ISSN: 2230-9926

Available online at http://www.journalijdr.com

IJDR

International Journal of Development Research
Vol. 15, Issue, 07, pp. 68736-68740, July, 2025
https://doi.org/10.37118/ijdr.29869.07.2025

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

GENOCIDE IN THE DIGITAL AGE: SOCIAL MEDIA INCITEMENT AND INTERNATIONAL LEGAL RESPONSES

***Dr. Swarup Mukherjee**

Associate Professor of Law, ICFAI University Tripura

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 19th April, 2025
Received in revised form
27th May, 2025
Accepted 10th June, 2025
Published online 29th July, 2025

Key Words:
Genocide; Digital Incitement; International Criminal Law; Social Media; Rome Statute; Genocide Convention; ICTR Jurisprudence; Myanmar; Ethiopia; Corporate Accountability; Hate Speech; Algorithmic Amplification; Freedom of Expression; Platform Regulation; Inchoate Crimes.

****Corresponding Author:***
Dr. Swarup Mukherjee

ABSTRACT

The proliferation of digital communication technologies, particularly social media, has introduced novel and complex challenges to the international legal regime governing genocide and mass atrocity prevention. This article examines the evolving phenomenon of incitement to genocide in the digital age, where hate speech, dehumanizing propaganda, and targeted disinformation campaigns are rapidly disseminated across virtual platforms. Drawing upon the Genocide Convention, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, and jurisprudence from the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, the study explores the definitional and doctrinal difficulties associated with applying traditional legal concepts—such as "direct and public" incitement—to algorithmically mediated speech. Through case studies from Myanmar, Ethiopia, and Sri Lanka, the article demonstrates how social media has contributed to atrocity environments and identifies the persistent accountability gap concerning platform liability and non-state actors. The article concludes by proposing targeted reforms to international criminal law, including the clarification of incitement thresholds, expansion of prosecutorial jurisdiction, and development of corporate responsibility frameworks. In doing so, it argues for a reconfiguration of international legal responses to meet the moral and juridical imperatives of atrocity prevention in the digital era.

Citation*: *Dr. Swarup Mukherjee. 2025. *"Genocide in the Digital Age: Social Media Incitement and International Legal Responses". International Journal of Development Research*, 15, (07), 68736-68740.

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of digital communication technologies—most notably social media—has significantly altered the modalities through which speech is disseminated, received, and acted upon. In the context of mass atrocity crimes, particularly genocide, this transformation has engendered novel challenges for both the identification of incitement and the imposition of criminal liability. While traditional paradigms of genocidal incitement focused on state-controlled broadcast media or official pronouncements (as exemplified by the Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines in the Rwandan context), contemporary manifestations of incitement frequently occur in decentralized and algorithmically driven digital environments. Genocide, as codified under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 1948 (hereinafter "Genocide Convention"), includes the crime of direct and public incitement to commit genocide (Article III(c)). This provision establishes incitement as an inchoate offence, punishable irrespective of the occurrence of the substantive act of genocide. However, the normative and jurisprudential contours of what constitutes "direct" and "public" incitement remain subject to interpretation, particularly in technologically mediated spaces. Recent developments—including the persecution of the Rohingya in Myanmar, interethnic violence in Ethiopia, and religiously motivated attacks in Sri Lanka—have demonstrated the instrumentalization of digital platforms for the propagation of dehumanizing narratives, hate speech, and targeted disinformation. These developments raise critical questions regarding the threshold of criminal liability for digital incitement and the attribution of responsibility to individual actors, states, and corporate intermediaries. Despite the significance of these developments, international criminal law has yet to comprehensively address the legal implications of online incitement. The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998), while encompassing liability for ordering, soliciting, or inducing the commission of core crimes (Article 25), does not provide explicit treatment of digital forms of communication or the role of intermediaries such as social media companies. Moreover, there exists a normative lacuna with respect to the accountability of non-state actors and technology corporations whose platforms may facilitate or amplify inciting content. This article undertakes a critical legal analysis of the evolving phenomenon of genocide-related incitement in the digital age. It examines the extent to which existing international legal frameworks, including the Genocide Convention, the Rome Statute, and relevant customary international law, are equipped to respond to incitement via social media and other digital channels. In doing so, the article interrogates key doctrinal issues such as the interpretation of "direct and public" in digital contexts, the evidentiary standards applicable to algorithmically amplified speech, and the scope of

