JOURNAL OF SOCIAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT
www.jsrd.org.pk   editor@jsd.org.pk

THE WEAPONIZATION OF INFORMATION: HOW DISINFORMATION CAMPAIGNS UNDERMINE SELF-DETERMINATION

Maryum Majeed[1], Raja Ishtiaq Ahmed[2] & Muhammad Rashid Aziz[3]

[1]Lecturer, Department of Law, Mohi-Ud-Din Islamic University Nerian Sharif, AJ&K, Pakistan
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Mohi-Ud-Din Islamic University, AJ&K, Pakistan
[3]Lecturer, Department of Law, University of Kotli, Azad Jammu & Kashmir, Pakistan

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Disinformation, Self-determination, Information Warfare, Psychological Manipulation, International Law	This research paper examines how disinformation campaigns harm self-determination processes by examining the psychological mechanisms by which public opinion can be manipulated, including confirmation bias and emotional manipulation. This body of work takes on task of understanding how these tactics can affect political choices, from voting behavior to the support of a protest, hampering the development of democracy. The paper reveals real-world consequences of disinformation on self-determination movements through a case study of a selection of significant events, such as Brexit referendum and 2016 U.S. presidential election. It is vital to have high-level international legal frameworks and accountability mechanisms to address this problem. The proposals include establishing international conventions, increasing transparency in social media, strengthening public media literacy & establishing partnerships among stakeholders. This study concludes that protecting self-determination rights demands shared work to address misinformation, ensuring that people can interact suitably with right information for participation in democratic procedures. Addressing these challenges ensures respect for the integrity of public discourse and fundamental rights of the people worldwide in an increasingly complex information landscape.
ARTICLE HISTORY Date of Submission: 24-08-2024 Date of Acceptance: 28-09-2024 Date of Publication: 29-09-2024	
Correspondence	Raja Ishtiaq Ahmed
Email:	hod.law@miu.edu.pk
DOI	https://doi.org/10.53664/JSRD/05-03-2024-14-168-184

INTRODUCTION

Central to international law and human rights discourse is self-determination, the right of people to exercise political status and pursue economic, social and cultural development in the manner free from foreign interference. Still, the idea is not a theoretical one. Overall, self-determination is vital

when people form democratic governance & social justice and gives voice to marginalized groups to exercise their right and identity (Muharremi & Dragusha, 2019). The ability to make the informed decisions that reflect the will and desire of community makes self-independence decisions possible and determines ability of communities to exercise self-determination. In modern digital world, the expansion of disinformation campaigns, or so-called meme warfare, has created an ever-increasing danger to the integrity of self-determination processes. With the proliferation of social media and the span of digital communication platforms, disinformation, or the deliberate dissemination of false or misleading information, is becoming a more prevalent force in our lives. Many of these campaigns are directed by state and nonstate actors to influence public opinion, create divisions, and offend already weak democratic processes (Albert, 2023). In the digital age, world has seen quick diffusion of disinformation, and a malicious actor can use this to spread its message to many people at great speed and efficiently.

This is a manipulation of information that distorts public perceptions and, despite concerns critical decisions, elections, referendums, and independence movements destroy the fundamental principle of self-determination (Górka, 2022). At the heart of this study is research problem of considering how disinformation campaigns undermine self-determination. In this paper, I concentrate on one aspect, namely, the means by which the disinformation (at times bolstered by cyber-attacks) can manipulate public opinion and the decision-making process related to self-determination. In this research, I investigate direct causal links between disinformation and erosion of self-determination to illustrate how manipulated information can influence the political choices and how collective agency can be undermined to counteract weaponization of information. It also explores how these campaigns perpetuate social polarization and cause internal conflict between groups attempting to rule themselves, therefore lowering their ability to govern themselves (Shandler, Gross & Canetti, 2022). In this linking, the disinformation is only misinformation: Spreading misinformation is one thing, but it also exacerbates tensions amid communities already fighting to avoid the unnecessary bloodshed of the civil war. Disinformation campaigns exploit social cleavages to divide precluding the relevant collective agency necessary for effective self-determination and leaving possibility for intrastate conflict.

In this dynamic, Jardine (2024) shows that key to this dynamic is psychological mechanisms, which disinformation uses to manipulate public opinion (for example, confirmation bias and emotional manipulation). The polarization of communal identities hinders the ability of groups to unite as a common cause of self-determination. Most of the existing international legal frameworks designed to protect self-determination are poorly suited to dealing with challenges from disinformation in digital space. In this research, we also consider what sorts of legal and normative responses to threat of disinformation campaigns there might be over international conventions, codes of conduct and platform regulations (Sarjito, 2024). This will examine the role of international organizations, states, and civil society in setting norms and determining how they are implemented, especially when ensuring right to self-determination in this emerging space dedicated to the information requires cooperation. The intent of research is to look at these dynamics, help understand how disinformation mold's public opinion & divides society along social lines. The aim of study is to inform policy retorts

that are able to protect right to self-determination, as it gradually threatens capitalist information warfare tactics.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Disinformation has become one of most fashionable phenomena because of its consequences related to self-determination of the people and democratic proceedings. For example, as 'disinformation', anything from an innocent joke through to more detrimental forms, the deliberate dissemination of false information has been shown to be capable of manipulating public opinion and influencing political decision-making Furlong and Lester (2022). Largely unexplored, still, are psychological mechanisms in the spread of this type of manipulation, which uses confirmation bias and emotional manipulation (Göcke et al., 2021). Strech et al.'s (2013) model of confirmation bias allows people to choose to base further information on what they already believe is right & emotional manipulation makes people feel scared and outraged to act impulsively. Research has shown that disinformation is capable of seriously undermining political votes on self-determination, i.e., voting behavior or sharing in protests. For instance, they can demonstrate that exposure to disinformation can distort perceptions of electoral integrity that, in return, reduce trust in democratic processes (Pham et al., 2014). Erosion of trust will reduce voter turnout and participation in social movements, resulting in weakening collective agencies' ability to build the effective self-determination efforts (Novianti & Irawanto, 2021).

