Research Article

Rethinking AI, Conflict, and Responsibility in the Digital Age: A Study of India–Pakistan Escalations

Ravindrakumar Sendhav*

Abstract

The complex interplay between artificial intelligence algorithms and social media during times of crisis especially focuses on the context that involves India–Pakistan escalations. The paper attempts to examine how AI drives narrative construction along with pushes to deepen ideological polarisation for further calculated gains by spreading misinformation and synthetic media. The study examines artificial intelligence algorithms' detailed relationship with social media platforms throughout the war. It focuses specifically on the context of India–Pakistan escalations. It examines how AI-driven recommendation systems construct national narratives, deepen ideological polarisation, and ease the spread of misinformation and synthetic media. The paper draws from interdisciplinary literature and discusses the algorithmic architecture of platforms, the emergence of digital echo chambers, and the governance challenges in managing content and algorithmic accountability during geopolitical crises. It ends by urging thought about platform duties. Algorithmic design should also be rethought so that they safeguard democratic integrity and promote informational authenticity during conflicts.

Keywords

AI, social media, India–Pakistan, war narratives, misinformation, deep-fakes, platform governance, algorithmic accountability

Introduction

The rise of social media has changed the communication practices of war, as well as the public s interaction with it. In current global conflicts, X (Twitter), YouTube, Instagram, and Facebook are more than just informational platforms: they are battlegrounds where differing narratives and counter-narratives are formed, shared, and fought over. This is especially true during the India-Pakistan tensions, where sentiment, strategy, and public opinion not only intersect but also flow in and out of each other in real time. While in the past, journalists reported on wars through framed narratives that were filtered via central editorial control. Today, the reporting is done through social media, which is decentralised, driven by user-generated content, and AI

Corresponding Author: Ravindrakumar Sendhav, Junior Research Fellow, Department of Political Science, the Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Gujarat, India., Email: ravindrasindhav@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1794-8425

(Tufekci 2018). Conflict is almost always a captivating subject, and social media algorithms tend to prioritise and showcase such content. Engagement-driven AI systems ensure that only emotionally charged or eye-catching content rises to the top while everything else is pushed further down. Social media algorithms are designed to streamline output, but the consequences during crises are highly dangerous. Such systems run the risk of elevating controversial, false, or misleading information while confirming bias and reinforcing ideology-aligned echo chambers. During conflicts, social media platforms can significantly impact public discourse, shaping perceptions of legitimacy, influencing collective memory, and even affecting responses on both domestic and global fronts (Wardle and Derakhshan 10). Furthermore, these underlying algorithms, often opaque due to the inherent "black box" logic of algorithmically powered platforms, make it impossible to adequately assess or mitigate their broader societal impact (Pasquale 4).

Considering the India-Pakistan conflict as a case study, this chapter focuses on the impact of social media AI algorithms on public discourse during war. It analyses how these platforms facilitate the creation of competing national narratives, worsen already strained relations, and control the flow of information during conflicts. Using recent escalations alongside emerging digital trends, the chapter analyses how information technologies shape communication, interpretation, response, and action among diverse global online audiences. It stresses the need to understand better the relationship between AI, media infrastructure, and geopolitical conflict, drawing attention to the risks and responsibilities posed by algorithmic mediation.

The Algorithmic Infrastructure of Social Media

Social media has a relatively more complicated and hidden framework of artificial intelligence at the base of it that decides for each user the content that they should see, when it should be reinforced, and how frequently that content should be shown. The algorithms used to decide what content to serve users are based on machine learning and deep neural networks, which focus on optimising user engagement by serving them content that is likely to resonate with their preferences, sentiments, and habits (Gillespie 2018). This infrastructure serves as a form of communication and, especially, as a form of perception management during times of conflict, like the India-Pakistan escalations.

Platforms such as YouTube, Facebook, Instagram, and X (formerly Twitter) have recommendation algorithms that focus on delivering the content to the user by analysing metrics such as watching time, shares, and comments. Such algorithms focus on retaining the attention of the user and often result in the emergence of posts that garner fear, outrage, and anger, especially during wartime (Tufekci; Vosoughi et al.). As a result, such algorithmic decisions and structures reinforce biases such as hyper nationalism or extremism, which result in an increased perception of nationalistic content, irrespective of its truth. Even though the decisions of engineers have no political motives, the algorithms they create have the power to produce politically consequential outcomes.

