The Platformed Public: Rethinking Digital Media Ecology in a Hyperconnected World

*Vaibhav Pratap Singh **Mahera Imam

ARTICLE DETAILS	ABSTRACT
	The current architecture of the digital media ecology in a hyperconnected world is explored in this paper, and it is argued that platforms are not simply tools of technology but constitute structural forces of mediation, governance and control. The concept of the platformed publics encapsulates how the contemporary form of publics is constituted not through open deliberative spaces, but by way of algorithmically edited, datafied and commodified in opaque digital media infrastructure. Like Jose van Dijck, Poell, and de Waal (2018) argue, Facebook, Twitter (X), and YouTube are not neutral platforms, but institutional actors that define access to information, social discourse, and social visibility. The paper questions the transformation of the media environment, through the prism of media sociology, communication studies, and critical platform theory, into an attention-driven ecosystem based on platform logics as opposed to a broadcast-focused model. The idea of surveillance capitalism as presented by Zuboff (2019) highlights the constant harvesting and commodification of user behaviour in order to turn the communication into a form of prediction and manipulation. The media platformisation (Helmond, 2015) not only changes the content production and distribution processes but also redefines the audience labour, erasing the line between the producers of data and consumers. India and Global South empirical data also indicate that platform governance entrenches the existing inequalities. The GSMA Mobile Gender Gap Report (2023)

states that women in low- and middle-level countries are 15 percent less likely to be mobile internet users, and where they use it, they are less likely to avail themselves of more services, which upholds gendered absences in popular culture. Moreover, the India Inequality Report (Oxfam, 2022) points out that internet connectivity in the poorest households is limited to 8.9 per cent, which underlines the fact that the class, caste, and geography continue to be the decisive determinants of exposure and engagement with the digital publics. The article critiques the techno-optimist presuppositions of the digital media discourse and proposes a redirection of the scholarly of public communication in order to predict algorithmic discrimination, power of platforms, and the governance of data. Based on the paradigm of data colonialism formulated by Couldry and Mejias (2019), the paper claims that the digital public is under the increasing influence of extractive infrastructures that give more weight to capital than citizenship, attention than deliberation, and virality than truth. With a new thinking of the digital media ecology, the paper makes a normative argument in platform accountability, redistributive media policy, and the democratic design - demanding a move towards platform-centric to rights-based participation, especially to historically marginalised communities that have not been part of dominant media discourse. This reconceptualization is crucial in the explanation and reclaiming of the digital public sphere as a zone of equity, plurality and justice.

I.Introduction: The Platformed Condition

The last twenty years have seen the media environment undergo a radical rearrangement. Centralised, broadcast-like dissemination of traditional mass communication has continued to be replaced by networked, decentralised, and interactive systems of media. The digital platforms like Facebook, Twitter/X, YouTube, and Instagram play a significant part in this new ecology as they are not only the mediators of communication, but also the institutions of infrastructures that dictate the visibility conditions, discourse, and involvement. Today we are in a platform society, in which the public sphere is

mediated and constructed on the basis of commercial platform logics, which prioritize profit, scale and data extraction over democratic deliberation as put forward by Jose van Dijck, Thomas Poell, and Martijn de Waal (2018). This broadcasting to platforming shift is a paradigmatic shift in media ecology, shifting the way publics are made, the circulation of knowledge, and the inequalities that they express. Platforms cannot be passive, rather they are active political-economic subjects built into what Nick Srnicek (2016) defines as platform capitalism, a model whereby large corporations harvest behavioural data and monetize user engagement in the name of connectivity. At the same time, these infrastructures act as algorithmic gatekeepers, influencing content viewed, promoted or suppressed and transforming power dynamics in the digital mass media.

Although digital platforms of information and communication have brought forth inclusivity and access, they have spawned new architectures of exclusion, visibilities hierarchies, and precarity, in particular to historically disadvantaged groups, is at the heart of this paper. According to Shoshana Zuboff (2019), it happens when human experience is turned into data to predict and offer it in a monetised way, which is known as surveillance capitalism. With content as a form of data capture, algorithms as forms of government, participation as a commodity, attention as cash, and visibility optimised on a platform, rather than creating a value, it is subject to optimisation on a platform.