individual and corporate liability. Through comparative analysis of relevant case studies and emerging jurisprudence, the article seeks to clarify the legal responsibilities of various actors and assess the adequacy of international legal mechanisms in preventing and punishing incitement to genocide in the digital era.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative, doctrinal research methodology aimed at analyzing the normative, institutional, and jurisprudential frameworks governing the crime of incitement to genocide, with specific reference to digital platforms. The research proceeds through a systematic examination of primary legal sources, authoritative jurisprudence, and institutional reports, supplemented by comparative case studies and empirical documentation concerning the role of social media in contemporary atrocity contexts. Primary sources include binding international legal instruments such as the *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 1948* ("Genocide Convention"), the *Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, 1998* ("Rome Statute"), and relevant provisions of customary international law, as identified in International Law Commission commentaries and academic commentary. The study further relies on judicial decisions of international criminal tribunals, most notably:

- *Prosecutor v. Akayesu*, Case No. ICTR-96-4-T (International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda), which elaborates on the constitutive elements of incitement to genocide, and
- *Prosecutor v. Bemba*, Case No. ICC-01/05-01/08 (International Criminal Court), for its relevance to modes of liability under Article 25 of the Rome Statute.

To contextualize the legal inquiry within recent events, the article examines fact-finding and investigative reports from United Nations bodies, including the *Report of the Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar* (2018), which documents the use of Facebook to facilitate hate speech and incitement against the Rohingya minority. Similar analyses are conducted using data from conflicts in Ethiopia's Tigray region and communal violence in Sri Lanka, where digital platforms were implicated in inciting ethnically targeted violence. The study also engages with secondary literature authored by leading legal scholars in the fields of international criminal law, transitional justice, and cyberlaw, to frame the normative debates on digital incitement, responsibility attribution, and platform liability. Supplementary empirical data is drawn from publicly available transparency reports, content moderation disclosures, and oversight decisions released by social media platforms such as Meta (formerly Facebook) and X (formerly Twitter), alongside critical analyses by civil society organizations such as Human Rights Watch, Access Now, and Amnesty International. This triangulated methodology facilitates a comprehensive and interdisciplinary legal analysis of how incitement to genocide via digital media can be conceptualized, regulated, and adjudicated within the existing structures of international criminal accountability. Special attention is paid to evidentiary challenges, definitional ambiguities, and normative gaps that arise when traditional legal frameworks confront technologically mediated incitement.

DISCUSSION

Legal Framework: Genocide and Incitement in International Law: The regulation of incitement to genocide within international law rests on a combination of treaty obligations, evolving jurisprudence from international criminal tribunals, customary international law principles, and academic interpretation. In an era where digital platforms increasingly mediate public discourse and mobilization, the application of these legal norms to online spaces raises new interpretative and enforcement challenges. This section explores the legal architecture governing incitement to genocide, with particular emphasis on its adaptability to digital environments.

The Genocide Convention, 1948: The *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 1948* (hereinafter the Genocide Convention) is the cornerstone of the international legal regime addressing genocide. Article III of the Convention enumerates punishable acts related to genocide, including:

- Genocide
- Conspiracy to commit genocide
- Direct and public incitement to commit genocide
- Attempt to commit genocide
- Complicity in genocide

Article III(c) criminalizes "direct and public incitement to commit genocide" even if the genocide does not occur. This reflects the recognition that incitement, by its very nature, creates a climate conducive to genocidal violence. It is categorized as an *inchoate crime*, meaning it is punishable regardless of its success in producing genocidal acts. The term "direct" implies an unambiguous call to action, while "public" indicates that the communication must reach a sufficient audience to pose a real risk. However, the Convention does not define "direct" or "public," leaving their interpretation to subsequent case law and doctrinal development. It also predates the digital age and thus provides no guidance on how these terms apply to social media platforms, algorithmic dissemination, or anonymous speech. The need to apply these outdated textual formulations to technologically advanced, transnational forms of communication creates interpretive tensions that remain unresolved in much of international practice.