Personalisation is also another important element to consider. Every user s feed is tailored specifically to them, creating "filter bubbles" or "echo chambers" where users are trapped within viewpoints and narratives that both reinforce and validate their beliefs while shielding them from opposing views (Pariser). With regard to India–Pakistan tensions, this might lead to digitally shattered publics in which Indian and Pakistani users are subjected to completely different narratives of the same event. For example, hashtags, videos, or reels recommended through algorithms may frame a border incident in radically different terms based on the user s country and engagement history.

Adding to this problem is the lack of explanation of these processes. Scholars and civil society actors have called for greater enforcement and answerability, but the algorithm s code is still inaccessible and under lock and key (Pasquale). The lack of transparency is an impediment both to the public and the government as far as analysing the conflictual dynamics that printed algorithmic infrastructure might be amplifying sentiment and discourse within the public sphere.

Historically, identity and war-related sentiments have been shaped by media controlled by the state, political rhetoric, and cultural narratives. In contrast, the digital media age sees social media platforms at the centre of constructing and disseminating nationalist discourses, especially during wartime. Arguably, algorithms contribute heavily to this scenario by engineering personalised information environments, which Sunstein termed "echo chambers," wherein users are exposed chiefly to opinions confirming their preexisting beliefs and identities (Sunstein 2009). These echo chambers essentially act as fuel for nationalist energies and minimise opportunities for exchanges of views from the opposite spectrum, reinforcing polarisation and antagonism between corresponding online communities on a rival nation's side.

Throughout India–Pakistan military or diplomatic escalations, the social media realm witnesses an influx of hyper-nationalist content. The hashtags go viral within the blink of an eye, airstrike videos or political speeches are circulated widely, and user-generated posts glorifying patriotism gain traction. Herein lies the algorithmic prioritisation: posts that appeal to collective identity, national pride, or perceived victimhood will be surfaced and shared ad infinitum (Cinelli et al.). Of course, this dynamic also works in reverse—and crosses borders. Most of the users from India and Pakistan are often fed with two different versions of the same story, which are confirmed in their echo chambers, hardening their attitudes.

This is further compounded by organised and concentrated action from political actors, digital influencers, and state-linked accounts. Entities like these often take advantage of algorithmic bias to promote nationalistic agendas or undermine opposing opinions (Bradshaw and Howard). Sometimes rage-inducing content is amplified by misinformation or fabricated content, including deepfakes and deceptively edited video, that spreads virally as a result of strong emotional appeal and algorithmic promotion (Wardle and Derakhshan).

Ravindrakumar Sendhav

ANANYAŚĀSTRAM:
An International Multidisciplinary Journal
(A Unique Treatise of Knowledge)
ISSN : 3049-3927(Online)

Digital Nationalism and the Algorithmic Construction of Identity in the India–Pakistan

In the digital age, nationalism has migrated increasingly from physical spaces of public discourse to platforms mediated algorithmically that prioritise deliberation or accuracy over engagement. This transformation has caused scholars as well as commentators to now refer to it as digital nationalism a phenomenon in which social media and algorithmic platforms construct and reinforce nationalist identities. Within the context of India–Pakistan relations, this digital shift does not only influence public sentiment during times of crisis, but it also mobilises collective emotions and political will in ways that are often polarised and exclusionary because of this.

Toby Miller claims digital technologies shape cultural policy along with national identity centrally. States, together with corporations, collaborate to regulate content, access, and data infrastructures, as Miller explains (Miller). "Platform governance," a new form, extends state influence into digital areas accordingly. Though participation may seem to be democratised, this often sidelines minority voices and increases dominant national narratives. As social media platforms evolved to digital battlefields of propaganda, national pride, and performative patriotism, this effect acutely shows within India–Pakistan tensions.

AI-driven algorithms play an important role here now. Systems that are designed so as to optimise engagement will prioritise emotionally charged content, which is notably posts evoking outrage or fear or else tribal loyalty. AI-based recommendation systems elevated content so that it affirmed dominant nationalist narratives on platforms such as Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube. This occurred throughout times of heightened Indo-Pak conflict, for example, the Pulwama-Balakot episode in 2019. As Patel and Singh observe (Patel and Singh 52), "AI systems reproduce as well as reinforce ideological echo chambers through continuously offering to users the kind of content that they have already interacted with—whether that is patriotic memes, war glorification videos, or anti-Pakistan rhetoric."