However, the most pressing issue of the intersection between self-determination and disinformation in digital age must be urgently addressed. Disinformation campaigns are proliferating, and they could disrupt self-determination processes in other harmful ways that could exacerbate injurious democratic governance. The weaponization of the information necessitates both rethinking extant cyber norms and elaborating new legal frameworks capable of responding to continual changes in cyber threats. The real-world impacts of misinformation on results of self-determination processes have been described in several case studies. The Brexit referendum and the 2016 U.S. presidential elections were both heavily mediated by disinformation campaigns driving the result of election (Mahood et al., 2013). In this connection, the disinformation was used to divide the movement of Catalan independence supporters to seek independence, as Elembilassery (2023) observed. In the same vein, disinformation in Brazil's 2018 elections revealed how demographics are disparaged to shape public opinion & voting tendencies (Faisal et al., 2021). Yesterday, the UN General Assembly passed a resolution declaring March 8 as 'International Women's Day'. However, there is a growing body of literature on disinformation, and yet, phrasing for self-determination has to be performed slightly more.

Similarly, the existing international legal frameworks do not clearly spell out ways of effectively inhibiting the spread of disinformation (Kumar et al., 2012). Moreover, it is difficult to correlate the responsibility in the case of the opposing campaigns of disinformation (Carter & Easton, 2011). As a result, there is a highly necessary provision to solve the legal and normative problems caused by the 'weaponization' of information in the digital age. It also shows that the phenomenon of 'sway' that disinformation has created is still dire in the aspects of self-determination and democracies. Still, through knowledge of the psychological mechanisms at the play and specific case studies, we can

glean valuable insights into the difficulties of disinformation. This paper examines the mechanisms and objectives of disinformation, its impact on individuals' ability to make informed decisions, and its broader implications for the autonomy of nations and communities. Given that digital landscape continues to change, it will be necessary for all stakeholders to conduct the ongoing research and collaborate to find strategies that ultimately work against disinformation and defend against the sanctity of self-determination efforts. Disinformation campaigns, characterized by the deliberate dissemination of the false or misleading diverse information, are a key tactic in undermining this fundamental right.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

With the qualitative research methodology, this study seeks to investigate how such disinformation campaigns may impede self-determination processes. Specifically, the subject of this study is well suited for a qualitative approach, as it requires a deep understanding of complexity and subtlety of manipulating public opinion with disinformation to be meaningfully understood. Achieving this necessitated an inquiry into qualitative data since these data are data that are supposed to capture the subjective experiences and perceptions of people affected by disinformation in a way that we construct a more enriched story as opposed to a mere story of individuals (Hunt, 2011). A systematic review of data derived from peer-reviewed journal articles is presented within the methodology of current research, with focus on three themes: disinformation, public opinion and self-determination. The guided selection of articles was based on specific criteria, such as how close the article is to the research questions and the methodological rigor and the different views that the article gives to the literature. In this regard, we gathered data by studying the dynamics of disinformation campaigns and their relationship with the destruction of democratic processes through an analysis of existing qualitative studies.

It also analyzes case studies in which disinformation affects actual world election results and social movements. This was done via use of qualitative content analysis to identify recurring themes and patterns across the literature and to generate a cogent understanding of how disinformation shape's public opinion and decision making. The research stresses that triangulation increases credibility and trustworthiness of findings. Research can be conducted using different sources of qualitative data, including interviews, focus groups and case studies, to produce a holistic view of phenomenon being investigated. This approach aligns with the principles of qualitative research, where context is important, human experience is viewed as subjective (Monahan & Fisher, 2010), and controlled experiments are neither the focus nor the goal of research. In summary, this research relies on the use of a qualitative methodology to thoroughly investigate how compound relationship between disinformation campaigns and self-determination works. This study contributes to this discussion concerning the implications of disinformation for democratization processes and the right to self-determination by focusing on the narratives and experiences of those whose rights are impacted by disinformation.

RESULTS OF STUDY

An analysis of disinformation campaigns and their effects on self-determination processes yields several findings. Second, we identify mechanisms through which psychological confirmation bias

and emotional manipulation lead to shaping public opinion over disinformation. Their belief that they are absorbing everyone's voice better allows them to more easily accept information that is already formed to confirm their belief, and emotional manipulation occurs through the use of fear & outrage to elicit responses and attitudes. Through these case studies, tools and mechanical details of these campaigns were revealed to be utilized in Brexit referendum and 2016 USA presidential elections by their proponents to exploit societal fears & anxieties to shape public sentiment. Second, results show that this manipulated information has a great influence on political decisions about self-determination.

Perceptions of electoral integrity that are skewed can lead to a loss of trust in democratic processes. For example, disinformation played a role in the Catalan independence campaign, confusing the legitimacy of the referendum and low turnout and participation in voting. The Brazilian elections demonstrated that the targeted disinformation had a sufficient effect on perceptions of candidates and issues by young voters to affect how much they participated in the electoral process. The case studies then show that, very naturally, boundaries of self-determination processes are in fact such tangible boundaries, despite what disinformation tells us. Notably, disinformation, which to some degree influenced Brexit referendum by manipulating public discourse around it, is a prominent example. The 2016 United States presidential election, for example, provided us with many ways in which manipulation of public sentiment & behavior over disinformation was very well established, with critical impacts on democratic integrity. From Catalan independence movement to Brazilian elections, we showed that how technology can be used to divide and weaken the collective agency of a community.

