest democracy and one of the world's most active social media markets, Indonesia illustrates how synthetic media is becoming increasingly integrated into ordinary political communication.

During the 2024 presidential election, AI-generated images, synthetic videos and digitally enhanced campaign materials became part of political communication strategies. Unlike earlier forms of misinformation, where the central concern was often deliberate deception, the Indonesian case highlights a broader transformation: synthetic media is becoming normalized.

This normalization creates a different challenge for journalism. When manipulated content becomes common, verification is no longer limited to identifying exceptional cases of fraud. Journalists must increasingly evaluate the authenticity of routine political communication.

The question changes from:

"Is this content fake?"

to:

"What level of authenticity, alteration or synthetic production is involved, and does it affect public understanding?"

This represents a fundamental transformation in journalism's verification role.

Indonesia also demonstrates why national language approaches are insufficient. Although Bahasa Indonesia receives comparatively greater technological attention than many smaller languages, political communication frequently takes place through regional languages and local communication networks.

Therefore, even within a single country, levels of platform protection may vary considerably.

This illustrates an important dimension of platform asymmetry:

Linguistic Inequality does not Only Exist Between Countries. It can also Exist Within National Information Ecosystems.

For journalism, the consequences are significant. Verification increasingly requires the ability to operate across multiple linguistic environments, each with different levels of technological

support and platform accountability.

Indonesia therefore represents a future challenge likely to become more widespread: a communication environment where synthetic content is not exceptional but routine, while verification infrastructures remain uneven.

Comparative Discussion: From Platform Asymmetry to Verification Inequality

The three cases demonstrate different manifestations of the same structural problem.

Myanmar shows how inadequate language-sensitive platform governance can allow harmful narratives to spread in environments where journalism has limited institutional support.

India demonstrates how generative AI complicates democratic communication by enabling synthetic content production across multiple languages faster than verification systems can respond.

Indonesia illustrates how synthetic media is becoming normalized, transforming verification from a response to exceptional misinformation into a permanent requirement of everyday journalism.

Despite these differences, all three cases reveal a common pattern:

Digital communication is increasingly global, but accountability remains uneven.

Global platforms provide access to communication technologies, but they do not distribute moderation resources, linguistic expertise and verification infrastructures equally.

This is the central condition described by platform asymmetry.

At the same time, the cases demonstrate the growing gap between the ability to create synthetic information and the ability to authenticate it. AI tools increasingly allow individuals and organizations to generate convincing content at scale, while verification remains dependent on institutions with limited resources.

This is the asymmetry of verification.

For journalism, the implications are profound. News organizations are increasingly expected to function as frontline institutions of verification within information environments characterized by unequal platform protection and expanding synthetic content production.

However, journalism itself is embedded within these unequal systems. media organizations serving under-resourced linguistic communities often face:

- Greater exposure to manipulation
- Fewer technological resources
- Weaker platform support
- Higher verification costs.

The challenge is therefore not only protecting journalism from AI-generated disinformation. It is addressing the unequal conditions under which journalism attempts to perform its democratic function.

The cases of Myanmar, India and Indonesia demonstrate that AI governance must move beyond questions of technological capability and regulatory competition. It must also address a deeper question:

Who Has the Institutional Capacity to Establish Trustworthy knowledge in the AI era?

Journalism and the Asymmetry of Verification

The preceding analysis has demonstrated that AI-generated disinformation cannot be understood solely as a technological challenge. While generative AI provides new tools for producing synthetic content, the societal consequences of these technologies are shaped by the institutional environments in which information is created, distributed and verified.

At the centre of these transformations is journalism.

For more than a century, journalism has served as a key institution for establishing credible knowledge in democratic societies. Through verification, source evaluation, editorial accountability and contextual reporting, journalism provides mechanisms through which citizens can distinguish reliable information from rumours, propaganda and manipulation.

Generative AI challenges this function by fundamentally altering the relationship between information production and verification.

The ability to produce convincing synthetic text, images, audio and video is becoming increasingly accessible. Individuals, political actors, commercial organizations and coordinated influence networks can now generate content that previously required significant financial and technical resources.

Verification, however, has not experienced a comparable transformation.

Authenticating information increasingly requires specialized expertise, technological tools, linguistic knowledge and institutional resources. These capabilities remain concentrated among major technology companies, research institutions, specialized fact-checking organizations and well-resourced media organizations.