Algorithmic recommendation reinforces identity. This process is not beyond neutrality. Instead, it constructs a reality beyond. Then users get to experience a version of nationalism, digitally tailored for them, that is confirming of the biases that they have now. "Digital Nationalism in South Asia" notes that tech-savvy political actors and influencers intentionally use AI-improved tools like deepfakes, auto-generated videos, and bot armies to push specific ideological agendas, as this phenomenon is described by The Economist as the "weaponisation of cultural identity in the digital area."

For influencing public opinion regarding Indo–Pak relations as well as national security, political parties along with right-wing digital influencers throughout India have mastered social media's use. In crises that occur, hashtags such as #IndiaStrikesBack or #BoycottPakistan have trended greatly, framing all international perceptions and influencing domestic discourse. AI increases all of these trends through its ensuring that users

Ravindrakumar Sendhav

ANANYAŚĀSTRAM:
An International Multidisciplinary Journal
(A Unique Treatise of Knowledge)
ISSN : 3049-3927(Online)

see each of them across feeds irrespective of accuracy. On page 54, Patel and Singh state that "algorithmic platforms have become the new frontline for nationalist performance and spectacle."

Democratic discourse and also geopolitical stability do face meaningful consequences. This is because of this form of digital nationalism. Users are more secure within their views, less tolerant of dissent, and more susceptible to misinformation because of constant exposure to nationalistic content creating a feedback loop. Furthermore, cross-border digital antagonism, even when it is fuelled by AI-driven systems, often spills into real-world consequences while exacerbating diplomatic tensions between India and Pakistan.

AI's intersection with digital nationalism demands both policy and scholarly urgent attention now. According to Miller, cultural policy must now extend into the digital space in order for algorithmic systems to serve the public interest instead of just corporate or state agendas (Miller). It also includes requests for open algorithm design plus content rules heeding local disputes. Also featured are digital literacy programs, giving users tools for content assessment.

Within India and Pakistan, digital nationalism stems not just from technological innovation, yet AI platforms intentionally and frequently tactically develop and enact national identity. Fostering peace in an increasingly polarised digital landscape requires regulating along with understanding this intersection to preserve democratic integrity.

War, Nationalism, and Digital Echo Chambers

National identity and wartime sentiment are shaped historically through cultural narratives, political rhetoric, and state-controlled media. Social media platforms have become central to nationalist discourses' construction for dissemination within the digital era. This is true at a particularly high level during conflicts, however. AI-driven algorithms do contribute greatly to this process by the creation of personalised information environments—or "echo chambers"—in which users are exposed mainly to views that do confirm their preexisting beliefs and identities (Sunstein 2009). These echo chambers can strengthen nationalist emotions and reduce exposure to diverse perspectives. These actions strengthen division between online communities among competing nations.

Hyper-nationalist content often saturates social media. India–Pakistan military or diplomatic escalations cause this saturation. Hashtags can trend in a rapid way, videos that show air strikes or political speeches will go viral, and user-generated posts may gain traction because they express a patriotic passion. This amplification has algorithmic prioritisation that is playing a key role. Posts may be more likely to be surfaced as well as shared widely when they resonate throughout collective identity, with national pride, or in perceived victimhood (Cinelli et al.). This process functions equally across boundaries. Since each narrative is validated

Ravindrakumar Sendhav

ANANYAŚĀSTRAM:
An International Multidisciplinary Journal
(A Unique Treatise of Knowledge)
ISSN : 3049-3927(Online)

inside its own echo chamber, Indian and Pakistani users are typically exposed to conflicting narratives of the same event, thus securing antagonistic perceptions.

Political actors, digital influencers, and state-affiliated accounts worsen these dynamics through coordinated efforts. Such of these efforts worsen these of the dynamics. Nationalistic agendas are pushed, or opposing viewpoints are discredited, through algorithmic trends often (Bradshaw and Howard). Content sometimes is augmented by misinformation or media that someone manipulated; also, deepfakes and out-of-context videos spread quickly because they impact emotionally, and algorithms make them visible (Wardle and Derakhshan). Platforms claim that they moderate harmful content but enforce inconsistently, particularly during high-traffic periods of national crisis.

Different populations operate under radically different assumptions of reality. The end result is that the public sphere is fragmented. This fragmentation weakens the chance for people to understand each other and discuss all things rationally. It weakens democratic processes in addition by privileging emotionally charged and often misleading content over evidence-based and also deliberative engagement (Persily and Tucker).