These issues are supported by empirical evidence. According to the GSMA Mobile Gender Gap Report (2023), women in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) are 15% less likely to use mobile internet as compared to men. Such gendered inequality is enhanced by digital literacy, ownership of a device, surveillance, and mobile barriers. In India, the Oxfam India Inequality Report (2022) indicates that just 8.9 percent of the poorest homes are connected to the internet, and there is a huge inequality by caste, region, as well as gender. These exclusions underscore how connection without regulation or equality furthers the structural gap with the result being what Richard Heeks (2017) characterizes as adverse digital incorporation - inclusion on conditions that produce social inequality, not lessen it.

The paper aims to challenge the structuring of the digital public sphere, therefore, questioning the techno-optimist narrative of the digital media as necessarily democratic. It interacts with critical media theory, feminist communication studies, and platform governance literature based on global discussions as well as the empirical examples of India and the Global South. The platformed condition, as the paper will also show, is that in which power functions in an algorithmic way, that the

attention economies fragment publics, and that extractive infrastructures are increasingly influential in the participation.

Reconsidering digital media ecology through the prism of platform power, data capitalism, and structural inequality, the paper is intended to play a role in the wider discussion of media justice, digital rights, and future of the public discourse in a hyperconnected and highly unequal world.

II. Theoretical Underpinnings: Media Ecology and Platform Power

In the case of digital public sphere nowadays, one should refer to the work by media ecology as a key theoretical filter. Media ecology shifts the focus off the content of media to the structural conditions of communication how media environments are generating social relations, knowledge production, and power. This view is important in the platform era as it helps understand how digital infrastructures restructure publics, visibility, and governance in a manner that goes way beyond the technological affordances.

The article by Boyle and Forcade (2003) serves as the starting point of the discussion about the evolution of the mass media into the networked publics.

2.1 The article by Boyle and Forcade (2003) is where this discussion starts, Neil Postman was the most vocal proponent of the media ecology idea when he suggested that the media are not neutral in their nature, but rather environments that organize human perception, social interaction and institutional order. Expanding upon the well-known saying of Marshall McLuhan that indeed the medium is the message, media ecology underlines the fact that when communication technologies change, it is not only the flow of information that is altered, but also the way society is structured, the way societies manage time, the way societies delegate authority and meaning. During the broadcast period, mass media created comparatively stable forms of publics which are structured around centralised media institutions which contain newspapers, radio and television strengthening gatekeeping, professional journalism and shared national histories.

This arrangement started to change drastically as the digital communication networks were introduced. Manuel Castells (2009) frames this new transformation using the concept of the network society where power is no longer exercised in the main because of hierarchical institutions, but rather because of networks, which cross physical space and linear time. Digital media shrink time, distance and allow constant connectivity creating what Castells describes as timeless time and space of

flows. The publics in this context are no longer formed by the mass broadcast but through networked interactions, hashtags, feeds, and streamlining by algorithms.

Breaking the mass media into networked publics is, however, not necessarily democratizing communication. Although earlier digital optimism was enthusiastic about the participatory culture and user-created content, later scholarship has shown that networked publics are highly organized around platform architectures. We live in a platform society where social, cultural and political life is structured around a few powerful digital platforms, as Jose van Dijck, Thomas Poell and Martijn de Waal (2018) claim. It is not that these platforms are simply the place of communication; on the contrary, they influence the communication norms, their visibility and participation, and install commercial and governance logics in the daily process of social interaction.

In this regard, digital publics are becoming more and more platformed publics instituted, fractured and operated by proprietary infrastructures that do not seek deliberation or inclusivity but rather focus on metrics of engagement, data extraction, and scalability. It is not merely a change in technology, therefore, but the reorganization of the public life itself.

