



Online Antisemitism Working Group

Online Antisemitism: A systematic review of the
problem, the response and the need for change

Dr Andre Oboler and Adv David Matas

This document is based on the work of the July 2011 meeting of the Working Group on Online Antisemitism of the Global Forum to Combat Antisemitism. The meeting took place at the Foreign Ministry in Jerusalem, Israel.

© 2013 Andre Oboler and David Matas



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

This license grants you the right to print, share, and upload this document for non-commercial purposes.

Table of Contents

MESSAGE FROM THE WORKING GROUP CO-CHAIRS	4
INTRODUCTION	5
THE TEMPIS TAXONOMY	5
SECTION A: KEY INCIDENTS	11
A1 THIRD INTIFADA ON FACEBOOK	11
A2 RED BUBBLE AND HIPSTER HITLER	11
A3 APPLE'S APP STORE	11
A4 TRUTH-UNVEILED.COM	11
A5 GOOGLE SEARCH RESULTS	12
A6 UCU MAILING LIST	12
A7 GOOGLE EARTH AND REPLACEMENT GEOGRAPHY	12
A8 HOLOCAUST DENIAL DEFINED AS "NOT HATE" BY FACEBOOK.	12
A9 FACEBOOK AND THE NEO-NAZI MOVEMENT	13
A10 SWEDISH BLOOD LIBEL	13
A 11 ANTISEMITISM ON PROGRESSIVE BLOGS:	13
A 12 EASY OF CREATING PAGES / THREADS LEADS TO FLOOD OF HATE	14
A 13 YOUTUBE USED TO SPREAD HATE MYTH AT LIGHTNING SPEED	14
SECTION B: AREAS OF CONCERN	15
B1 ANTISEMITIC THEMES ONLINE	15
B2 PLATFORM SPECIFIC CONCERNS	16
SECTION C: POSITIVE INITIATIVES	20
C1 REPORTS.....	20
C2 CONFERENCES	20
C3 GOVERNMENT ACTION RELATED TO ONLINE ANTISEMITISM	20
C4 PROGRAMMES TO COMBAT ONLINE ANTISEMITISM.....	21
C5 EXPERT CENTERS ON ONLINE HATE	23
SECTION D: PROPOSALS	25
D1 PLATFORM PROVIDERS	25
D2 NGO'S AND ACTIVIST'S ROLE	25
D3 PARENTS, TEACHERS, EMPLOYERS	26
D4 INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDERS.....	26
D5 INDUSTRY BODIES.....	27
D6 SEARCH ENGINES	27
D7 DOMAIN NAME REGISTRARS	28
D8 CONSOLIDATING INFORMATION	28
D9 DETERMINING WHAT IS ANTISEMITIC.....	28
D 10 COPYRIGHT AND SHARING.....	28
D11 CLASSIFICATION OF ONLINE SPACES FOR POLICY PURPOSES.....	28
D12 LAW OF THE INTERNET	29
D13 CARRIER IMMUNITY	30
D14 COMMUNITY RESPONSES.....	30

D15 MAINSTREAM MEDIA	31
D 16 NET NEUTRALITY	31
D17 OTHER PROPOSALS	31
D18 GLOBAL FORUM	31
SECTION E: CHALLENGES.....	32
APPENDIX A: POSITIVE INITIATIVES (EXPANDED DETAILS)	34
EXPANDED C1 - REPORTS COVERING ONLINE HATE.....	34
EXPANDED C2 - CONFERENCES THAT INCLUDED A FOCUS ON ONLINE ANTISEMITISM	46
APPENDIX B: COMMUNICATIONS WITH FACEBOOK	48
LETTER 1- LETTER TO FACEBOOK	48
LETTER 2 – FACEBOOK’S REPLY	50
LETTER 3 – REPLY TO FACEBOOK’S LETTER	51
APPENDIX C: RECOMMENDATIONS PROVIDED TO FACEBOOK.....	54
RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRIVILEGED USERS	54

Message from the Working Group Co-Chairs

We thank the members of the working group for their commitment and effort over the past three and half years in the fight against online hate, and for joining us in 2011 to share their expertise and to help us build this report into a key resource for those working in the field of online antisemitism and online hate more generally.