ICTR Jurisprudence: Defining Incitement through Media: The most detailed elaboration of the crime of incitement to genocide in international law has emerged from the jurisprudence of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR), particularly in the landmark cases of *Akayesu* and *Nahimana et al.*

Prosecutor v. Akayesu, ICTR-96-4-T (1998): In *Akayesu*, the Tribunal held that incitement to genocide consists of "a direct appeal to commit an act constituting genocide," and that such speech must be public and intentionally directed toward instigating others to commit genocide. Akayesu, a local mayor, was convicted for statements that encouraged violence against Tutsis. The judgment emphasized that intent is a key component—mere hate speech is not sufficient unless it aims to provoke genocidal acts.

Prosecutor v. Nahimana, Barayagwiza, and Ngeze (the "Media Case"), ICTR-99-52-T (2003): This case involved the founders and executives of *Radio TélévisionLibre des Mille Collines (RTLM)* and the extremist magazine *Kangura*. The Tribunal found that these media outlets played a direct role in inciting genocide by broadcasting messages that dehumanized the Tutsi population, spread misinformation, and glorified ethnic violence. Even coded language and implicit messages were found to constitute direct incitement in the Rwandan context, where such terms were widely understood. The Media Case is especially relevant to contemporary debates on digital incitement, as it established that:

- Media actors can bear criminal responsibility for genocide.
- Coded language may qualify as incitement if the audience understands the genocidal intent.
- Mass communication platforms, whether traditional or digital, can amplify incitement to dangerous levels.

These precedents suggest that content disseminated on social media, which similarly dehumanizes targeted groups or encourages violence, could be subject to comparable scrutiny—yet no international tribunal has yet applied these standards directly to digital communication.

The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998): The Rome Statute, which established the International Criminal Court (ICC), recognizes genocide as a core crime under Article 6, but does

not expressly codify incitement to genocide as a standalone offence unless it results in the commission of genocide.

Relevant provisions include:

- ***Article 25(3)(b)***: Criminalizes ordering, soliciting, or inducing the commission of any of the crimes under ICC jurisdiction, including genocide.
- ***Article 25(3)(d)***: Addresses contribution to a group acting with a common purpose to commit genocide.

Unlike the Genocide Convention, the Rome Statute does not criminalize inchoate incitement—that is, incitement that does not result in genocide. This creates a jurisdictional and normative gap, particularly in cases where digital incitement may mobilize violence but fall short of meeting the evidentiary threshold for genocide itself. Moreover, the Rome Statute does not address digital intermediaries, such as tech platforms, nor does it contain provisions for corporate criminal responsibility, thereby excluding liability for companies whose platforms may algorithmically amplify genocidal incitement. In a world where digital communication plays a primary role in shaping public opinion and triggering mass mobilization, the statute's silence on these matters appears increasingly problematic.

Customary International Law: The prohibition on incitement to genocide has been widely recognized as a norm of customary international law, binding on all states regardless of treaty ratification. Jurisprudence from the ICTR and state practice confirm that incitement to genocide is a punishable international crime, even absent a completed act of genocide. According to the International Law Commission (ILC) and commentary from the International Court of Justice (ICJ) (e.g., *Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro*), states have both a negative obligation not to engage in incitement and a positive duty to prevent it. This responsibility includes identifying and suppressing emerging risks of genocide, including those facilitated through digital infrastructure. Customary norms provide a theoretical foundation for extending liability to non-state actors, such as private individuals or tech companies, where they act with genocidal intent or recklessness. However, enforcement remains a challenge due to:

- Jurisdictional limitations
- Difficulty proving intent
- Absence of settled doctrine on algorithmic or corporate complicity.

Doctrinal Challenges in the Digital Context: Applying the above legal frameworks to digital spaces introduces several doctrinal uncertainties:

- **"Public" nature of online speech**: Is a closed group or viral post sufficient to satisfy the "public" requirement?
- **"Direct" incitement in coded memes or dog whistles**: Can content filtered through cultural references or satire still qualify?
- **Intent vs. Algorithmic Amplification**: If content is unintentionally boosted by platform algorithms, who bears liability?
- **Transnational speech and jurisdiction**: What happens when incitement originates from one state and targets victims in another?

These questions suggest a pressing need to revisit international legal definitions, develop jurisprudence attuned to digital harms, and explore potential extensions of international criminal and civil liability to intermediaries who facilitate or profit from the propagation of genocidal speech.