Disinformation campaigns & cyberattacks: A nexus of manipulation

Misinformation, a word often mistaken for disinformation or propaganda is, in fact, the deliberate distribution of false or misleading information to manipulate target. Misinformation is essentially incorrect information that is spread innocently as opposed to propaganda, which is a vaster term referring to information that may in procuration be colored or distorted for some sort of political cause or mindset to be promoted (Ross et al., 2021). Knowing how disinformation spreads depends on the distinction between disinformation and misinformation, which is crucial, especially in cases of self-determined movements this: political change with high stakes and deadly consequences for misinformation. In today's digital age, cyberattacks have become a powerful information weapon to proliferate and magnify disinformation. False narratives about an issue are amassed through things like botnets, social media manipulation, hacking and all of these techniques so that they can sway the opinion of the public, or politically. Another scale is the ability to scale through networks of compromised computers—so-called 'botnets', used to scrape social platforms using malcontent at a massive scale (Anderson et al., 2021). It can turn into automated extension of some narratives that distort your perception of reality, in turn make those narratives seem more populated than reality they belong to.

However, social media websites' structure and running exacerbate this issue since they are designed to spread content (even if it is fictive) to drive engagement (Ross et al., 2021). However, hacking can also show opponent disruption and procurement of public discourse (Agarwal et al., 2017). There

have been disinformation campaigns for years; they included cyberattacks and self-determination movements, 2016 U.S. presidential election and Brexit referendum. Such campaigns tend not only to disseminate misinformation but also to be part of the coordinated effort to mold public opinion and shape political outcomes. For example, in U.S. election they made in 2016 by Russian interference, as they hacked the leak of fake narratives to destabilize democratic processes (Stewart et al., 2024). For example, as with the Brexit referendum, bots such as accounts spread fake news and, as accounts are believed to have done, create confusion and division among public (Salaverría et al., 2024). I have used these examples as good evidence that disinformation is more of a key part of propaganda and influences the political apparatus in digital age. Furthermore, social media platforms increase the depth of disinformation, while the further spread of misleading messages is amplified through perpetuating the spread of misleading messages via echo chamber mechanisms on these platforms (Munoz et al., 2024).

In addition, they are intentional and have resulted in the widespread frivolous dissemination of false information (French et al., 2023). Finally, disinformation effects extend beyond the political sphere to public trust in (democratic) institutions and in (mainstream) media in number of countries with varying levels of democratic quality (Salaverría et al., 2024). Content moderation, education developed as form of public skepticism, counter campaigns are proposed strategies for overcoming these challenges (Butts et al., 2023). These measures across the way of the spread look to lessen the hazard of data distortion, in the same way as expanding open vulnerability to such accounts. Our hacktivist face could be our undoing if we are not careful, just as disinformation campaigns that directly manipulate public's opinion present an enormous risk to self-determination movements, fundamentally requiring an approach to eliminating it in the information age. The 2018 Brazilian presidential election illustrates intricate relationships in ethnic tensions, disinformation campaigns, social cohesion and political dynamics. Most of the disinformation during this election circulated on social media platforms, with WhatsApp being at center of spread of false narratives that intensified the polarization, against the Workers' Party (PT) and its supporters, petistas (Samuels et al., 2023; Ozawa et al., 2022).

Although bots were not the main way in which fake news was spread, they were used to create echo chambers that furthered those biases and political animosity (Dourado, 2023). Linked to historical marginalization of ethnic groups, such as Quilombola communities, whose collective identities are denied, who are now suffering additional violations & threats from dismantling of protective policies, this environment of misinformation and polarization was exacerbated (Rios & Miranda, 2024; Ruan, 2022). In this drive, journalists and fact-checkers are vital, as they attempt to fight misinformation and regain the trust of public; however, their work has not gone unchallenged by the widespread lack of trust in classical institutions and the sheer number of social media outlets used as a primary news feed source (Neto, 2022; Cazzamatta & Santos, 2023). Still, as cyberattacks & disinformation campaigns flow together, they present very difficult challenge to integrity of self-determination. Yet, as such tactics become more advanced and more embedded, threat of manipulation increases, undermining very basis for democratic governance and people's right to choose their political fates. A good understanding of mechanisms of disinformation and cyberattack is necessary for revealing

doctrines of how to effectively combat these threats and protect right to self-determination in an age of digitalization.

Manipulating Public Opinion & Influencing Decision-Making

Psychological mechanisms, including confirmation bias and emotional manipulation, are used to promote disinformation to influence public opinion. The spread and acceptance of disinformation are closely related to confirmation bias, the psychological tendency for people to prefer and give more value to information that corroborates their preexisting beliefs. Cognitive dissonance theory tells us that people avoid discomfort of an opposing viewpoint by seeking information that confirms their beliefs (Neves & Oliveira, 2024; Miller & Cabell, 2024); this is this bias. This is conducive to disinformation campaigns constructing narratives that hook into specific ideological tribes and push them along (Winter et al., 2024; Pilgrim et al., 2024). Thus, in particular, during the 2016 U.S. presidential campaign, disinformation in messages aimed at specific deciles of voters tried market voters' feelings and fears and activated them for the desired candidates as well as positions (Елена & Анастасия, 2024). Strategic disinformation campaigns benefit grime by pulling on ideological divides, promoting narratives. An example of tactic was observed in 2016 U.S. presidential election, particularly as disinformation aimed at voter demographics, triggering fears as well as anxieties to mobilize them to vote for the certain candidates or to support certain policies (Merilehto et al., 2024; French et al., 2023).

Oriented on typology of disinformation intentionality and impact defined by the authors (French et al., 2023), these campaigns were developed to deceive and polarize audience. Virtual communities distribute disinformation by building around the basis of grievances shared and identity-related controversies, creating echo chambers in which false narratives are amplified (Czerwiński, 2024; Ruiz & Nilsson, 2022; Czerwiński, 2024). Disinformation also has a geopolitical dimension: Russia uses historical revisionism & strategic narratives that aim at changing this public opinion to promote state interests (Arribas et al., 2023: Morales et al., 2023). The media environment is spread across it, which helps provide a social media medium to spread the adversarial narratives that weaponize both falsehood and truth via identity-driven controversy (Ruiz & Nilsson, 2022; Arce, 2024). Bases like DISARM have been developed to analyze and react to any organized disinformation incidents, highlighting the importance of taking cognitive security measures to ensure information integrity (Terp & Breuer, 2022). In general, disinformation campaigns represent a multilayered threat that demands all-inclusive effort from media literacy, transparency and cybersecurity countermeasures to lessen their influence on the democracy as well as social consensus (Merilehto et al., 2024; Terp & Breuer, 2022).