This imbalance constitutes what this article defines as the **asymmetry of verification**:

The growing gap between the expanding capacity to produce synthetic information and the unevenly distributed capacity to determine whether that information is authentic.

The consequence is a fundamental transformation of journalism's operating environment. Journalism is increasingly required to verify more information, across more platforms and in more languages, while the resources available to perform this task remain unevenly distributed.

Journalism as a Verification Institution in the AI Era

The democratic value of journalism has historically been connected to its ability to establish trustworthy accounts of reality.

Journalists do not simply transmit information. They evaluate evidence, investigate competing claims, identify inconsistencies and provide context that allows audiences to understand complex

events. Verification is therefore not an additional function of journalism; it is central to journalism's social purpose.

The rise of generative AI intensifies the importance of this role.

Earlier forms of misinformation often relied on limited production capabilities. Creating convincing fabricated material required organizational resources, technical skills or access to distribution networks. Generative AI significantly lowers these barriers.

A false statement can be generated instantly.

A political figure's voice can be artificially reproduced.

A realistic image of an event that never occurred can be created within seconds.

The problem facing journalism is therefore not simply an increase in misinformation. It is a transformation in the relationship between evidence and authenticity.

Traditional indicators of credibility are becoming less reliable. Images, recordings and videos have historically functioned as powerful forms of evidence because audiences assumed that visual or audio material represented real events. Synthetic media weakens this assumption.

As a result, journalism must increasingly verify not only claims but also the authenticity of the evidence itself.

This creates additional demands on news organizations:

- Forensic analysis of digital material
- Verification of sources and origins
- Assessment of ai-generated content
- Cross-platform monitoring
- Multilingual contextual analysis

These responsibilities require expertise and resources that are not equally available across media systems.

Linguistic Inequality as Verification Inequality

The asymmetry of verification becomes particularly significant in multilingual societies.

Information environments across Asia are characterized by extensive linguistic diversity.

Citizens consume news through national languages, regional languages, minority languages and transnational digital platforms. False information frequently moves across these linguistic boundaries, adapting to different communities and political contexts.

Generative AI Accelerates this Process

A fabricated narrative created in one language can now be translated, localized and redistributed across multiple linguistic communities almost immediately. AI tools can reproduce not only words but also cultural references, political terminology and communication styles.

However, verification systems do not operate with the same linguistic flexibility.

Many AI detection systems, moderation tools and fact-checking infrastructures perform most effectively in languages with:

- Large digital datasets
- Extensive research investment
- Commercial importance
- Established technological support

By contrast, languages with fewer digital resources often receive weaker support.

This creates a form of linguistic verification inequality.

A journalist working in English may have access to sophisticated verification tools, extensive databases and established fact-checking networks. A journalist working in Burmese, Bengali, Tamil, Urdu, Pashto or other under-resourced languages may face significantly greater obstacles despite confronting similar or even higher levels of manipulation.

The issue is therefore not simply whether misinformation exists.

The deeper issue is whether all communities possess comparable institutional capacity to identify and challenge misinformation.

Without such capacity, linguistic inequality becomes an information inequality.

Journalism Under Unequal Information Conditions

Platform asymmetry and the asymmetry of verification combine to create unequal conditions of journalistic practice.

News organizations do not operate on equal terms within the global information ecosystem. Their ability to verify information depends partly on the infrastructures surrounding them.

Large international media organizations may have access to:

- Dedicated verification teams
- Ai-assisted investigative tools
- Specialist researchers
- Legal and technological support.

Many regional and local news organizations operate with far fewer resources.

Yet these smaller organizations frequently serve communities where linguistic and political vulnerabilities are greatest.

This creates a paradox:

The communities most exposed to information manipulation are often served by media organizations with the fewest verification resources.

The result is a double disadvantage.

First, journalists work within platforms where moderation and accountability mechanisms may be weaker.

Second, they often lack access to the technological and institutional resources required to compensate for these weaknesses.

This means that journalism itself becomes affected by platform asymmetry.

The issue is not only that audiences receive unequal protection. Journalists also experience unequal professional conditions depending on the language and region in which they operate.

The future of information integrity therefore depends not only on improving AI systems but also on strengthening the institutions responsible for verifying information.

Why Fact-Checking Alone Is Not Enough

Public discussions about AI-generated disinformation frequently identify fact-checking as the primary response.