2.3 Surveillance and Platform Capitalism

The availability of communicative power to digital platforms should be placed in the context of broad political-economic changes. Theorist Nick Srnicek (2016) explains this as platform capitalism, a system where platforms act as data monopolies making value by owning and controlling digital infrastructures. In contrast to the traditional media companies, platforms do not enjoy the monetary gains of content creation but data collection, user addiction, and network effects. It is their economic strength in that they are able to establish themselves as mediators who are indispensable in various fields - communication, commerce, labour and government.

To complement this analysis, Shoshana Zuboff (2019) presents the idea of surveillance capitalism to explain that platforms transform human experience into behaviour data to make predictions, target, and make money. Within this model, the actions of users such as clicks, likes, searches, and movements are raw material on algorithmic analytics, which turns communication into a place of constant surveillance and commodification. Participation in digital publics is therefore not detachable of surveillance because even expression is a source of extractable value.

This platform politics economy significantly erases classical lines:

- between individual and state, monetisation of personal expression occurs;

- between content and infrastructure, since visibility is dictated by algorithms;

- between monetisation and free speech, since systems of engagement are incentivised to reward outrage, virality, and emotion.

The magnitude of the transformation is highlighted by empirical evidence. The global platform economy research indicates that information flows and advertisement markets are controlled by several corporations, which are, in turn, controlled by more influential corporate interests the most: Meta, Google, Amazon. These dynamics have been aggravated in India by the fast growth of social media and mobile internet despite the uneven access. The Oxfam India Inequality Report (2022) points to the fact that even with the widespread smartphone usage, 8.9 of the poorest households have a reliable internet connection, which demonstrates the existence of platform capitalism and structural exclusion.

Collectively, these frameworks prove that platforms cannot be understood as neutral sites of interaction but technopolitical infrastructures that rearrange the ecology of media in terms of extraction, surveillance, and control. The platformed public is thus not just a product of the participation of the users but of the governance of algorithms as well as the demands of the economy that dictate who talk and who speaks to marginal sides and whose data can be monetised.

Bringing together media ecology, network society theory and political economy, this section provides a conceptual base upon which to examine the platformed public. Based on the insights of Postman and McLuhan about media environments, networked power by Castells, and platform society by van Dijck et al., or surveillance capitalism by Zuboff, it is clear that the theme of power is consistent: communication infrastructures are places of power. The concept of digital inequalities and media transformation thus require a focus not just on content and users, but equally on the structural logics of platforms as such.

III. The politics of Visibility and Algorithmic Curation.

3.1 Algorithmic Publics

In the modern world of platform society, algorithms become the unseen editors that determine what users look at, post and experience. These algorithmic systems, which are also present in the ranking, recommendation, and moderation systems of such platforms as Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, and Twitter (now X), dictate decisively whose voice will be heard and whose will be silenced. The

architecture of visibility has been under algorithmic control as users are increasingly using platforms as the main place to find news, entertainment, and social interaction.

In her pioneering work Algorithms of Oppression, Safiya Noble (2018) chronicles how the search engine, such as Google, perpetuates racial and gender hierarchies by indexing and advertising its search logic and structuring metadata. In her research, she explains that searches that include terms like Black girls are more likely to provide hypersexualised, or otherwise stereotypical results and indicates that algorithms tend to reflect and reproduce the social biases incorporated in training data and platform design. These biases are structural rather than incidental based on the commercial interests and cultural beliefs of the mainstream tech giants.

Equally, Tarleton Gillespie (2018) formulates platforms as the guardians of the internet, claiming that content moderation is a kind of governance, not just technical hygiene. The choices made by moderation, such as banning a person, labelling a post or content, shadow banning, etc. are political in nature and are often made in an opaque way by large global corporations with limited accountability. Gillespie emphasizes that moderation is infrastructural and systematic and defines the limits of permissible speech, and disproportionately impacts marginalised users whose speech can be misinterpreted or miscategorised by automated systems or poorly-trained human moderators.

These relations undermine the principles of democracy of free speech and equal representation. Visibility in the platform publics is not a level playing field but a battleground, and it is negotiated using algorithms that are not designed to enhance fairness. In this sense, the concept of the internet as an open public sphere is becoming a myth, access is distorted by systems of proprietary, non-transparent and commercialized access.