Strategic disinformation campaigns benefit the grime by pulling on ideological divides, promoting narratives that land with different groups to reaffirm heighten receptivity to altered information. An example of this tactic was observed in the 2016 U.S. presidential election, particularly as the disinformation aimed at voter demographics, triggering fears and anxieties to mobilize them to vote for certain candidates or to support certain policies (Merilehto et al., 2024) (French et al., 2023). Oriented on typology of disinformation intentionality and impact defined by the authors (French et

al., 2023), these campaigns were developed to deceive and polarize the audience. Thus, the virtual communities distribute disinformation by building around the basis of grievances shared as well as identity-related controversies, creating the echo chambers in which false narratives are amplified (Czerwiński, 2024), (Ruiz & Nilsson, 2022). Disinformation campaigns target these communities to normalize extreme views and polarize society when these communities are created as a reaction to a changing society (Czerwiński, 2024). Disinformation also has a geopolitical dimension: Russia uses historical revisionism and strategic narratives that aim at changing this public opinion to promote state interests (Arribas et al., 2023: 5) (Madrid-Morales et al., 2023: 2). The media environment is spread across it, which helps provide the social media medium to spread the adversarial narratives that weaponize both falsehood and truth via identity-driven controversy (Ruiz & Nilsson, 2022) (Arce, 2024).

The frameworks such as DISARM that have been developed to analyze and react to any organized disinformation incidents, highlighting importance of taking cognitive security measures to ensure information integrity (Terp & Breuer, 2022). Disinformation campaigns are multifaceted threats that require a comprehensive but holistic approach, which includes media literacy, transparency, and cybersecurity capabilities, to reduce their negative effects on democracy and social cohesion (Terp & Breuer, 2022) (Merilehto et al., 2024). We observed the manifestation of this during the Brexit referendum: the public was polarized by fake news on immigration and economic instability, and this was done to determine the result (Елена & Анастасія, 2024). Consequently, to mitigate these effects, the key step needed is to improve media literacy and fact verification. The results of one study, critically understood and its ability to check power through media literacy intervention, revealed that they are not able to reduce disinformation in citizens, as explained previously (Dewi & Elfiandri, 2024). These effects must be mitigated, enhanced media literacy and fact verification are key here. Additionally, information source transparency must be increased, and regulatory frameworks for social media accountability must be developed to stop the spread of disinformation (Warin, 2024).

Despite these efforts, the challenge remains significant, as cognitive biases such as confirmation bias are deeply ingrained, difficult to overcome, necessitating continuous education and collaboration across sectors to strengthen citizens' ability to face information challenges in the digital era (Dewi & Elfiandri, 2024) ("Weakening the ideological immune system: "What kinds of debiasing techniques can help reduce confirmation bias? (2023). Research has shown that media literacy interventions can radically lower the power of the disinformation by enhancing the critical comprehension and independent fact checking of citizens who live in media-saturated world (Dewi & Elfiandri, 2024). Furthermore, transparency of information sources should be increased, and regulatory framework should be tightened to ensure that social media accountability is stimulated to fight disinformation (Warin, 2024). In this connection, despite these efforts, the challenge remains significant, as the cognitive biases such as confirmation bias are deeply ingrained as well as difficult to overcome, and necessitating continuous education and collaboration across sectors to strengthen citizens' ability to face information diverse leading challenges in digital era (Dewi & Elfiandri, 2024) ("Weakening

the ideological immune system: What methods can debiasing the techniques reduce confirmation bias (2023)?"

A. Impact on Political Choices Related to Self-Determination

Disinformation also plays a significant role in shaping decisions to exercise political choice in terms of self-determination through distorting perception of electoral integrity and undermining public confidence in elections as a democratic process. This problem has been worsened by proliferation of disinformation occurring via digital platforms, notably through social media, which provide the means for rapid dissemination without traditional checks tearing down public trust and distorting democratic processes (Warin, 2024). Political marketing techniques that exploit personal data and spread false news developed in posttruth era in USA, further polarized society while threatening electoral integrity (Kriška & Kováčik, 2024). The manipulation is not exclusive to the U.S.; legacy news media use during the 2022 Brazilian presidential election was associated with fewer beliefs in electoral misinformation (Mont'Alverne et al., 2024), with media trust acting as an antidote to misinformation. Currently, disinformation campaigns, especially those relayed by social bots and AI (Allegri, April 11, 2024). Thus, given the vulnerability of the credibility of voting systems to the misinformation, it can affect political polarization and decrease electoral participation; therefore, they need proactive communication strategies in educating voters and preparing them for what to expect during the elections as well as identifying the malicious advertisement attacks (Vasconcelos et al., 2024).

Belinda et al. (2024) explained how information manipulation with visual content and emotional narratives has caused public distrust of electoral bodies in Indonesia, which is a security challenge for national security. However, a cross-national study, for example, revealed how disinformation campaigns can lead to misguided beliefs about electoral fairness due to polarized perceptions of electoral integrity (Mauk & Grömping, 2023). Misinformation in U.S. has made election officials work more danger and serve to suppress voter turnout, particularly in marginalized communities (Exploring Cybersecurity, Misinformation, and Interference in Voting and Elections Through Cyberspace, 2023). While the effort to counter disinformation through crisis communication may reduce skepticism about election security, partisanship is often an amplifying factor, making the acceptance of electoral outcomes difficult (Winger et al., 2023). Finally, research from the Czech Republic also indicates that disinformation does not change people's opinions much but instead feeds on those who are already dissatisfied with a specific political party (Syrovátka & Komasová, 2023). The media literacy interventions can radically lower power of disinformation by enhancing the critical comprehension and independent fact checking of citizens. In general, it undermines public confidence so that the political choice of self-determination takes place with respect to its electoral processes.