Fact-checking remains essential. It provides evidence-based corrections, challenges false claims and contributes to public understanding. However, fact-checking alone cannot address the structural inequalities identified in this article.

The reason is that fact-checking is fundamentally reactive.

It responds after information has already been produced and circulated.

Platform asymmetry, however, concerns the conditions that determine whether harmful content can spread widely in the first place.

Similarly, media literacy initiatives, while valuable, cannot be considered a complete solution. Citizens cannot reasonably be expected to independently verify increasingly sophisticated synthetic content without corresponding investments in institutional accountability.

An overemphasis on individual responsibility risks shifting attention away from actors with the greatest capacity to reduce systemic harm.

A more comprehensive approach requires strengthening the entire verification ecosystem:

- Platforms must invest in multilingual safety infrastructures
- Governments must support independent research and accountability mechanisms
- Technology companies must improve transparency
- Journalists require sustainable access to verification tools
- Academic and civil society organizations must contribute expertise

Verification must be treated as a collective infrastructure rather than an individual newsroom responsibility.

Journalism as Democratic Infrastructure

The implications of AI-generated disinformation extend beyond the media sector. They concern the foundations of democratic communication.

Democratic societies depend upon the possibility of establishing shared understandings of events. Disagreement is a normal and necessary feature of democratic debate, but democratic participation becomes increasingly difficult when citizens cannot determine whether the information environment itself is trustworthy.

In this context, journalism performs a function similar to other forms of democratic infrastructure.

Just as societies invest in institutions that maintain legal accountability, public health or economic stability, they must also recognize the importance of institutions that maintain information integrity.

This does not mean that journalism should become the sole authority determining truth. Rather, it means supporting institutions that apply transparent methods of evidence evaluation, accountability and verification.

The challenge posed by AI is therefore not only about protecting journalism from technological disruption.

It is about ensuring that societies retain the institutional capacity to distinguish evidence from fabrication.

For Asia, this challenge is particularly urgent. The region contains some of the world's largest digital populations and most linguistically diverse information environments. Yet many communities remain dependent on platforms and technologies whose governance structures are largely shaped elsewhere.

Building resilient information systems will therefore require investment in regional verification capacities, multilingual technologies and stronger support for independent journalism.

From Verification Inequality to Linguistic Justice

The asymmetry of verification ultimately raises a broader question

Who has the power to determine what counts as authentic information in the AI era?

As synthetic media becomes increasingly sophisticated, verification capacity itself becomes a form of power.

Those with access to advanced tools, technological expertise and institutional resources will possess greater ability to establish credible knowledge. Those without such resources risk becoming dependent on external systems for determining what is true, false or harmful.

This creates a new dimension of digital inequality.

The central challenge is therefore not simply ensuring access to AI technologies. It is ensuring equitable access to the capacity to evaluate and govern their consequences.

This article argues that linguistic justice should become a central principle of AI governance.

Language equity requires that protection against manipulation, access to verification tools and participation in digital governance should not depend primarily on linguistic visibility or commercial importance.

For journalism, this means that supporting information integrity requires more than protecting press freedom. It requires investing in the practical conditions that allow journalism to perform verification effectively.

The future of journalism will depend not only on who can generate information.

It will depend on who has the capacity to verify it.

Towards Linguistic Justice: Policy Pathways for Equitable AI Governance and Information Integrity

The preceding chapters have demonstrated that AI-generated disinformation is not merely a technological challenge. It is shaped by deeper structural inequalities in the global information environment. The cases of Myanmar, India and Indonesia illustrate that the risks associated with synthetic media are experienced differently across linguistic communities because platform

accountability, moderation capacity and verification infrastructures are unevenly distributed.

Addressing these challenges requires moving beyond narrow approaches focused exclusively on technological detection or individual media literacy. While both remain important, they do not adequately address the structural conditions that determine who receive protection from information manipulation and who possesses the capacity to verify information.

This article has conceptualized these conditions through two related concepts: **platform asymmetry** and the **asymmetry of verification**.

Platform asymmetry describes the unequal distribution of platform governance resources across linguistic communities, including moderation systems, safety investments, transparency mechanisms and accountability structures.

The asymmetry of verification describes the growing imbalance between the widespread ability to generate synthetic information and the unequal capacity to authenticate it.

Together, these concepts point towards a central policy challenge:

Digital technologies may operate globally, but protection against their harms remains unevenly distributed.