3.2 Misinformation, Echo Chambers, and Attention Economies

The other important impact of algorithmic curation is that it facilitates the existence of misinformation ecosystems and polarisation based on identity. Platform algorithms are conditioned to ensure that they maximize user engagement, which Favors content that is emotionally engaging, biases, and keeps users engaged. This reasoning can have a propensity to increase false, divisive or extremist content, as such content will tend to do better in attention economies.

According to Couldry and Mejias (2019), this process is what they call data colonialism in which human experiences, emotions, preferences, behaviours, etc., are mined, commoditized, and weaponized to meet economic and political goals. They believe that the platform architecture is a re-

enactment of the colonialist logic of extraction, which does not just steal data belonging to the user but also transforms the epistemological basis of knowledge, trust, and truth in society. The datafied user is transformed into a mined resource rather than a citizen to be engaged.

The Global South has been especially affected by the effects of this phenomenon. WhatsApp, the ubiquitous messaging platform that has more than 500 million users, has been involved in several cases of mob violence and lynchings in India, which were caused by viral misinformation. A report by the BBC (2018) found that more than 30 individuals died in mob attacks that were triggered by the rumours of child kidnapping via WhatsApp forwards. End-to-end encryption and forwarding capabilities of the platform make it an optimal ally in un-verified content, and the architecture of the platform encourages no critical interaction or verification of the source of information.

In the same vein, YouTube recommendation has been demonstrated to push users to more radical or conspiratorial content as time goes. A study by Mozilla Foundation (2020) revealed that the feature of the suggested next video usually leads to extremist videos, especially on political or identity-related subjects. This can be compared to the fact that platforms reward content which evolves outrage, which strengthens the echo chambers and ideological silos.

With the power of Instagram and other visual media, algorithms prioritize one type of body, one type of skin, one type of aesthetic and one type of speech over others, creating the so-called filter politics, as critics term it. Algorithms Studies indicate that light-skinned, conventional female creators and English-speaking creators are more likely to be favoured by algorithms, and the work of Dalit, queer, disabled, and fat creators is usually under-represented, demonetized, or filtered.

These tendencies reveal that virality tends to win over veracity and emotional content is better at working than factual subtleties. The impact this has on the discourse of democracy is immense as it further divides the already caste, religiously, and gendered hierarchical societies.

Digital publics politics is formed through algorithmic infrastructures, which place more emphasis on engagement than equity, monetisation than truth, and optimisation than inclusion. Although these systems present themselves as neutral, they act as governance technologies, which strengthen dominant ideologies and alienate opposition. Communication scholars need to not only ask questions about what circulates on digital platforms, but about who circulates and how it circulates, and whose speech is readable, profitable, or disposable. These dynamics can only be dealt with by means of critical transparency, algorithmic audit and involvement of marginalised communities into platform governance.

In the absence thereof, the digital public sphere is exposed to becoming an environment of a manufactured consensus, commodified emotion, and epistemic violence whereby one is allowed participation, but not given authority.

IV. Digital Inequalities on the Platformed Public

4.1 Access ≠ Empowerment

The argument of digital inclusion tends to factor technological access with empowerment. Nevertheless, access does not translate to autonomy, safety, and meaningful involvement, as feminist scholars and development theorists have long contended. The digital divide has ceased to be a dichotomy between connected and unconnected to have a more heterogeneous usage, literacy and results spectrum - determined by structural inequalities of classes, caste, gender and geography.

These differences are supported by empirical evidence. In the GSMA Mobile Gender Gap Report (2023), it is found that low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) have a gap of 15% in mobile internet use between women and men, and the disparity increases in rural areas. Another reason as to why women use digital less is brought out in the report because of the affordability, the safety factor, the control that patriarchy has on the devices, and digital literacy. Gendered patterns of engagement even exist among connected users, with women having a higher likelihood of using passive or domestic oriented services, and men possessing economic and political digital space.