B. Case Studies of Disinformation Impacting Self-Determination Processes

Several case studies illustrate tangible effects of disinformation campaigns on self-determination processes: 1. Brexit Referendum (2016): During the Brexit campaign battle over whether the United Kingdom should remain in European Union, wealth of false information was published. It is strongly

affected by votes that have been swayed by campaigns that have spread false economic arguments about why we should leave EU and exaggerate amount of immigration. The appeal to emotion that there was plenty of emotion tug to reclaim national sovereignty played for many citizens & played for this campaign to win, just narrowly (Bennett & Livingston, 2018). This included the use of bots and trolls and simply misleading content, the internet Research Agency said, to spread misleading content on social media platforms. Badawy et al. (2019) argue that the objective of this campaign was to provoke discord within electorate and led to the behavior of voters that eventually ended in Donald Trump winning the elections. 3. Catalan Independence Movement (2017): In October 2017, disinformation was used during Catalan independence referendum to split pro-independence camps and to erode sense of the legitimacy of vote. Thus, false narratives were reported on possible consequences of independence & legitimacy of referendum, thus creating confusion and skepticism among voters.

However, this manipulation not only changed the voter turnout but also polarized the community, complicating self-determination (Syrovátka et al., 2023). 4. Brazilian Elections (2018): During the 2018 Brazilian elections, we observed that the potential disinformation had to influence political outcomes. Thus, through platforms such as WhatsApp, disinformation campaigns targeted literal demographics, most specifically young voters, to spread misinformation on candidates and policies. However, there is no paradox to the major influence of this manipulation on voting behavior and efforts from both parties to mobilize voters, all stemming from disinformation that can shockingly disrupt democratic processes and even subvert self-determination (Ozawa et al. 2023). In this drive, they represent a substantial threat to public opinion and political decision making, especially with respect to self-determination. Therefore, Brexit, the 2016 U.S. presidential elections, the Catalan independence movement and the Brazilian elections showcase that how disinformation inherently affects self-determination processes. In this linking, with disinformation techniques continuing to shift, understanding the psychological nuances behind such tactics and their actual effects in the real world to develop the effective countermeasures for neutralizing their influence that becomes increasingly important.

International Legal & Normative Responses

At worst, the proliferation of disinformation campaigns that can be linked to self-determination movements at best causes a rethinking of existing international legal frameworks and applicability or relevance to be digitized. Self-determination is an acknowledged basic human right of people to choose political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development. However, disinformation proliferation disinclines the belief that the principle it safeguards can be achieved with the help of existing legal mechanisms and that it needs to be reexamined. In essence, the right of self-determination, having roots primarily in the Charter of the United Nations and many human rights conventions, is a multiform and extraordinarily complex principle recognized as a people's right to determine their political status & pursue their economic, social and cultural development. Self-determination is principle enshrined in Charter of United Nations, which is found in Chapter 1, Article 1. The United Nations has following purpose: establishing friendly relations among nations on the basis of respect for principle of equal rights and self-determination of people. The principle is

embodied in UN Charter and more developmentally in Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which claims that all people have a right to self-determination (Dieckhoff, 2023).

However, the right to self-determination is not applied as easily as the very term 'people' entitled to right to self—is defined vaguely in international law, which leaves no clear line between people and other categories of humans (Wachsmuth, 2023). Since then, self-determination has been a crucial idea in decolonization that has contributed to liberation from colonization and the transition to self-governance by independent countries (unfortunately, not by internal self-determination within the independent states), as Huawei (2023) states. In addition, the exercise of this right has challenged indigenous peoples, particularly the Naga people, whose self-determination is essential for their own humanization and whose collective aspiration is recognized (Longchari, 2024). The principle also intersects with issues of the national sovereignty and territorial integrity, creating tensions in cases of secession, such as those observed in Kosovo and Catalonia, where external self-determination is justified only under exceptional circumstances of severe human rights violations ('The right to self-determination of people through examples of kosovo and catalonia: what 'justifies the secession of kosovo in modern public international law?' (2023). The case for the referendums exemplified by the Donetsk and Luhansk People's Republics illustrates the democratic aspect of self-determination, but the international community's reaction to such a scenario is still uncertain (Stepanyuk et al., 2024).

In addition, the self-determination is slowly becoming perceived as customary international law because of its application to Indigenous peoples' participation in international governance (Jones, 2024). Although the right of self-determination is especially important in the international law, it remains subject to diversified understanding and implementation on the basis of the geopolitical interests of the doers as well as changes in world order (Kagramanov, 2023). However, these rights are difficult to apply to a digital landscape rife, with disinformation campaigns spanning national boundaries that are not able to be easily attributed to those to be held responsible (Kagramanov, 2023). Although international law provides a basis for addressing violations of self-determination, it does not, by itself, address the challenges of digital disinformation that clarify and demarcate the public discourse and therefore democratic processes (Akhtar, 2022). International law provides a template for nonrecognition of violations of self-determination, but the same problems confronting recognition of that template in the digital epoch are same problems preventing it internationally. Digital platforms have increased the speed of the circulation of disinformation, or lies intentionally spread, consequently threatening the institutions of democracy and social stability (Huang, 2024; Warin, 2024).

Some strategies to fight disinformation include improving digital literacy, promoting transparency in information sources and setting up regulatory frameworks to hold social media accountable for the information it spreads (Warin, 2024; Nallasamy et al., 2024). In addition, the principles of the nonintervention and obligations of the due diligence regarding digital information operations in accordance with international law have been imposed (Dias, 2023). The sectors must work together to protect democratic values and information integrity in the digital age via collaboration in media

literacy education and fact checking programs (Praveenkumar, 2024; Merilehto et al., 2024). Thus, international law takes the form of a solid foundation but still has to evolve as a means of dealing with particular digital—disinformation-related issues related to democracy and social cohesion protection. This evolving process of collective self-determination reflects ongoing historical and political realities and thus merits a nuanced understanding in which internal and external forms of self-determination are equally considered while recognizing the possibility of abuse in the digital era (Sparks, 2022). Consequently, there is an urgent need to analyze ways to correct existing legal frameworks to be able to effectively manage the implications of disinformation in the digital age while maintaining right to self-determination in a fashion that corresponds to the current realities (Kadir, 2023).