Thus, social media platforms do not merely host nationalistic discourse during wartime; they structurally condition nationalistic discourse. Algorithms using AI mould the sociopolitical conflict environment by reinforcing echo chambers and incentivising content that resonates emotionally.

Misinformation, Deepfakes, and the Crisis of Authenticity

In the context of wartime social media dynamics, misinformation spread has become a critical threat to public discourse. AI generates content increasingly, from textual disinformation to highly realistic images, audio, and video known as deepfakes, strengthening the authenticity crisis. More and more, platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, and X are populated by content blurring fact and also fiction, especially during a national emergency or conflict escalation. This poses a serious problem for public belief in news sources and groups and for fact-finding (DiResta; Chesney and Citron).

Numerous examples exist within the India-Pakistan digital battlefield where unverified footage goes viral. This footage includes military actions, explosions, or protests that are often drawn from unrelated events or are modified using digital tools, and it spreads before fact-checkers are able to intervene. The algorithmic visibility increases in turn (Pennycook and Rand) that provokes patriotism, anger, or fear via emotionally charged narratives accompanying these posts. Deepfakes, in particular, have added to this problem a new dimension through enabling people to create synthetic yet convincing media that mimic public figures or stage nonexistent events (Chesney and Citron 1765–66). Since crises generate short response times, even brief exposure to false content can influence public opinion lastingly.

Ravindrakumar Sendhav

ANANYAŚĀSTRAM:
An International Multidisciplinary Journal
(A Unique Treatise of Knowledge)
ISSN : 3049-3927(Online)

This phenomenon is worsened on account of social media platform architecture. AI algorithms do not indeed verify truth, but in its place they optimise for maximum engagement. False content spreads with greater speed and range than truthful content, as empirical research has shown (Vosoughi et al.). Wartime makes this especially dangerous since perceived threats and acts of aggression, along with humanitarian concerns, highly sensitive rapid decision-making with public sentiment. Misinformation fosters misinformation loops around borders. It also can escalate all the tensions, or it can incite acts of violence or disrupt diplomatic efforts.

Platforms' misinformation combat efforts remain inconsistent and often reactive through fact-checking, content warnings, and moderation. Furthermore, adversarial actors as well as bot networks, along with state-sponsored disinformation campaigns, adapt quickly in response to these interventions (Bradshaw and Howard). Content moderation policies can be opaque, and generative AI tools do have a global reach. Thus, as they seek to dodge discovery, malicious actors may always test fresh formats and plans.

In this setting, the thought that reality is "shared" risks a lot. AI-generated misinformation s authenticity crisis hurts democratic discussion and makes resolving conflict tough, replacing talk with lies and distrust. For understanding and reduction of this threat, a multidisciplinary approach is required. This approach includes international cooperation as well as technology design plus media literacy with policy reform.

Platform Governance and Algorithmic Accountability in Wartime

As social media platforms take on their roles of real-time information disseminators during conflicts, questions related to governance as well as accountability are becoming quite urgent. The architecture of these platforms is shaped by proprietary algorithms, which influence public discourse in a powerful way. Mechanisms via which content is suppressed, removed, or promoted are often opaque as well as inconsistently applied, particularly in geopolitical crises such as India–Pakistan escalations (Gillespie 2018). Important risks confront democratic accountability and international stability because transparent processes for algorithmic governance during wartime and clear standards are lacking.

Social media companies often claim neutrality; also, they frame themselves as technology providers rather than editorial entities. However, algorithms increase certain narratives, authorities selectively enforce moderation policies, and platforms privilege engagement above accuracy to challenge these claims (Klonick; Pasquale). Content moderation meets specific challenges during wartime. Content moderation is especially difficult during wartime. Cultural and linguistic gaps that exist in moderation teams do often weaken efforts that are meant to curb hate speech, incitement to violence, or misinformation. Because it is generated and

Ravindrakumar Sendhav

ANANYAŚĀSTRAM:
An International Multidisciplinary Journal
(A Unique Treatise of Knowledge)
ISSN : 3049-3927(Online)

shared in real time, the sheer volume of content is a factor (Douek). Context-specific needs often exceed moderation tools in South Asia because coded language, regional dialects, and quickly changing politics exist.