We also thank the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Israel for hosting the 2011 meeting, and for the logistical support provided by the ministry's Antisemitism Department. The then head of Department, Aviva Raz-Shechter, served as an excellent chair of the Global Forum and provided invaluable support over the first two years of the working group, as did then Department Counsellor, Amit Gil-Bayaz, who provided support in organising the 2011 working group meeting. Our thanks also go to the current head of the Antisemitism Department, Amb Gideon Behar, and to Counsellor Ruth Zakh who have continue to support the working groups efforts in this important area.

While the Working Group meeting in 2011 was restricted to a small number of leading international experts in the field of online antisemitism, the support of the wider global forum members is also gratefully acknowledged and appreciated. The Global Forum includes statesmen, parliamentarians, diplomats, journalists, legal experts, NGO's and scholars. The expertise and contributions of many members of the Global Forum are reflected in this report.

While recommendations have been updated and developed, and we hope the framework provided in this report will be of lasting benefit, the data in this report covers the period up until July 2011. More recent development will be discussed, and recommended responses considered, when the Working Group reconvenes in May 2013 at the 4th Global Forum Conference.

The rapid pace of technological change requires a rapid, international, and well informed response. Most significantly, it requires a response that is constantly updated and which can draw on the skills of experts with no vested interest in specific technologies. We hope this document, and the working group's many other activities, provide a useful tools for all stakeholders in the fight against online hate and discrimination.

Andre Oboler and David Matas

Co-Chairs of the Online Antisemitism Working Group

Global Forum to Combat Antisemitism

April 2013

Introduction

The report begins by introducing a taxonomy known as TEMPIS, based on technical capabilities, to the discussion of online hate in general and online antisemitism in particular. The working group recognises that existing technologies are rapidly changing, and new technologies continue to emerge. We hope the taxonomy will assist the formation of policies and laws that are general enough to withstand the test of time, yet still specific enough to be practically applied.

In terms of determining what is or is not antisemitism content, the working group endorses the EUMC Working Definition of Antisemitism as a guide for those making decisions at all levels. The definition is maintained by the European Agency on Fundamental Rights,ⁱ and was used as the basis for classification in the US State Department's Report to Congress on Antisemitism.ⁱⁱ

In this document we broadly list areas of concern by themes and platform (Section A), details of key antisemitic online incidents which proved instructive in understanding the manifestations of online hate (Section B), and various efforts to combat online hate, including reports, conferences and projects (Section C). The document concludes with proposals and recommendations (Section D), and a list of open challenges remaining (Section E).

The TEMPIS Taxonomy

The Global Forum's Online Taxonomy ("TEMPIS") distinguishes between means of online interaction based on the nature of the communication. This differentiation allows different rules, policies and laws to be put in place by various actors to cover the different types of situation that may arise. Differentiation is important to allow the right balance to be found between the prevention of hate speech and the facilitation of free expression through internet based tools.

Timing: This can be either real time (synchronous) communications or stored (asynchronous) communication. For example, in Skype, the audio conversation is real time while the text based chat is stored.

Real time communication generally has a lower impact and cannot spread beyond the initial audience. When real time communication is recorded, replicated or repeated, it becomes stored communication.

Communications that are intended to be real time only should have strong policies in place to ensure it is kept to this format, and strong sanctions for those breaching the real time only policy.

Empowerment: Online tools can empower moderators or administrators giving them control over other users either across an entire platform, or within some part of it. An example would be a Facebook page administrators ability to remove posts and

ban users from the page. Wikipedia is an extreme example where any user can edit any other user's work.

User empowerment can reduce the need for a platform provider's staff to handle most complaints. To be effective, however, there needs to be expectations placed, by the platform provider, on those who are empowered within the platform. Abuse of power should lead to a revocation of power. A failure to implement policies against hate speech should be seen as an abuse of power.

In giving users responsibility to match the power given to them it is important they have the option to surrender the responsibility when they are unable to manage it. Platform based expectations about a space being under the control of a user must be enforced. Platforms may need to automatically offer to empower to users when no empowered users are available. Spaces may also need to go offline if no empowered user is available to look after them. Training should be available. Systems like this have long existed in Internet Relay Chat (IRC) and other real time systems and lessons from these systems can be adapted to new online environments.