Case Studies: The Role of Social Media in Incitement to Genocide and Mass Atrocities: Digital platforms have increasingly become the primary vectors for the dissemination of hate speech, targeted propaganda, and calls for violence—phenomena that align closely with the normative elements of incitement to genocide under international law. This section analyzes three key case studies—Myanmar, Ethiopia, and Sri Lanka—to evaluate the extent to which social media activity has contributed to atrocities and whether international legal frameworks are adequate to address such digital incitement.

Myanmar: The Rohingya Genocide and Facebook's Role: The persecution of the Rohingya Muslim minority in Myanmar represents the most illustrative contemporary case of digital incitement contributing to a genocidal campaign. The UN Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar (2018) concluded that the Myanmar military, particularly the Tatmadaw, used Facebook as a tool to spread misinformation, vilify the Rohingya, and incite ethnic hatred. Systematic posts referred to Rohingyas as "terrorists," "invaders," and "sub-human," invoking classic markers of genocidal dehumanization. Despite Facebook's community standards, the platform failed to act promptly. Senior UN investigators noted that Facebook had "substantively contributed to the level of acrimony and hatred" against the Rohingya. It was only in 2018 that Facebook belatedly removed accounts linked to the military.

Legal Analysis:

- The public and widespread nature of posts targeting an identifiable group fulfills the "public" criterion under Article III(c) of the Genocide Convention.
- The content, in many cases, called for *direct action* and removal of the Rohingya population—implicating the "directness" element.
- Although individual perpetrators have not been prosecuted under international criminal law, Facebook's role has prompted growing debate about corporate complicity and derivative liability.
- No prosecution has yet attempted to bring digital incitement actors under Article 25 of the Rome Statute, leaving a doctrinal and accountability vacuum.

Ethiopia: Ethnic Violence in the Tigray and Amhara Regions: In Ethiopia, the conflict between federal forces and the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF), followed by widespread interethnic violence, saw social media become a key battleground. Platforms like Facebook and Twitter were flooded with calls for violence, including graphic memes, manipulated images, and hate-filled hashtags targeting Tigrayans and Amharas.

In 2021, Facebook's own internal whistleblower documents (the "Facebook Papers") revealed that the company lacked sufficient moderation capacity in Ethiopian languages, leading to the unchecked spread of inciting content. Hate speech calling for ethnic cleansing remained on the platform for extended periods.

Legal Analysis:

- Many posts can be read as *solicitations* to commit violent acts against ethnic groups, potentially meeting the "inducement" standard under Article 25(3)(b) of the Rome Statute.
- The context—a region already in armed conflict—means the speech had a high likelihood of triggering atrocities, strengthening causation analysis.
- The absence of enforcement against digital actors, despite clear causal links, highlights the jurisdictional weakness of current international legal structures, particularly concerning private corporate actors and non-state instigators.

Sri Lanka: Anti-Muslim Riots and WhatsApp Mobilization: In Sri Lanka, multiple waves of communal violence targeting Muslims were facilitated through digital platforms, particularly WhatsApp, Facebook, and YouTube. In 2018 and again in 2019, virally circulated rumors accused Muslims of sterilizing Sinhalese women, poisoning

food, and plotting violence against Buddhists. These messages, often originated or circulated by nationalist Buddhist groups, triggered widespread attacks on Muslim businesses, homes, and mosques. Despite warnings from civil society, authorities failed to contain the online incitement. Meta Platforms (formerly Facebook, Inc.) was again criticized for allowing hate speech in Sinhala and Tamil to go unmoderated for long periods.

Legal Analysis:

- Although the violence did not rise to the level of genocide under the strict intent requirement of the Genocide Convention, the online content likely constituted incitement to violence, persecution, or crimes against humanity.
- The use of closed digital groups (e.g., WhatsApp) raises questions regarding the "public" nature of the inciting communication. Jurisprudence must evolve to clarify whether such messages, if sent to a large group with the likelihood of further dissemination, meet the public threshold.
- These incidents underscore the need to reconceptualize the "public" element in digital speech contexts, including private group chats with viral potential.

Comparative Insights and Normative Implications

Across all three case studies, a consistent pattern emerges:

- Hate speech and incitement were disseminated widely on digital platforms.
- The targeted groups were marginalized ethnic or religious minorities.
- The inciting content often included falsehoods, conspiracy theories, and dehumanizing rhetoric.
- States and tech companies failed to act in a timely or effective manner.