A more equitable information environment therefore requires a shift from technology-centred governance towards accountability-centred governance. The following policy pathways propose how governments, technology companies, international organizations, civil society and journalism institutions can contribute to building a more inclusive AI ecosystem.

From Platform Accountability to Language Equity

A first priority is recognizing language as a fundamental dimension of platform governance.

Current approaches to platform accountability often evaluate performance through broad indicators such as the number of removed posts, response rates or overall moderation capacity.

However, such measures can conceal significant inequalities between linguistic communities.

A platform may demonstrate strong global moderation performance while providing substantially weaker protection for users communicating in under-resourced languages.

Therefore, transparency requirements should move beyond national and aggregate statistics towards **language-disaggregated accountability reporting**.

Platforms should provide greater transparency regarding:

- Moderation capacity by language
- Availability of language-specific reviewers
- Accuracy of automated detection systems across languages
- Response times for harmful content reports
- Investment in local expertise and partnerships.

Such reporting would make visible inequalities that currently remain largely hidden.

Language equity should become a measurable governance objective rather than an aspirational principle.

This does not require identical moderation systems for every language community. Different societies will continue to have different cultural contexts, legal frameworks and communication practices. However, basic protections against coordinated disinformation, election manipulation, hate campaigns and AI-generated deception should not depend primarily on whether a language has sufficient commercial value.

A truly global platform must therefore recognize linguistic diversity not as an operational difficulty but as a core responsibility

Building Multilingual Verification Infrastructures

Reducing the asymmetry of verification requires investment in verification ecosystems that extend beyond individual organizations.

At present, verification capacity is concentrated among a relatively small number of technology companies, research institutions and well-funded media organizations. This concentration creates vulnerability because many societies depend upon verification infrastructures they do not control.

A more resilient model requires the development of regional and multilingual verification networks.

Such networks could bring together:

- News Organizations
- Universities
- Civil Society Organizations
- Investigative Journalists
- Technology Researchers
- Language Specialists.

The purpose would not simply be to increase fact-checking output. Rather, it would be to create sustainable infrastructures for identifying, analysing and responding to emerging forms of synthetic manipulation.

For Asia, regional cooperation is particularly important. Information manipulation frequently crosses borders and languages. A false narrative originating in one country can quickly spread through regional networks, translated and adapted for different communities.

Verification systems must therefore become similarly networked.

Cross-border collaboration could support:

- Shared verification methodologies
- Regional expertise databases
- Multilingual datasets
- Rapid-response mechanisms during elections and crises
- Open research on AI-generated manipulation

Verification should be understood as a form of democratic infrastructure rather than an isolated media activity.

Investing in Inclusive and Multilingual AI Systems

A third policy priority concerns the development of AI systems themselves.

Many current AI models perform more effectively in languages with extensive digital resources and large training datasets. This creates a structural disadvantage for communities whose languages are less represented online.

The consequence is a paradox:

AI systems are increasingly shaping global communication while often understanding global linguistic diversity unevenly.

This has implications for both moderation and verification. Systems that perform poorly in underrepresented languages are less capable of detecting harmful content, supporting journalists or assisting researchers.

Addressing this challenge requires investment in:

- Multilingual datasets
- Language technologies for underrepresented languages
- Culturally informed AI evaluation methods
- Open research initiatives
- Local participation in AI development

However, inclusion cannot be reduced simply to increasing the number of languages supported technically.

Representation also matters.

Communities should participate in decisions concerning how their languages, histories and cultural contexts are incorporated into AI systems. Otherwise, multilingual AI risks reproducing existing patterns of technological dependency.

For this reason, linguistic inclusion should be understood not only as a technical requirement but also as a question of digital sovereignty and democratic participation.

Supporting Journalism as Information Infrastructure

A central argument of this article is that journalism must be understood as a critical component of information resilience.

AI-generated disinformation is often discussed primarily as a challenge for technology companies or users. Yet journalism remains one of the few institutions specifically designed to evaluate evidence, investigate claims and provide accountable information.

However, journalism cannot perform this role without adequate resources.

Across many parts of Asia, news organizations face significant pressures:

- Declining advertising revenues
- Platform dependency
- Shrinking newsrooms
- Limited access to technological tools
- Increasing demands for verification.

Generative AI intensifies these pressures by increasing the volume and complexity of information requiring assessment.