Platform providers who do not attach responsibility to empowered users retain greater responsibility for all content on their system themselves. Those who empower users and attach responsibility to that empowerment should be entitled to longer to review complaints. They should also be able to focus on random checks of the way complaints are handled by empowered users, and to focusing on those complaints the empowered users pass up to the platform provider. There remains an obligation on platform providers to aggregate complaints against the same user that are upheld by multiple empowered users and to take further action in such cases.

Moderation: Pre-moderation requires approval of a publisher before user content is shared, post moderation occurs when content is published but then reviewed, exception moderation occurs when content is only reviewed after being reported by users, and complaint moderation is when content is only reviewed on receipt of a written complaint, for example, a letter threatening legal action.

An example of pre-moderation is a blog where comments are reviewed before they are posted. An example of post moderation are news sites where the comments are actively reviewed. YouTube is an example of exception moderation, where staff review videos that have been flagged by other users. Twitter is an example of complaint moderation, the site only allows flagging of user accounts for spam not reporting of specific tweets.

The level of moderation should determine how long a company has to respond to a complaint before becoming complicit in the hate speech. The greater the level of moderation, the longer the company should be given to review the situation internally.

- Publicness:** Online content can either be shared privately or publically. Public does not mean immediately available to the world at large, rather, means it is able to be seen by least one person who is not an associate of the person posting the content. An example of a private communication is an e-mail. An example of a public communication is a tweet (from twitter) directed at someone.
- The greater the privacy of a communication, the more important protecting freedom of expression becomes. The more public a communication is, the greater the importance of preventing hate speech. The reasons for this relate to public safety and to maintaining an environment where all members of society feel free to participate. By giving those promoting hate speech free reign, this restricts the participation of minority groups who are being targeted. It drives them away from that channel of communication.
- The larger the channel, the more important it is that all members of society be able to participate, and feel free being part of the community.
- Identity:** Different online tools require different levels of identity verification. Some allow completely anonymous engagement, for example the image board 4chan or Wikipedia, while others require verification linked to a person's real identity, for example online purchases including apps. In between are systems that require a verified e-mail address or a third party login such as through Facebook, Google or Twitter.
- The greater the anonymity, the more freedom users will feel they have. This can be positive, enabling dissents to challenge regimes, or negative when it is used to bully, harass and promote hate against individuals or groups in society.
- The use of anonymous access should be a privilege not a right. Users who face sanctions in an online environment should lose anonymous access. This would protect dissents and political activists, but reduce the field of operations for those propagating hate.
- Social Impact:** Social impact relates to the ability of a platform to drive an item of content viral. A conventional website (without social media tools) has low social impact as by itself it lacks the tools for the content to be spread. At the other extreme are social networking sites, such as Facebook and Twitter, where all content that is posted can easily be shared and propagated. In between are tools that enable sharing to a users own contacts, for example a website with an "e-mail a friend" button or tools to share from the website to social media sites.
- The greater the social impact of an online tool the greater the responsibility on the platform provider to prevent it being used to propagate hate.

The TEMPIS Taxonomy can be presented in the following table of options:

Timing	Empowerment	Moderation	Publicness	Identity	Social Impact
Real Time	None	Pre-moderated	Personal	Verified real ID	No sharing
Stored	Power	Post Moderated	Private Group	Unverified Consistent ID	Sharing with associates
-	Responsibility	Exception Moderated	Associates	Anonymous possible	Public Sharing
-	-	Complaint Moderated	Public	Anonymous	-

TEMPIS is applied here to Facebook and Twitter as an examples.

TEMPIS Applied to Twitter

Regular tweets on Twitter:

Timing	Empowerment	Moderation	Publicness	Identity	Social Impact
-	None	-	-	-	-
Stored	-	-	-	Unverified Consistent ID	-
-	-	-	-	-	Public Sharing
-	-	Complaint Moderated	Public	-	-

Direct Messaging on Twitter:

Timing	Empowerment	Moderation	Publicness	Identity	Social Impact
-	None	Pre-moderated ¹	Personal	-	No sharing
Stored	-	-	-	Unverified Consistent ID	-
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-

¹ Direct messages can be considered pre-moderated as there must first be approval from both sides before the communication channel can be used.