These facts collectively demonstrate that the doctrinal elements of incitement to genocide, as interpreted in Akayesu and Nahimana, can indeed manifest in digital environments. However, enforcement remains elusive due to:

- The transnational nature of digital platforms;
- The absence of international criminal liability for corporations;
- Jurisdictional and evidentiary constraints in prosecuting anonymous or pseudonymous actors;
- The lack of doctrinal clarity on the application of "public," "direct," and "intent" in the context of digital incitement.

Key Doctrinal Gaps and Reform Proposals: The preceding analysis illustrates a growing disjunction between the normative aspirations of international criminal law and the realities of digitally mediated incitement to mass atrocities. While international legal instruments such as the Genocide Convention and the Rome Statute provide a doctrinal framework for prosecuting incitement to genocide, they remain underdeveloped in relation to the specific dynamics of digital communication technologies, algorithmic amplification, and corporate platform governance. This section discusses key doctrinal gaps and proposes targeted reforms to enhance the capacity of international law to respond to incitement in the digital age.

Normative and Jurisprudential Gaps: Several gaps in the current legal framework impede the prosecution of digital incitement:

Ambiguity in the Interpretation of "Direct and Public": The Genocide Convention criminalizes only "direct and public" incitement to genocide. However, neither the Convention nor subsequent multilateral treaties provide a universally accepted definition of these terms in the context of online speech. Courts have interpreted "direct" to require an unambiguous call to action and "public" to mean accessible to a general or targeted audience. Yet, the question arises: can algorithmically personalized, geo-fenced, or group-based digital content be considered "public"?

Platforms such as Facebook or WhatsApp enable communication that is publicly impactful while technically semi-private. Without doctrinal evolution, harmful content may escape liability due to outdated understandings of publicity.

Insufficient Coverage of Inchoate Incitement in the Rome Statute: While the Genocide Convention criminalizes incitement as an inchoate offence, the Rome Statute does not include an explicit provision for direct and public incitement to genocide unless it results in actual genocidal acts. This restricts the ICC's ability to intervene at early stages, when the speech climate may already be laying the groundwork for atrocities.

Absence of Corporate or Platform Liability: International criminal law remains centered on individual criminal responsibility. As a result, corporations, including social media companies, cannot be held criminally liable under the Rome Statute. This presents a critical accountability gap, especially in cases such as Myanmar, where platforms demonstrably failed to prevent the weaponization of their services. The doctrine of aiding and abetting or complicity is also narrowly construed in relation to non-natural persons.

Reform Proposals: To bridge these gaps and strengthen the legal regime for digital incitement, the following reform proposals merit consideration:

Amend the Rome Statute to Incorporate Incitement as an Inchoate Offence: The Assembly of States Parties could consider amending Article 6 and Article 25 of the Rome Statute to explicitly criminalize direct and public incitement to commit genocide, regardless of the commission of the underlying act. This would bring the ICC's jurisdiction into closer conformity with the Genocide Convention and facilitate early intervention.

Develop Jurisprudence on Digital Incitement Through Interpretive Guidance: The ICC's Office of the Prosecutor, in collaboration with UN special rapporteurs and digital rights experts, could issue interpretive guidelines or policy papers clarifying how existing legal concepts such as "directness," "publicity," and "intent" apply to digital speech. This could be modeled on the OTP's existing policy papers on gender-based crimes and cultural property.

Establish Corporate Civil Liability Frameworks in International and Regional Forums: Although criminal prosecution of corporations under international law remains contested, civil liability mechanisms may offer a viable alternative. Instruments such as the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, the proposed UN Binding Treaty on Business and Human Rights, and EU's Digital Services Act could provide models for enforcing accountability on tech platforms that fail to take reasonable measures to prevent incitement.

Create a Specialized Treaty or Protocol on Hate Speech and Atrocity Prevention in Digital Environments: States should consider negotiating a dedicated multilateral treaty or protocol that addresses digital incitement to atrocity crimes. Such a treaty could:

- Define thresholds for incitement in digital spaces;
- Mandate transparency and content moderation standards for platforms;
- Establish an international monitoring mechanism;
- Encourage cooperation in cross-border evidence sharing.