DISCUSSION

This research shows that manipulation of speech at disinformation junctures is what disenfranchises and deprives people of self-determination as well as democratic processes. We investigated the psychological mechanisms, confirmation bias & emotional manipulation, over which disinformation works and how it can affect public opinion. These mechanisms provide an explanation for why people lack tolerance for disinformation, particularly when the environment is laced with emotion. Political support for self-determination processes is subject to potentially devious disinformation about political issues. The case studies showed that disinformation could distort citizen perceptions of electoral integrity to undermine citizen trust in institutions and processes of democracy. This erosion of trust has potentially lasting implications for future turnout of voters and social movement participation and their attendant weakening of the collective agency necessary for successful self-determination.

The results show that self-resolution can be made difficult by disinformation crushing, extending the separation inside areas. Finally, I discuss two case studies of Catalan independence movement in Spain and Brazilian elections in 2018 to demonstrate how disinformation can sow confusion and doubt, can handicap group's ability to speak with one voice as it pursues self-determination. Still, this fragmentation is a major cause of disaggregation, which not only undermines radiating power of movement but also provokes issues of social cohesion and democratic discourse. These findings demonstrate that a single approach is not enough to address disinformation challenges; it requires a more thorough approach. Policymakers, civil society & researchers, need to develop disinformation strategies together to protect the integrity of self-determination processes against such phenomena. However, it means better equipping the population with media literacy, fostering openness in social media, drawing up strict legal frameworks identifying disinformation campaigns and prosecuting their perpetrators.

CONCLUSION

Campaigns to spread disinformation also threaten democratic processes and can influence public opinion. Psychological mechanisms of confirmation bias and emotional manipulation are associated with disinformation warp perceptions and decisions of whom to vote for, which, with far-reaching detrimental results, further cripple communities working to achieve autonomy & self-governance. The effects of disinformation on the electoral outcomes and social cohesion are examined via case

studies: the Brexit referendum; the 2016 US presidential election; the 2017 Catalan independence referendum; and 2018 elections in Brazil. The fight against disinformation requires legal framework sound enough for every policymaker, international organization and civil society to stand as one. Disinformation is defined at international level; mechanisms of accountability are strengthened, and social media companies are convinced to provide more transparency and promote the public media literacy. By addressing challenge that disinformation poses to right to self-determination and the right to accurate information, stakeholders will be better prepared to protect the right to self-determination & ensure that people actually have access to precise information. Communities must move toward their aspirations of self-determination while protecting democratic processes and drivers of public discourse from foreign interference. Disinformation threats to our democratic institutions are not merely a question of ensuring that our institutions are resilient; rather, they are a fundamental threat to basic human rights around the world in an increasingly complex information environment.

Recommendations

1. Develop International Legal Frameworks: Attach disinformation to treaties that require the states and nonstate actors to hold responsible and that provide for the protection of rights of self-determination.
2. Strengthening Accountability Mechanisms: Establish standards to hold accountable those behind disinformation campaigns and treat state-backed disinformation as a breach of self-determination principle.
3. Promote Transparency in Social-Media: Regulations should be stipulating disinformation identification and a mitigation code of conduct to be implemented by major social media platforms to disclose algorithm transparency.
4. Enhance Media Literacy: These efforts should supplement the educational activities of media literacy programs & public awareness campaigns designed to increase individuals' recognition of disinformation and their ability and inclination to critique it.
5. Foster Collaboration amid Stakeholders: Helping create international cooperation between states, organizations and civil society with the aim of exchanging best practices and resources for fighting disinformation.

REFERENCES

Aaron, M., Veda, C., & Linda, W. (2023). A typology of disinformation intentionality and impact. *Information Systems Journal*, 10.1111/isj.12495.

Aaron, M., French, C., & Linda, W. (2023). The impact of cognitive biases on the believability of fake news. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 10.1080/0960085x. 2023.2272608.

Aküm, L. (2024). Self-determination: at the heart of Indigenous humanization. 10.4337/9781800 377011.00010.

Alain, D. W. (2023). Self-Determination and National Sovereignty. 10.1017/9781108551458.023.

Albert, C. (2023). Twitter propaganda operations: analyzing sociopolitical issues in Saudi Arabia. *Social Media + Society*, 9(4).

Aleksandar, P. (2023). Right of Self-Determination in (Unilateral) Declarations of Independence: A Brief History. 10.56461/zr_24.lajt.26.

Alessia, C., Marwil, J., Fernández., J., & Fernández., S. (2021). Seeing what can(not) be seen: The Confirmation bias, employment dynamics & climate change. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 10.1016/J.JEBO.2021.07.004.

Alexandre, M., Marcelo, R., & Marcos, R. (2024). Disinformation in electoral processes and the credibility of voting systems. 10.56238/sevenvmulti2024-018.

Anisha, N., Manju, R., Ahmad, W., Mudasir, A., Salah, F., & Naveen, H. (2024). The Pervasive Threat of Fake News and Disinformation in the Digital Age: Challenges and Solutions. South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics, 10.9734/SAJSSE/2024/v21i6825.

Praveenkumar, B. (2024). Misinformation and Disinformation: Unraveling the Web of Deceptive Information. 10.69662/JLLRD. v1i1.7.

Badawy, A., Addawood, A., Lerman, K., & Ferrara, E. (2019). Characterizing the 2016 Russian IRA influence campaign. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 9(1).

Bennett, W., & Livingston, S. (2018). The disinformation order: disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. *European Journal of Communication*, 33(2), 122-139.

Brandon, S., Shelby, J., John, I., & Michael, C. (2024). Explaining Russian state-sponsored disinformation campaigns: who is targeted and why? *The East European Politics*, 10.1080/21599165.2024.2302597.