As can be seen, different uses of the same tool may result in very different taxonomy profiles. This means a policy, law or regulation should not be created for “Twitter” but rather for “Tweets” or for “Direct Messages” specifically.

TEMPIS Applies to Facebook

In a similar way Facebook consists of Profiles, Groups, Pages, Messages and Apps. Each of these (except messages) is capable of being configured so as to fit multiple profiles. What becomes clear is that the risk of online hate is greater in pages than in groups, in fact pages seem designed to foster abuse of the Facebook system.

Facebook profiles:

Timing	Empowerment	Moderation	Publicness	Identity	Social Impact
-	-	-	Personal	Verified real ID	No sharing
Stored	Power	-	Private Group	Unverified Consistent ID	-
-	-	Exception Moderated	Associates	-	Public Sharing
-	-	-	Public	-	-

Facebook Groups:

Timing	Empowerment	Moderation	Publicness	Identity	Social Impact
-	-	-	-	Verified real ID	-
Stored	Power	-	Private Group	Unverified Consistent ID	Sharing with associates
-	-	Exception Moderated	-	-	Public Sharing
-	-	-	Public	-	-

Facebook Pages:

Timing	Empowerment	Moderation	Publicness	Identity	Social Impact
-	-	-	-	-	-
Stored	Power	-	-	-	-
-	-	Exception Moderated	-	-	Public Sharing
-	-	-	Public	Anonymous ¹	-

¹ The identity of a page Administrator is own known to Facebook and any other administrators.

Facebook Messages:

Timing	Empowerment	Moderation	Publicness	Identity	Social Impact
-	-	Pre-moderated	Personal	-	No sharing
Stored	Power	Post Moderated	Private Group	Unverified Consistent ID	Sharing with associates
-	-	Exception Moderated	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	Anonymous	-

Pre-moderated id settings restrict messages to friends. Post moderates as people can be blocked. Exception moderated as content can be flagged to Facebook. Messages can be anonymous as a page can send a message. Messages can be shared with associates by adding them to the conversation.

Facebook Apps:

Timing	Empowerment	Moderation	Publicness	Identity	Social Impact
Real Time	None	Pre-moderated	Personal	Verified real ID	No sharing
Stored	Power	Post Moderated	Private Group	Unverified Consistent ID	Sharing with associates
-	Responsibility	Exception Moderated	Associates	Anonymous possible	Public Sharing
-	-	-	Public	Anonymous	-

SECTION A: Key Incidents

Highlights of online antisemitic incidents that have attracted academic, NGO and media comment

A1 Third Intifada on Facebook

- Report 10. Islamic activists opened a page in Facebook calling for a third intifada. Facebook refused to pull it down at first, claiming that the page was only calling for a peaceful protest. After global pressure Facebook agreed to pull down the page, claiming that the page had begun to support violent action.
- A third intifada iPhone application encouraged potentially millions of users to employ violence against Israel. Israeli information minister Yuli Edelstein emailed Steve Jobs, the chief executive of Apple, in protest. Apple removed the application from its online store, calling it 'offensive.'ⁱⁱⁱ
- Protests against Israel were launched in Second Life Israel during Operation Cast Lead, causing the Israel site to be closed for a limited time^{iv}

A2 Red Bubble and Hipster Hitler

1. While possibly satirical in its original cartoon strip form, single cells of the Hipster Hitler cartoons, as sold on merchandise via Red Bubble, were seen as antisemitic by both the community of platform users and by antisemites in online forums.
2. The company's lawyers severed ties over the issue, and after consultation with the Anti-Defamation Commission Red Bubble withdrew all the merchandise.^v
3. Paypal also investigated but found there was no breach of the terms of service.