Strengthen Domestic Incorporation of International Standards: Domestic legal systems must be equipped to prosecute incitement that originates or spreads through digital means. States parties to the Genocide Convention should review their implementing legislation to ensure that incitement via social media is recognized as a

prosecutable offence. National laws should also provide extraterritorial jurisdiction where incitement affects vulnerable populations abroad.

Balancing Freedom of Expression and Prevention of Mass Atrocities: A persistent challenge lies in reconciling the prohibition of incitement with the protection of freedom of expression under instruments such as Article 19 of the ICCPR and corresponding constitutional provisions. However, Article 20(2) of the ICCPR mandates the prohibition of "any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence." The Rabat Plan of Action (2012), adopted under the auspices of the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, provides a six-part threshold test (context, speaker, intent, content, extent, and likelihood) for evaluating incitement. This framework can be instrumental in guiding judicial and regulatory bodies in distinguishing protected speech from punishable incitement, especially in the digital realm. In sum, international law's ability to confront genocide and atrocity crimes in the digital age depends upon its adaptability. The transformative power of digital communication requires not only reinterpretation of existing doctrines but also the development of new legal tools—normative, procedural, and institutional. Closing the accountability gap for digital incitement is essential to fulfill the preventive purpose of international criminal law and uphold the global commitment to "never again."

CONCLUSION

The digitalization of public discourse has profoundly reshaped the modalities through which incitement to genocide is generated, disseminated, and consumed. Social media platforms, through their unprecedented reach, speed, and algorithmic targeting, have transformed hate speech from a localized propaganda tool into a transnational and rapidly amplifying threat. As the case studies from Myanmar, Ethiopia, and Sri Lanka demonstrate, digital incitement is no longer a hypothetical risk but an empirically verifiable precursor to mass atrocities. International legal frameworks, while normatively robust in principle, remain ill-equipped to address this evolving landscape. The Genocide Convention provides a foundational prohibition on direct and public incitement but lacks interpretive precision for application to algorithmically mediated or semi-private digital speech. The Rome Statute, while offering some avenues for prosecuting instigators, does not encompass inchoate incitement nor recognize the role of corporate or algorithmic actors. These normative and jurisdictional gaps leave a growing class of perpetrators and facilitators—particularly non-state actors and digital intermediaries—effectively beyond the reach of international accountability mechanisms.

Addressing these challenges requires a multi-layered approach. At the doctrinal level, key definitional concepts such as "directness" and "publicity" must be reinterpreted in light of digital communication dynamics. At the institutional level, the ICC and other accountability bodies must expand their policy focus to include digital incitement and develop protocols for gathering and authenticating online evidence. At the regulatory level, states and international organizations must strengthen obligations for platform governance, corporate due diligence, and cross-border cooperation. Furthermore, any reform agenda must balance the right to freedom of expression with the imperative of atrocity prevention, drawing on existing international human rights standards such as Article 20(2) of the ICCPR and the Rabat Plan of Action. Legal clarity, procedural safeguards, and contextual analysis must remain central to any enforcement strategy. Ultimately, the prevention and punishment of genocide in the digital age necessitates not only the extension of legal accountability to new actors and mediums but also a recalibration of international legal consciousness to meet the moral urgency of digital-era atrocity prevention. As the world becomes increasingly interconnected, so too must the mechanisms of justice evolve—proactively, precisely, and proportionately—to forestall the reemergence of genocidal violence in any form, analog or digital.

REFERENCES

Amnesty International. (2022). *Social Media and Conflict: How Big Tech Failed in Ethiopia*.

Human Rights Watch. (2021). *"Our Lives Are Like Death": Digital Censorship and Ethnic Targeting in Myanmar*.

International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR), *Prosecutor v. Akayesu*, Case No. ICTR-96-4 (1998).

International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR), *Prosecutor v. Nahimana*, Case No. ICTR-99-52-T (2003).

Meta Oversight Board. (2021). *Case Decision: Myanmar Military Account Ban Review*.

Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, 17 July 1998, UN Doc. A/CONF.183/9.

Schabas, W. (2009). *Genocide in International Law: The Crime of Crimes*. Cambridge University Press.

Smeulers, A. (2010). "Incitement to Genocide and the Media." *International Review of Penal Law*, 81(1), 115–138.

United Nations Human Rights Council. (2018). *Report of the Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar*.

United Nations. (1948). *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*.

****