Policy responses should therefore include stronger support for journalism, particularly in multilingual and regional media environments.

Possible measures include:

- Funding for investigative journalism
- Access to verification technologies
- AI literacy and training programmes for journalists
- Partnerships between media organizations and research institutions

- Support for local-language news ecosystems.

Such measures should not be interpreted as protecting a traditional media industry from technological change. Rather, they represent investments in the institutions required for democratic societies to maintain reliable knowledge systems.

Expanding Global AI Governance Beyond Technological Powers

Current discussions on AI governance are often dominated by actors with significant technological or regulatory influence, particularly the United States, China and the European Union.

These debates are essential, but they risk overlooking societies that primarily experience AI as users rather than producers.

For many countries across Asia, the central question is not how to compete in developing frontier AI systems. It is how to ensure that the benefits and risks of AI are distributed fairly.

A more inclusive global AI governance framework should therefore include stronger participation from countries and institutions in the Global South.

This requires attention to issues that have historically received less attention, including:

- Linguistic inequality
- Unequal access to verification technologies
- Representation in AI datasets
- Platform accountability across regions
- The needs of multilingual media systems.

Global AI governance cannot be considered complete if it addresses technological innovation while overlooking unequal exposure to technological harms.

The future of AI governance should therefore be measured not only by innovation capacity but also by accountability capacity.

Towards a More Equitable Information Order

The challenges identified in this article ultimately concern the distribution of power.

Artificial intelligence changes who can produce information, but it does not automatically determine who can evaluate, authenticate or govern that information.

Without intervention, existing inequalities may deepen. Communities with fewer technological resources, weaker platform accountability and limited verification infrastructures may become increasingly dependent on systems designed elsewhere.

However, a different trajectory remains possible.

AI can also contribute to a more inclusive information environment if governance priorities shift towards:

- Multilingual accessibility
- Equitable platform accountability
- Distributed verification capacity
- Stronger journalism ecosystems
- Meaningful participation from diverse linguistic communities.

The goal should not be to eliminate synthetic content or prevent technological development. Such efforts are neither realistic nor desirable.

The goal should be to ensure that societies possess sufficient

institutional capacity to understand, evaluate and respond to technological change.

This requires recognizing that information integrity is not produced by technology alone. It depends upon the institutions, communities and infrastructures that surround technology.

Ultimately, the central question of the AI era is not simply:

Who can create information?

Increasingly, the more important question is:

Who has the capacity to verify it?

A democratic information order requires that this capacity is not concentrated among a small number of languages, companies or regions.

Technology may be global.

Accountability must become global as well.

Conclusion: Technology is Global, Accountability Must be Global Too

Artificial intelligence is transforming the global information environment by fundamentally changing how information is produced, distributed and evaluated. Generative AI has expanded the ability to create persuasive synthetic content at unprecedented speed and scale, creating new challenges for journalism, democratic communication and public trust. Yet the consequences of these transformations are not experienced equally.

This article has argued that one of the defining inequalities of the AI era is not simply unequal access to technology, but unequal access to protection and verification. While digital platforms operate across linguistic and national boundaries, the infrastructures designed to reduce information harms remain unevenly distributed. Users communicating in different languages often experience fundamentally different levels of moderation, accountability and institutional support despite participating within the same global communication systems.

To explain this phenomenon, the article introduced the concept of **platform asymmetry**. Platform asymmetry describes the unequal distribution of platform governance capacities across linguistic communities, including moderation resources, safety investments, transparency mechanisms and accountability structures. It demonstrates that digital inequality has evolved beyond questions of connectivity and access. In increasingly connected societies, the central question is no longer only whether people can participate online, but whether they receive comparable levels of protection once they do.

The article also introduced the concept of the **asymmetry of verification** to describe the growing imbalance between the democratization of content production and the concentration of verification capacity. Generative AI has significantly lowered the barriers to producing synthetic text, images, audio and video. However, the technological, institutional and journalistic resources required to determine authenticity remain concentrated among a limited number of actors. As a result, information production is becoming increasingly distributed, while verification remains uneven.

This imbalance has profound consequences for journalism.

Historically, journalism has served as a central institution of verification within democratic societies. Through professional norms, editorial procedures and accountability mechanisms, journalists help establish the credibility of information and provide citizens with the context necessary for meaningful participation in public life. The rise of generative AI does not reduce the importance of this role; it makes it more essential. However, it also places journalism under increasing pressure by expanding the volume of information requiring verification while reducing the reliability of traditional markers of authenticity.