Camila, A., Amy, A., Ross., Sayan, B., Benjamin, T., Richard, F., & Rasmus, K. (2024). The Electoral Misinformation Nexus: How News Consumption, Platform Use, and Trust in News Influence Belief in Electoral Misinformation. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 10.1093/POQ/nfae019.

Carlos, R., & Tomas, K. (2022). Disinformation & Echo Chambers: How Disinformation Circulates on social media Through Identity-Driven Controversies. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 10.1177/07439156221103852

Cecilie, S., Traberg., A., Morton, S., & Linden, V. (2023). Counteracting the socially endorsed misinformation through an emotion-fallacy inoculation. *Advances.in/psychology*, 10.56296/aip00017.

Charlie, P., Adam, S., Eugene, M., & Thomas, T., (2024). The Confirmation bias emerges from approximation to Bayesian reasoning. *Cognition*, 10.1016/j.cognition.2023.105693.

Christian, A., R. (2023). Discrimination with inaccurate beliefs and confirmation bias. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 10.1016/j.jebo.2023.04.018

Coffé, H. (2016). Citizens' media use and the accuracy of their perceptions of electoral integrity. *International Political Science Review*, 38(3), 281-297.

Da, W., & Yuxiang, H. (2023). Impact of perceived influence on confirmation bias in social media messages: the moderating effect of civic online reasoning. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 10.1080/01292986.2023.2261114

Dani, Madrid, H., & Saifuddin, A. (2023). The Geopolitics of Disinformation: Worldviews, Media Consumption and the Adoption of Global Strategic Disinformation Narratives. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 10.1093/ijpor/edad042.

Daniel, W. (2023). Who are the "Peoples" Entitled to the Right of Self-Determination? 10.4324/9781003036593-6.

Daniel, J., Davis., Tammy, E., Beck. (2023). How social media disrupts institutions: Exploring the intersection of online disinformation, digital materiality and field-level change. *Information and Organization*, 10.1016/j.infoandorg.2023.100488.

David, B., Sam, A., & Michael, S. (2023). The Mathematical modeling of disinformation and effectiveness of mitigation policies. *Dental science reports*, 10.1038/s41598-023-45710-2.

David, L. (2023). Deliberation, mood response, and the confirmation bias in religious belief domain. *Journal of behavioral and experimental economics*, 10.1016/j.socec.2024.102161.

David, S., Fernando, M., & Cesar, Z. (2023). Partisan Stereotyping and Polarization in Brazil. *Latin American Politics and Society*, 10.1017/lap.2023.38

Fernanda, O., & Clarissa, V. (2024). Citizens and Their Bots That Sniff Corruption: Using Digital Technology to Monitor & Expose Politicians Who Misuse Public Money. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 10.1177/00027642241268572.

Flavia, Rios., & Lara, M. (2024). Ethnic and racial violence and violations in the context of the Brazilian democratic crisis: a study of Black and Quilombola populations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 10.1080/01419870.2024.2329341.

Górka, M. (2022). Catalysts of cyber threats on the example of visegrad group countries. *Politics in Central Europe*, 18(3), 317-342.

Hunt, B. (2011). Publishing qualitative research in counseling journals. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 89(3), 296-300. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00092.x.

Jacek, C. (2024). "Useful Idiots" of Disinformation Campaigns. Mechanisms for the Formation of Virtual Communities Spreading Falsehood and Manipulation Online. *Konteksty Społeczne*, 10.17951/ks.2022.10.2.5-30.

Jardine, E. (2024). Cyberattacks and public opinion – the effect of uncertainty in guiding preferences. *Journal of Peace Research*, 61(1), 103-118.

Jessica, K., & Branislav, K. (2024). Posttruth Era of Political Marketing: Manipulation Techniques & Their Impact on Public Opinion and Electoral Integrity in USA. *Politické Vedy*, 10.24040 /politickevedy.2024.27.2.122-143.

Jing, H. (2024). Information Warfare in the Digital Age: Legal Responses to the Spread of False Information under Public International Law. *Journal of education, humanities and social sciences*, 10.54097/46jmtq31.

Jingtai, Tang., & Mingliang, X. (2023). Emotional community and concerted action: on emotional mobilization mechanism of disinformation in Anti-extradition Law amendment movement in Hong Kong. *Online media and global communication*, 10.1515/omgc-2023-2002

Joao, V., Ozawa., S., Joseph, D., Martin, J., & Jacob, G. (2022). 5. How Disinformation on WhatsApp Went from Campaign Weapon to Governmental Propaganda in Brazil. *Social media and society*, 10.1177/20563051231160632.

Joshua, S. (2023). Relevance of the Doctrines of Natural Law, Human Rights and International Law to the Principle of Self-Determination. *Strathmore law journal*, 10.52907/slj.v7i1.246

Jovana, D. (2021). On how to defend oneself against media manipulation: The role of informational and media literacy. *CM*, 10.5937/cm17-34211

Juhani, M., Tuomas, K., Roosa, P., & Emma, P. (2024). Disinformation campaigns – from international politics to societal cybersecurity threat. 10.31235/osf.io/zeajh.

Julia, M., Beatriz, B., Adriana, A., Stieglitz., M, & Clara, A. (2023). Combating misinformation with internet culture: case of Brazilian public health organizations and COVID-19 vaccination campaigns. *Internet Research*, 10.1108/intr-07-2022-0573.

Kelly, G., (2022). Educating future researchers with an eye toward intellectual humility. *Industrial and organizational psychology*, 10.1017/iop.2021.135.

Luiz, P. (2022). Journalist-Twitterers as Political Influencers in Brazil: Narratives and Disputes Toward New Intermediary Model. *Media and Communication*. 10.17645/mac. v10i3.5363.

Allegri, M. (2024). The Impact of Disinformation on the Functioning of Rule of Law and Democratic Processes in the Eu. Interdisciplinary journal of research and development, 10.56345/ijrdv11n1s116.