According to the report of Oxfam India Inequality (2022), it was discovered that in India, 8.9% of poorest households have access to internet, as compared to 48.7% of the richest households. The report explains that urban-rural differences, caste-based discrimination and educational disparities cut sharply across digital access. To provide an example, Dalit and Adivasi women have both overlapping obstacles to access, such as discrimination in online workplaces, institutional protection, and increased vulnerability to online harassment, as well as to presence, which restricts their access along with the visibility of their presence.

Furthermore, agency-free access frequently leads to what Richard Heeks (2017) terms adverse digital incorporation (i.e. marginalised communities are incorporated into digital systems e.g. Aadhaar, gig platforms, online banking) without any protections, rights or control). In this case, digital technologies are used as an instrument of control and weakness instead of strength. Dalit creators, queer users, and rural youth are also affected by these conditions as they may be online but cannot be seen or targeted by the algorithm or are targeted by cultural policing. Online media recreate social inequalities as

participation depends on popularity scores, social reporting functions, or content regimes rooted in English voices that do not conform to prevailing caste, gender, or sexuality norms.

Therefore, one cannot be empowered without having literacy, autonomy, relevance and control. Inclusion should not be measured merely by connectivity rates, but by the ability of the user to engage substantially in the development of their online spaces. Unlike participation, this means involvement in decision-making processes without being affected by those decisions.

4.2 Participation without Power

This is different to participation and involves being involved in decision making processes without being influenced by these decisions. The initial, optimistic idea of the digital age, which was best known by the name Henry Jenkins (2006) in his theory of participatory culture, thought that the web would democratise cultural production, whereby each user could be a producer. Further criticism, however, demonstrates that the nature of participation in platformed publics is generally asymmetrical, controlled through algorithmic visibility, economic capital and channel-related gatekeepers.

Even the prolific and engaged marginalised creators do not find it easy to be seen and make money. Social networking platforms, such as Instagram, YouTube, and Tik Tok, serve opaque content ranking and recommendation algorithms that are usually biased towards already popular accounts or content categories that conform to platform norms, like polished aesthetics, content designed to get likes, or culturally dominant narratives. By reinforcing the issue of racism, casteism, and sexism through erasing and stereotyping, these algorithmic hierarchies replicate these patterns in the concept of being neutral, as Safiya Noble (2018) remarks.

Shadow banning, which is the suppression of a user without informing the user, is one of the most prominent signs of this asymmetry. Studies indicate that the content of Dalit activists, LGBTQ+ creators and Muslim voices in India tends to be de-prioritized or labelled as sensitive even when it would not be in breach of explicit community rules. As an illustration, in 2021, posts on caste atrocities, protests by farmers and Palestine solidarity grew artificially suppressed on Instagram and Twitter in India, an example of how platform curation and algorithms intersect with geopolitical and cultural power.

Moreover, moderation bias is more found among those users whose content goes against the dominant ideologies. Outsourced and underpaid moderation teams operate in a limited cultural context, resulting in over-policing of particular linguistic or visual expressions of marginalised identities a phenomenon Sarah T. Roberts (2019) calls commercial content moderation under digital colonialism.

Such trends form a paradox: the users can be but not empowered. They can own followers, and little power. Their popularity might briefly increase, yet without platform support and consistent attendance, as well as without algorithmic preference, their content will remain marginal. Therefore, the issue of platform involvement should not only be studied in terms of who is online, but on who is listened to, trusted, amplified and monetised. Since, according to scholars such as Couldry and Mejias (2019), the platform era is always entrenched within extractive logics, participation in the platform era is surveilled, structured, and sold. Digital inequality requires not just the broadening of access, but also the reallocation of power in the architecture of the same.

V. Towards a Responsible and fair Media Ecology

The transnational tech-driven digital media environment has generated unexplained possibilities in communication, yet it has created more visibility, access, and control asymmetries. In order to get out of criticisms of platform capitalism and algorithmic injustice, this section proposes ways forward to more responsible and equitable media ecology, based on democratic governance, feminist praxis, and public infrastructural alternatives. In an attempt to draw conclusions, the author began by assessing the relationship between the concept of platform governance and media justice

5.1 Platform Governance to Media Justice

The author has tried to make an attempt to conclude with the relationship between the concept of platform governance and media justice. Platforms are becoming more infrastructural to the discourse of the citizenry, and they should be subject to democratic principles. The existing self-regulation approach implemented by Big Tech has failed to mitigate the negative effects of misinformation, algorithmic discrimination, and data mining, as well as marginalisation of minority groups.