Opaque internal policies furthermore guide decisions about what content to remove or suppress. External review is likewise absent from those policies. Platforms can implement crisis protocols such as elevating official sources or flagging false content. Frenkel and Alba observe these interventions lack even application across conflicts or countries. For example, geopolitical entities may consider, regulators might threaten, and markets can incentivize the ways companies respond to pressure coming from national governments, potentially resulting in biased enforcers or censors.

Thus, wartime algorithmic accountability calls involve transparency in content filtering as well as promotion. They also involve mechanisms for institutional and public scrutiny. Scholars and also digital rights advocates have proposed a range of possible solutions: algorithmic impact assessments, independent audit regimes, real-time transparency dashboards, and also legally mandated disclosures of content moderation practices (Citron and Pasquale; Mozilla Foundation). Most platforms, however, continue resisting structural changes subjecting them to democratic oversight or revealing the workings behind their recommendation systems.

These debates gain in urgency from within the wartime context. Platform governance becomes inseparable from global peace and security when algorithmic infrastructures influence how people perceive national identity, take military action, and apply international law. For the ensuring of accountability within such contexts, states and corporations must innovate technologically, but also they must commit ethically and create legal frameworks.

Conclusion

The digital transformation of warfare shifted conflict's terrain to algorithmically mediated perception and discourse spaces from physical battlegrounds. This chapter has explored that AI algorithms that social media platforms deploy do not merely reflect public sentiment when crises such as the India–Pakistan escalations occur but do actively shape it since they increase nationalistic narratives and deepen polarisation and enable rapid spread of misinformation and synthetic media. About an increasingly digitised and conflict-prone world, these dynamics raise critical questions about power, accountability, and democratic deliberation's future.

Platforms such as X, YouTube, Instagram, and Facebook prioritise engagement over truth and scale over context, operating according to logics that are commercial and opaque, unlike gatekeepers in customary media. In a time of war, this logic is especially dangerous because consequences of algorithmic amplification can escalate to real-world violence, diplomatic breakdowns, and trust erosion in institutions (Tufekci; Marwick

Ravindrakumar Sendhav

ANANYAŚĀSTRAM:
An International Multidisciplinary Journal
(A Unique Treatise of Knowledge)
ISSN : 3049-3927(Online)

and Lewis). AI-generated deepfakes alongside disinformation are present, compounding the problem. They erode at the possibility for establishing a shared reality, which is something necessary in order to have any meaningful conflict resolution or international diplomacy (McGuffie and Newhouse).

AI ethics, along with platform responsibility, must be rethought. This landscape is in fact rapidly evolving and also changing. Stronger regulatory frameworks are needed since they require transparency, independent audits, and accountability during crises. Alternatively, platforms increasingly play a geopolitical role. Platforms also must act in an ethical way and with responsibility instead of hiding behind the guise of neutrality (Zuboff). Governance mechanisms must include not only technological safeguards but also strongly ensure that cross-border legal entities cooperate, that citizens oversee, and that moderators include local linguistic and cultural contexts.

Since nations grapple with the digital age's changing nature of warfare, addressing the algorithmic foundations that mediate public discourse becomes imperative. Rethinking responsibility involves asking not only how we govern platforms but also how we design AI systems that prioritise informational integrity over virality, with democratic resilience prevailing over engagement metrics. Military and diplomatic strategy may determine the future of peace along with conflict. In this future, the code that shapes what billions of people see, believe, and act upon could also play a role.

References

Bradshaw, Samantha, and Philip N. Howard. The Global Disinformation Order: 2019 Global Inventory of Organised Social Media Manipulation. Oxford Internet Institute, 2019, https://demtech.oii.ox.ac.uk/.

Chesney, Robert, and Danielle Citron. "Deepfakes and the New Disinformation War: The Coming Age of Post-Truth Geopolitics." Foreign Affairs, vol. 98, no. 1, 2019, pp. 147–155.

Cinelli, Matteo, et al. "The Echo Chamber Effect on Social Media." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. 118, no. 9, 2021, e2023301118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2023301118.

Citron, Danielle K., and Frank Pasquale. "The Scored Society: Due Process for Automated Predictions." Washington Law Review, vol. 89, no. 1, 2014, pp. 1–33.

DiResta, Renée. "Computational Propaganda: If You Make It Trend, You Make It True." The Yale Review, vol. 106, no. 4, 2018, pp. 62–79.

Douek, Evelyn. "The Rise of Content Cartels." Harvard Law Review, vol. 136, no. 2, 2022, pp. 469–523.