Manuel, P., Marinella, P., Fabio, S., & Rocco, N. (2024). Online disinformation in 2020 U.S. election: swing vs. safe states. *EPJ Data Science*, 10.48550/arxiv.2402.18664.

Marlene, M., & Max, G. (2023). Online Disinformation Predicts Inaccurate Beliefs About Election Fairness Among Both the Winners and Losers. *Comparative Political Studies*, 10.1177/00104140231193008.

Marta, P., Darren, G., & Alejandro, T. (2023). A Systematic Literature Review of the Phenomenon of Disinformation and Misinformation. Media and Communication, 10.17645/mac. v11i2.6453.

Mauk, M. (2023). Online disinformation predicts inaccurate beliefs about election fairness among both winners and losers. *Comparative Political Studies*, 57(6), 965-998.

Monahan, T., & Fisher, J. (2010). Benefits of 'observer effects': lessons from the field. Qualitative Research, 10(3), 357-376. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794110362874.

Ni, P., Sinta, D., & Elfiandri, E. (2024). Overcoming the Disinformation and Hoaxes in Political Communication: Promoting Media and Fact Literacy. *Journal International Dakwah and Communication*, 10.55849/jidc. v4i1.663.

Olena, P., Nevelska, V., Olexandrivna, N. (2021). Manipulation as a means of information and psychological influence in the information war. 10.21564/2663-5704.50.235389.

Ozawa, J., Woolley, S., Straubhaar, J., Riedl, M., Joseff, K., & Gursky, J. (2023). How disinformation on WhatsApp went from campaign weapon to governmental propaganda in Brazil. *Social Media + Society*, 9(1).

Pau, M., Fernando, D., & Alejandro, B. (2024). Modeling disinformation networks on Twitter: structure, behavior, and impact. *Applied Network Science*, 10.1007/s41109-024-00610-w

Peter, S., Marijn, A., Paul, E, Deyshawn, J., & Agostino, M. (2024). 3. Noise and opinion dynamics: how ambiguity promotes pro-majority consensus in the presence of confirmation bias. *Royal Society Open Science*, 10.1098/rsos.231071.

Regina, C., Augusto, J., Silva, S. (2023). 10. Checking verifications during the 2022 Brazilian run-off election: How fact-checking organizations exposed falsehoods and contributed to accuracy of public debate. Journalism: Theory, Practice & Criticism, 10.1177/14648849231196080.

Sachin, M., Rohit, S., Shivam, G., & Denis, D. (2021). A Confirmation Bias View on social media Induced Polarization During Covid-19. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 10.1007/S10796-021-10222-9

Sara, Terp., & Pablo, C. (2022). DISARM: A Framework for Analysis of Disinformation Campaigns. 10.1109/cogsima54611.2022.9830669.

Sang, L., & Saifuddin, A. (2023). Social media in Black Lives Matter movement: amplifying or reducing gaps in protest participation? *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 10.1080/19331681.2023.2223210

Sarjito, A. (2024). Countering hybrid threats: challenges and the role of defense science. *Publicness Journal of Public Administration Studies*, 3(1), 101-111.

Scott, A., Adriano, B., & Ahmed, M. (2023). Analyzing Misinformation Claims During the 2022 Brazilian General Election on WhatsApp, Twitter, and Kwai. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 10.1093/IJPOR/edae032.

Shan, Xu., Masahiro, C., & Najera, J., (2022). Exposure Effects or Confirmation Bias? Examining Reciprocal Dynamics of Misinformation, Misperceptions, and Attitudes Toward COVID-19 Vaccines. Health Communication, 10.1080/10410236.2022.2059802.

Shandler, R., Gross, M., & Canetti, D. (2022). Cyberattacks, psychological distress, and military escalation: an internal meta-analysis. *Journal of Global Security Studies*, 8(1).

Shelley, B., & Sang, L. (2022). The Conspiracy Beliefs, Misinformation, Social Media Platforms, and Protest Participation. *Media and Communication*, 10.17645/mac.v10i4.5667

Steven, J., & Samuli, H. (2024). Rethinking the International Law of Interference in the Digital Age. 10.1093/OSO/9780197744772.003.0018.

Syrovátka, J., Hořejš, N., & Komasová, S. (2023). Toward a model that measures the impact of disinformation on elections. *European View*, 22(1), 119-130.

Talita, D., & Souza, D. (2023). The Limits on Information Operations Under International Law. 10.23919/CyCon58705.2023.10181348.

Tatiana, D. (2023). 3. Who Posts Fake News? Authentic and Inauthentic Spreaders of Fabricated News on Facebook and Twitter. *Journalism Practice*, 10.1080/17512786.2023.2176352.

Thierry, W. (2024). Disinformation in the Digital Age: Impacts on Democracy and Strategies for Mitigation. 10.54932/gqwb1497.

Tian, H. (2023). Decolonization and the Right to Self-Determination. Advances in public policy and administration (APPA) book series, 10.4018/978-1-6684-7040-4.ch002.

Tim, H. (2024). The Problem of Disinformation: A Critical Approach. Social Epistemology, 10.1080/02691728.2024.2346127.

Václav, Š., & Sabina, M. (2023). Information Disorder and the Illiberal Public Sphere. 10.1007/978-3-031-54489-7_7.

Wen-Qi, Ruan. (2022). 'Them' without 'us': negative identities and affective polarization in Brazil. *Political Research Exchange*, 10.1080/2474736x.2022.2117635

Yaqi, L. (2022). True feelings but False meanings: The Emotional Performance and Individual Confrontation in Dissemination of Misinformation. 10.54691/bcpep.v4i.805

Zhen, G., Jin, C., & Changsheng, L. (2023). Mitigating Influence of Disinformation Propagation Using Uncertainty-Based Opinion Interactions. IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems, 10.1109/TCSS.2022.3225375.

И.К., Елена, & Анастасия. С. (2024). Disinformation: analysis, consequences and counteraction. 10.26297/2312-9409.2024.1.13.