The case studies of Myanmar, India and Indonesia demonstrate how these challenges emerge within different political and media environments. Myanmar illustrates the consequences of inadequate language-sensitive platform governance in contexts of political conflict and social vulnerability. India demonstrates the challenges of verifying AI-generated political communication within one of the world's largest and most linguistically diverse democracies. Indonesia highlights the growing normalization of synthetic media within everyday political communication.

Although these cases differ significantly, they reveal a common structural pattern. Global platforms provide access to communication technologies, but they do not distribute accountability equally. At the same time, the ability to create synthetic content is expanding faster than societies' ability to verify it. Together, these dynamics create unequal conditions of information integrity.

For Asia, these challenges are particularly significant. The region contains some of the world's largest digital populations and most linguistically diverse societies. Yet many communities remain dependent on digital infrastructures, AI systems and governance frameworks developed primarily outside their own contexts. A one-size-fits-all approach to AI governance is therefore unlikely to address the realities of multilingual digital societies.

This article has argued that **language equity** should become a central principle for AI governance and platform accountability. Language equity does not require identical systems across different societies. Rather, it requires that fundamental protections against coordinated disinformation, election manipulation, hate campaigns and AI-enabled deception should not depend primarily on linguistic visibility, economic value or market importance.

Achieving this goal requires a shift in how information integrity is understood. The challenge of AI-generated disinformation cannot be addressed through technological solutions alone. Detection tools, fact-checking systems and media literacy initiatives are important, but they are insufficient without broader investments in institutional capacity.

A more equitable information environment requires:

- Greater transparency from technology companies regarding language-specific moderation and safety investments
- Stronger multilingual verification infrastructures
- Greater investment in underrepresented languages within ai development
- Sustainable support for independent journalism
- More inclusive participation from the global south in shaping ai governance frameworks.

These measures are not merely technical interventions. They represent investments in democratic resilience.

The central issue raised by AI is therefore not only who can generate information, but who has the capacity to determine what information can be trusted. In an environment where synthetic content can be produced at scale, verification becomes a crucial form of social power. If verification capacity remains concentrated among a small number of companies, institutions and languages, existing inequalities within the global information order may deepen.

The future of journalism will depend not only on adapting to new technologies but also on ensuring that the conditions required for verification are distributed more equitably. Journalism cannot sustain public trust if the infrastructures surrounding it produce unequal possibilities for establishing truth.

Ultimately, artificial intelligence presents both a challenge and an opportunity. It can reinforce existing inequalities by concentrating technological power and weakening information resilience in underrepresented communities. But it can also become an opportunity to build more inclusive communication systems if accountability, representation and verification capacity become central principles of governance.

The defining question of the AI era is therefore not simply whether technology will become global. It already has.

The question is whether accountability, verification and protection can become equally global [23-49].

Technology is global. Accountability must become global too.