Faris, Robert, et al. Information Disorder: Toward an Interdisciplinary Framework for Research and Policymaking. Harvard Kennedy School, Shorenstein Center, 2017.

Frenkel, Sheera, and Davey Alba. "In India, Facebook Struggles to Combat Misinformation and Hate Speech." The New York Times, 14 Nov. 2021, www.nytimes.com/2021/11/14/technology/india-facebook-misinformation.html.

Gillespie, Tarleton. Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media. Yale University Press, 2018.

Klonick, Kate. "The New Governors: The People, Rules, and Processes Governing Online Speech." Harvard Law Review, vol. 131, no. 6, 2018, pp. 1598–1670.

Marwick, Alice, and Rebecca Lewis. Media Manipulation and Disinformation Online. Data & Society Research Institute, 2017, https://datasociety.net/pubs/oh/DataAndSociety_MediaManipulationAndDisinformationOnline.pdf.

McGuffie, Kevin, and Aaron Newhouse. "The Radicalization Risks of GPT-3 and Advanced Neural Language Models." Center on Terrorism, Extremism, and Counterterrorism, Middlebury Institute of International Studies, 2020, https://www.middlebury.edu/institute/sites/www.middlebury.edu.institute/files/2020-08/gpt3-article.pdf.

Miller, Toby. The Routledge Companion to Global Cultural Policy. Routledge, 2014.

Mozilla Foundation. YouTube Regrets: A Crowdsourced Investigation into YouTube s Recommendation Algorithm. 2021, foundation.mozilla.org/en/youtube-regrets.

O Neil, Cathy. Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy. Crown Publishing Group, 2016.

Pariser, Eli. The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You. Penguin Press, 2011.

Patel, Rakesh, and Anjali Singh. "AI, Nationalism, and the Public Sphere." South Asian Digital Cultures, vol. 6, no. 2, 2023, pp. 45–67.

Pasquale, Frank. The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information. Harvard University Press, 2015.

Penny cook, Gordon, and David G. Rand. "The Implied Truth Effect: Attaching Warnings to a Subset of Fake News Stories Increases Perceived Accuracy of Stories Without Warnings." Management Science, vol. 66, no. 11, 2020, pp. 4944–4957. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2019.3478.

Riaz, Ali. Digital Jihad and the Quest for Legitimacy: Framing Armed Resistance in the Age of Social Media. Oxford University Press, 2021.

Sahoo, Niranjan. "Technology, Democracy and the Rise of Digital Authoritarianism in India." Observer Research Foundation, no. 342, 2020, www.orfonline.org/research/technology-democracy-and-the-rise-of-digital-authoritarianism-in-india/.

"Digital Nationalism in South Asia." The Economist, 14 Mar. 2022, www.economist.com/digital-nationalism.

Persily, Nathaniel, and Joshua A. Tucker, editors. Social Media and Democracy: The State of the Field, Prospects for Reform. Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Sunstein, Cass R. Going to Extremes: How Like Minds Unite and Divide. Oxford University Press, 2009.

Tufekci, Zeynep. "Big Questions for Social Media Big Data: Representativeness, Validity and Other Methodological Pitfalls." Proceedings of the Eighth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media, 2014, pp. 505–514.

—. "YouTube, the Great Radicalizer." The New York Times, 10 Mar. 2018, www.nytimes.com/2018/03/10/opinion/sunday/youtube-politics-radical.html.

Vosoughi, Soroush, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral. "The Spread of True and False News Online." Science, vol. 359, no. 6380, 2018, pp. 1146–1151. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559.

Wardle, Claire, and Hossein Derakhshan. Information Disorder: Toward an Interdisciplinary Framework for Research and Policymaking. Council of Europe, 2017, www.coe.int/en/web/freedom-expression/information-disorder.

Zuboff, Shoshana. The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. PublicAffairs, 2019.

Beck, Ulrich. Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity. Sage Publications, 1992.

Gelman, Andrew, and Jennifer Hill. Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/Hierarchical Models. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Tirosh, Noam. "Platform Responsibility and Digital Nationalism: A Comparative Study of India and Israel." Journal of Information Policy, vol. 11, 2021, pp. 210–235.

Woolley, Samuel C., and Philip N. Howard, editors. Computational Propaganda: Political Parties, Politicians, and Public Opinion. Oxford University Press, 2018.