A3 Apple's App Store

4. On Holocaust Memorial day 2010, the second most downloaded application for the Apple iPhone in Italy was a collection of speeches by Benito Mussolini, the Fascist dictator of Italy. The application, iMussolini was downloaded at a rate of over 1000 installations per day.^{vi} It is concerning that Apple chose not to comment on the matter, adopting a value neutral response to the content they were selling.^{vii} Law and policy on copyright rather than against hate appears to have been the cause of its removal.^{viii}
5. A Third Intifada iPhone application which promoted violence against the Jewish state was removed after protests from Israel and the Jewish community. In removing it Apple said they took action, "because it violates the developer guidelines by being offensive to large groups of people".^{ix}

A4 truth-unveiled.com

- This website was present as a Roma site about Jews. It used classical antisemitic stereotypes and made allegations about Jewish conspiracy theories. The site caused concern in both the Jewish and Roma communities. A report by the Community Internet Engagement Project, together with the Anti-Defamation Commission was used as a basis for a complaint filed

with the Australian Human Rights Commission by the Executive Council of Australian Jewry. The site was promptly shutdown, though some of the content appears to have migrated to servers located outside Australia.

A5 Google Search Results

- Google was returning search results that incited hatred and the called for violence, some of these also denied the Holocaust. (See Report 2 in appendix)
- An Argentinean court ordered Google to remove "suggested searches" which directed users to sites that are illegal under Argentinean laws against incitement to violence and propagate racist and antisemitic libels.
- Google was also ordered to stop posting ads on illegal sites in order to deny the sites additional revenue

A6 UCU Mailing List

- Letters to the University and Colleges Union (UCU) in June 2008 and July 2011 by lawyer Anthony Julius have highlighted "open and incontinent expression of anti-Semitic [sic] opinion" in the "Activists' List", a mailing list the union runs. The letters also raise issues about the moderation of that list which is also archived online.

A7 Google Earth and Replacement Geography

- Virtual Israel, as represented by Google Earth, was littered with orange dots, many of which claim to represent "Palestinian localities evacuated and destroyed after the 1948 Arab-Israeli war."
- Israel was therefore depicted as a state born out of colonial conquest rather than the return of a people from exile.
- Each dot linked to "Palestine Remembered", a website with antisemitic content, most of it along the lines of "Zionism is Racism".
- The inclusion of virtual Palestine, superimposed on Israel in the core layer of Google Earth, is an example of replacement geography advanced by technology.^x
- As all content went through a moderation process performed by people appointed by Google, this was a different situation, on technical grounds, to situations like YouTube.
- After research by Dr. Andre Oboler, a campaign by ZOA and JIDF, and discussions with Google, this problem was corrected.

A8 Holocaust denial defined as "not hate" by Facebook.^{xi}

- Facebook ignored complaints about Holocaust denial and glorification of Nazism for a long time.
- This included ignoring the law in Germany where this activity is illegal.^{xii}

- Facebook finally responded by removing the section of its Terms of Service which stated that users had to abide by their local law or it would be a breach of the Terms of Service.
- Facebook also removed the prohibition on many forms of problematic behaviour including racism.
- Finally Facebook declared that Holocaust denial did not breach the clause prohibiting "hateful" content as Facebook does not consider Holocaust denial, in and of itself, to be hateful.
- Following the Working Group meeting in July 2011 the Global Forum Working Group on Online Antisemitism exchanged a number of letters with Facebook on this topic, the letter are in the Appendix.

A9 Facebook and the Neo-Nazi movement

- Long-term and ongoing case studies originating in Canada prove that neo-Nazi groups use Facebook to network with international extremist groups.
- Facebook internal policies and Facebook user agreements must be amended.
- Facebook, like other Internet platforms, is being used as a recruitment tool for the National Socialist community.
- Recently, as part of the case studied mentioned, two murders were prevented through the consistent police monitoring of hate sites.

A10 Swedish Blood Libel

- Unsubstantiated allegations from Palestinians are reported as fact in the Swedish tabloid Aftonbladet in the summer of 2009. The story claimed that during Operation Cast Lead the IDF removed organs from Palestinian corpses for organ transplant operations in Israel, due to the shortage of organs for transplant in Israel.
- The claim had no basis, but it received wide exposure and fomented a great deal of secondary press and anti-Israel sentiment.
- The content was propagated on line long after the initial incident was over