References

1. Zuboff S (2019) *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. PublicAffairs.
2. Couldry N, Mejias UA (2019) *The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism*. Stanford University Press.
3. Gillespie T (2018) *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media*. Yale University Press.
4. Schaake M (2024) *The Techno-Democratic Challenge: Governing Technology for Democratic Societies*. Princeton University Press.
5. Bell E, Owen T (2017) *The Platform Press: How Silicon Valley Reengineered Journalism*. Tow Center for Digital Journalism, Columbia University.
6. Nielsen RK, Ganter SA (2022) *The Power of Platforms: Shaping Media and Society*. Oxford University Press.
7. Carlson M (2018) *The Information Politics of Journalism in the Digital Age*. Columbia University Press.
8. Graves L (2016) *Deciding What's True: The Rise of Political Fact-Checking in American Journalism*. Columbia University Press.
9. Helberger N (2020) The political power of platforms: How current attempts to regulate misinformation amplify opinion power. *Digital Journalism* 8: 842-854.
10. Taeiagh A (2021) Governance of artificial intelligence. *Policy and Society* 40: 137-157.
11. European Commission (2024) *Artificial Intelligence Act*. European Union.
12. Asean (2024) *ASEAN Guide on AI Governance and Ethics*. Association of Southeast Asian Nations.
13. Asean (2025) *ASEAN Guide on AI Governance and Ethics: Generative AI*. Association of Southeast Asian Nations.
14. Nothias T (2025) An intellectual history of digital colonialism. *Journal of Communication* 75: 385-397.
15. Dachwitz I, Hilbig S (2025) *Digitaler Kolonialismus: Wie Tech-Konzerne und Großmächte die Welt unter sich aufteilen*. Rowohlt Verlag.
16. Gray ML, Suri S (2019) *Ghost Work: How to Stop Silicon Valley from Building a New Global Underclass*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
17. Crawford K (2021) *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. Yale University Press.
18. Hao K (2025) *Empire of AI: Dreams and Nightmares in Sam Altman's OpenAI*. Penguin Press.
19. Ojoshi P, Santy S, Budhiraja A, Bali K, Choudhury M (2020) The state and fate of linguistic diversity and inclusion in the NLP world. *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 6282-6293.
20. Dijk J van (2020) *The Digital Divide*. Polity Press.
21. Bender EM, Gebru T, McMillan-Major A, Shmitchell S (2021) On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* 610-623.
22. Brennen JS, Simon FM, Howard PN, Nielsen RK (2020) Types, sources, and claims of COVID-19 misinformation. *Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism*.
23. Carlson M (2017) *Journalistic Authority: Legitimizing News in the Digital Era*. Columbia University Press.
24. Cheng Y, Chan JM (2022) Digital authoritarianism, surveillance, and information control in Asia. *Asian Journal of Communication* 32: 211-228.
25. Chesney R, Citron D (2019) Deep fakes: A looming challenge for privacy, democracy, and national security. *California Law Review*, 107: 1753-1820.
26. Kreps S, McCain RM, Brundage M (2022) All the news that's fit to fabricate: AI-generated text as a tool of media misinformation. *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 9: 104-117.
27. Lee J (2023) Artificial intelligence governance in Asia: Between innovation, regulation, and strategic competition. *Asian Journal of International Affairs* 8: 145-162.
28. Marwick A, Lewis R (2017) *Media Manipulation and Disinformation Online*. Data & Society Research Institute.
29. Napoli PM (2019) *Social Media and the Public Interest: Media Regulation in the Disinformation Age*. Columbia University Press.
30. Newman N, Fletcher R, Robertson CT, Eddy K, Nielsen RK (2024) *Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2024*. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
31. Nielsen RK, Graves L (2017) *News You Don't Believe: Audience Perspectives on Fake News*. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
32. Noble SU (2018) *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York University Press.
33. OECD (2019) *Artificial Intelligence in Society*. OECD Publishing.
34. OECD (2024) *OECD Digital Economy Outlook 2024*. OECD Publishing.
35. O'Neil C (2016) *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*. Crown Publishing.
36. Poell T, Nieborg D, van Dijck J (2019) Platformisation. *Internet Policy Review* 8: 1-13.
37. Pohle J, Thiel T (2020) Digital sovereignty. *Internet Policy*

- Review 9: 1-19.
38. Raji ID, Bender EM, Buolamwini J, Gebru T, Mitchell M (2020). Closing the AI accountability gap: Defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* 33-44.
39. Sambasivan N, Kapania S, Highfill H, Akrong D, Paritosh P, et al. (2021) Everyone wants to do the model work, not the data work: Data cascades in high-stakes AI. *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* 1-15.
40. Stanford Institute for Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence (2024) AI Index Report 2024. Stanford University.
41. UN Human Rights Council (2018) Report of the Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar. United Nations.
42. UNCTAD (2021) Digital Economy Report 2021: Cross-border Data Flows and Development. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
43. UNESCO (2021) Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. UNESCO.
44. (2024) United Nations Secretary-General's High-Level Advisory Body on Artificial Intelligence. *Governing AI for Humanity: Final Report*. United Nations.
45. Vos TP, Thomas RJ (2019) Journalism and truth in an age of social media. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*.
46. Wardle C (2019) *Understanding Information Disorder*. First Draft.
47. Wardle C, Derakhshan H (2017) *Information Disorder: Toward an Interdisciplinary Framework for Research and Policy Making*. Council of Europe.
48. World Bank (2021) *World Development Report 2021: Data for Better Lives*. World Bank.
49. World Economic Forum (2024) *The Global Risks Report 2024*. World Economic Forum.

Copyright: ©2026 Debarati Guha. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.