- One of the measures is institutionalisation of transparent governance mechanisms:
- Discriminatory ranking or moderation patterns can be indicated through the algorithmic audits.
- In the EU, transparency reports on content moderation may help clarify the situation of people being silenced and their reasons.
- A regulatory regime should also center around the user data rights such as informed consent, data portability, and meaningful opt-outs.

Two years after, the Digital Services Act (DSA) by the European Union was a milestone in the world. It requires Very Large Online Platforms (VLOPs) to perform assessment of systemic risks, to be subjected

to independent audits, and made vetted researchers accessible to data. These are aimed to avoid the harms to fundamental rights, the health of the population and the integrity of democracy. On the international scene, the UN Cybercrime Convention (2024) has started expressing the state responsibilities to safeguard the digital rights such as gendered harms, surveillance abuse, and cross-border data regulation. Although its application continues to be unequal, it prepares normative foundations on a rights-based global digital rule-system.

Nevertheless, solutions are not enough in the form of regulations. According to the arguments of scholars, including Evelyn Douek, platform governance should not just adjust the existing models but move towards the sphere of media justice - where the issues of power, access, voice, and accountability will be at the centre stage.

5.2 Feminist and Intersectional Interventions

The interventions required to create inclusive digital futures cannot be built without an intersectional and feminist theory, which reveals the operations of power on intersecting boundaries of gender, caste, class, race, sexuality, and geography. The theory of intersectionality provided by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) serves as a reminder that the harms of the digital are not equally experienced. Dalit women, queer youth, disabled users, and other marginalized users, do not always feel targeted, but are frequently compounding vulnerable to both algorithmic invisibility and targeted harassment, but still, they are not present in governance discourses.

It can be applied to the digital world by the triadic model of redistribution, recognition and representation suggested by Nancy Fraser (1995):

- Redistribution: Fair access to digital infrastructure, platforms, and devices.
- Recognition: Dealing with erasures and stereotypes in platform design and moderation.
- Representation: Making true to empower the development of digital policies, norms, and architectures.

Continuing on this, Sasha Costanza-Chock (2020) suggests a feminist infrastructural theory, which suggests design justice. She brings out in her book Design Justice: Community-Led Practices to Build the Worlds We Need how this tech infrastructures fail to address the needs of the people who are at the margins. Instead, systems should be:

- Multilingual, to encompass the non-English and indigenous language users.

- Available, to users, both ability and literacy, as well as connectivity, divides.
- Governed together, making sure that the design and the governance processes involve affected communities.

These frameworks provide normative clarity and operational heuristics to make digital systems remade more just and more inclusive.

5.3 Public Digital Infrastructures

We should also rethink the digital media ecosystem itself to disrupt the extractive logic of the corporate platforms. This will involve investing in civic interest's platforms and network owned by communities that are more focused on civic values than profit. In India, the degradation of the public service broadcasting (Prasar Bharati) and the concomitant corporate colonization of the digital space through such services as YouTube prove an urgency of encouraging the development of the independent, non-profit media ecosystem. Digital public goods that need funding are localised content creation, educational programming, and minority language media. Other models Cooperative models of platforms (e.g. Amped, a music co-op; Resonate, a fair streaming platform) have started competing with the extractive models of Spotify or Patreon globally. These options are based on the principles of the democratic ownership structure, clear algorithm, and fair revenue distribution.

The Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) projects in India, like the Unified Payments Interface (UPI) and DigiLocker, demonstrate that digital systems that are state-led are scalable in an inclusive way when accompanied by accountability and rights protection. The concept of techno-solutionism has been cautioned by authors like Reetika Khera and Anupam Saraph but their writings can also open ways to reclaim the digital commons by using participatory policy design.