A 11 Antisemitism on progressive blogs: ^{xiii}

- The three most popular progressive political blogs in the United States are Huffington Post, Salon, and Daily Kos. These three together have over thirteen million unique visitors per month.
- Within these three blogs a number of historical antisemitic themes appear frequently: excessive Jewish power and control over society/government, Jewish citizens are more loyal to Israel than to their own country, Israel resembles Nazi Germany, etc
- Partially due to the huge size of the blogosphere (there are thousands of bloggers at Daily Kos alone), such hateful commentary usually escapes the kind of scrutiny that the traditional media faces.
- The progressive blogs also use antisemitic cartoons, and generally fail to remove such hateful cartoons, despite blog policies expressly prohibiting posts that contain "hateful" or "inflammatory" content.^{xiv}

A 12 Easy of creating pages / threads leads to flood of hate

- The Kick a Jew group (mostly from the USA) on Facebook - inciting violence against Jews
- Punch a Jew in the Face (mostly from Australia) event on Facebook - inciting violence against Jews
- Kick a ginger groups also spread on Facebook
- The “Bored of Studies” student websites (in Australia) hosted antisemitic propaganda and hate groups (content has since been removed)

A 13 YouTube used to spread hate myth at lightning speed

- Report 23. The myth concerning organ harvesting by Israeli soldier-physicians in Haiti began from a single YouTube video created by a man from Seattle. Within a day the video was picked up by news agencies in countries hostile to Israel and on antisemitic websites.

SECTION B: Areas of Concern

Highlighting emerging areas of concern (new forms of antisemitism, growth in specific types of online antisemitism)

B1 Antisemitic Themes Online

Following are select disturbing online trends according to reports published over the last two years:

B1.1 Holocaust denial

- Report 3. Many websites in 2010 and specifically the Muslim Brotherhood official website deny the Holocaust, claiming that it is a Jewish/Western invention.
- Report 4. Antisemitic groups all over the world are using Facebook, YouTube and other internet platforms to promote Holocaust denial. While disavowing Holocaust denial Facebook continues to allow itself to be used as a platform for Holocaust denial.

B1.2 Holocaust trivialization

- During the last three years several INACH member bureaus increasingly received complaints about instances of online trivialization of the Holocaust . Complaints included depiction of the Holocaust as as a dance party in the infamous video ‘Housewitz’, the so-called satirical comic ‘Hipster Hitler’ (also mentioned under ‘key incidents’) e-cards of Auschwitz stammlager gas chamber I with the text ‘cosy, but needs some refurbishing’, and the *holofun/six chimneys/church of the holy hoax* pages (Holocaust jokes) at heretical.com

B1.3 New Antisemitism

- Report 3. Extremist Left wing websites around the world claim that Israel is behind the real Holocaust happening to the Palestinian people and compare Israel to the Nazi Regime.

B1.4 Conspiracy theories

- Report 25:
 - As the financial crisis continues to affect markets around the world, online Antisemitic elements utilize the opportunity to promote conspiracy theories about Jewish involvement in the crisis.
 - These conspiracy theories are repeated and believed by many in the world and cause a surge in antisemitism.
 - One Conspiracy theory is that before collapsing, Lehman Brothers bank transferred a huge sum of money to Israeli Banks.
 - Another conspiracy theory claims that the Jews were behind the 9/11 attack since 4,000 Jews did not report to work that day.
 - These lies are based on old antisemitic themes, e.g. portray the Jews as greedy and possessing the power to control the world. The lies are spread successfully and quickly via the internet.

- Report 26. The report showed that the Madoff scandal gave rise to many conspiracy theories regarding both the transferring of money to Israel (thievery) and the [Jewish] sacrifice of human values for money (greed).

B1.5 Cyber-bullying

Reports 17 and 18 refer to cyber-bullying and explain how it occurs and how to protect one's family and students. Detailed information can be found at - <http://www.adl.org/cyberbullying/>