To create a more equitable digital public space, it has to reconsider how and by whom digital infrastructures are managed, the governance of platforms, and whose voices are heard or silenced. A media ecology that is purely profit oriented will always be concerning to manipulation, polarisation and exclusion.

Conclusion: Reclaiming the Platformed Public

The digital commons is not a field of neutrality and inclusiveness anymore; it has become a field of algorithmic optimisation and extractive platform infrastructures and systemic asymmetries of power. Formerly open platforms have been turned to closed systems operating opaque algorithmic and

commercial logics and surveillance systems. As presented in this paper, civic intention is having less influence on the development of digital publics and more influence is being exerted by the demands of datafication, monetisation, and behavioural prediction. This corresponds to the development of surveillance capitalism created by Shoshana Zuboff (2019) where the lives of users are turned into unrefined material to be commodified. In a similar manner, Jose van Dijck et al. (2018) have demonstrated how platforms have transformed themselves into infrastructural institutions not only in the field of communication but also governance, identity, and labour.

In order to overcome this escalating crisis of digital inequality, the digital media studies need to be repoliticised, with power, precarity and justice at the centre of the enquiries. According to Nick Couldry and Ulises Mejias (2019), datafication is not just technical in nature: it is colonial: mining human experience to become concentrated power with marginalised groups suffering the most effects of its violence.

- Reestablishing democratic authority over digital infrastructures needs cross-sector cooperation. Frameworks that are being co-created must be:
- Epistemically just (Fricker, 2007): making sure the marginalised knowledges and experiences are not erased or tokenised.
- Intersectionally inclusive (Crenshaw, 1989): recognition of the caste, class, gender, geography, and ability influence of digital participation and harm.
- Politically responsible: integrating transparency, collective ownership and redistribution into platform governance designs.
- In the future, a number of tendencies can be identified that are so pressing and needed:

Participatory Research Models

Giving communities the power to record and analyse and recount their own digital experiences would guarantee more rooted knowledge generation. Here, the feminist participatory action research (PAR) and community technology audits can provide strong frameworks.

Platform Co-Governance

This will go beyond the concept of user feedback, and it requires collaborative decision-making regarding the design of the algorithm, norms of content moderation, data ethics and access equity. Such examples are platform councils, worker cooperatives and community moderation boards.

Radical Re-inventing of Public Infrastructures

Corporate logics should not be copied in digital ecosystems that are publicly available. Rather, we should have commons-based, non-extractive, and care-oriented alternatives, whether in the form of municipal broadband, platform co-operatives or feminist tech collectives.

Remember that as scholar-activist Ruha Benjamin (2019) points out, the imagination is a disputed zone of action. In case the existing digital order is characterized by exclusion, invisibilisation, and control, new stories, new alliances, and new infrastructures should be the starting points of reimagining of digital justice.

When reclaiming the platformed public, we do not merely repair what is broken, but we inquire about what types of digital futures can be created when based on solidarities, care, and epistemic dignity.

Ph.D. Candidate, Centre for Culture, Media, and Governance, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, Contact Details +91 8800586885, vaibhav301096@gmail.com

**Research Scholar, Department of Women's Studies, Khajamalai Campus, Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli, 620023, Contact Details: +91 9625614655, maheraimam8@gmail.com*

References

- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. Oxford University Press.

- Costanza-Chock, S. (2020). *Design justice: Community-led practices to build the worlds we need*. MIT Press.

- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.

- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *1989*(1), 139–167.

- European Commission. (2022). *The Digital Services Act (DSA)*. Retrieved from https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu

- Fraser, N. (1995). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'post-socialist' age. *New Left Review*, *212*, 68–93.

- Gillespie, T. (2018). *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press.

- GSMA. (2023). *The Mobile Gender Gap Report 2023*. GSM Association.

- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York University Press.

- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.

- Oxfam India. (2022). *India Inequality Report 2022: Digital Divide*. Oxfam India.

- Srnicek, N. (2016). *Platform capitalism*. Polity Press.

- United Nations. (2024). *UN Convention on Cybercrime (Draft)*.

- van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & de Waal, M. (2018). *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. Oxford University Press.

- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.