B2 Platform Specific Concerns

B2.1 Facebook

- Facebook has had a policy change on Holocaust denial, racism, problematic user names and page/group content (including images). This was put into effect through the removal of the explicit ban on racism and other problems in their Terms of Use.
- Facebook complaints oftentimes seem to be ignored or take a very long time to be processed.
- Facebook users can be deleted by Facebook because of their content or profile messages, yet such users are able to sign up for a new account, making use of the same email address and cell-phone numbers.
- A mechanism needs to be put in place to ensure that those who are removed cannot use the same information.
- Furthermore, Facebook needs to be more accessible to the law enforcement community. Access to the IP addresses of users who post racist/antisemitic content could be valuable.
- Report 4. Antisemitic groups are using Facebook to open groups spreading links and information to followers concerning Holocaust denial. Facebook claims that it cannot disband these groups since Holocaust denial, while a 'bad idea', is an idea nonetheless and fall under the rubric of 'free speech.'
- Report 14. Antisemitic Facebook groups are used to recruit activists to attack Israel.
- Report 21. In the case of the antisemitic hate Facebook group "Israel" is not a country!... ... Delist it from Facebook as a country!" it was shown that antisemitism activists can join groups with legitimate natures and transform them from within to reflect an Antisemitic character, using it for their propaganda purposes. Facebook is reluctant to intervene, claiming that it must preserve a free exchange of ideas. There are however actions that might be taken in order to damage the antisemitic group and/or convince Facebook to act.
- Report 27 - Holocaust Denial in Facebook:
 - Facebook was informed that there were Holocaust Denial groups in Facebook which are in direct contradiction to its Terms of Use and local law in several states.
 - Facebook's response was to change their Terms of Use so that there would be no requirements on its part to take down these groups from Facebook. In the new Terms of Use reference to compliance with local law also vanished.
 - In doing so, Facebook created a safe haven for Holocaust denial, and enabled this kind of antisemitism within the Facebook community.
 - Facebook's policy demonstrates a lack of understanding regarding antisemitism and Holocaust denial in particular, and a lack of engagement with the problem of antisemitism 2.0.

B2.2 YouTube

- YouTube is being used to promote messages of Antisemitism not only via videos, but also via user profiles.
- Neither problem can be reported unless one has a YouTube account, and even with an account the profile problems cannot be reported if the user has not posted a video. (This has now been removed with the addition of a report option for background images, thumbnails and user activity).
- Google / Youtube / blogspot Europe now has legal counsel officers who take prompt action on instances of antisemitism and/or Holocaust denial.
- Report 4. Antisemitic individuals with a heavy web presence (e.g. Frank Weltner from the JewWatch website) are using platforms such as YouTube to spread their agenda.
- Report 15. When a user encounters an antisemitic YouTube video, the user should contact YouTube and explain why the video is a violation of their Terms of Use and/or fosters hate/anti-Semitism. YouTube has the ability to take down videos in cases of such violations.
- Report 15. The report contains contact information for YouTube.
- Report 23. YouTube can be used to quickly spread myths and falsehoods, and it takes little to get started (see list of key incidents).

B2.3 Yahoo Groups and Google Groups

Yahoo groups and Google groups host antisemitic sites. Yahoo has a fascism category with a link inviting you to "Create a new fascist group".

B2.4 Twitter

- Report 7. Extremist Islamic elements use Twitter to spread misinformation about Israel.
- Report 15. The report contains contact information for Twitter.
- It is not possible to prevent someone spreading hate about another twitter user. The victims only option is to block the hater so they themselves don't see it. This is an inadequate response.
- Twitter's reporting options are geared to prevent spam not hate speech, the platform needs to improve the reporting options available.

B2.5 Individual websites

- Report 3. In Hungary the nationalist party JOBBIK (Movement for Better Hungary) published antisemitic propaganda on its website (kuruc.info) which is linked to a network of extremist sites.
- Report 3. The official Muslim Brotherhood of Egypt website publishes statements denying the Holocaust and comparing Israel to the Nazi regime.
- Report 6. Arrahman.com serves as a one-stop resource for South East Asian extremists with insurgent videos, pronouncements by Al Qaeda leaders, discussion forums, an online store for books and DVDs and even video games.

B2.6 Search Engines

- Report 2. Google search results may direct users to antisemitic/hate sites. Antisemitic and hate sites may appear high up on search results on Google and other search engines.
- Report 15. Search engines such as Google have a high level of control over their search results and can drop a site from their listings, but are reluctant to do so. The report suggests contacting the search engine's management, as sometimes Google may act based on information supplied to it.

- Report 15. The report contains contact information for Google.

B2.7 Web hosting companies

- Report 3. 1st-Amendment.net seems to be a platform specializing in hosting neo-Nazi sites.

B2.8 Games

- Reports 4 and 5. Hate groups use games to appeal and recruit a younger population into hating and attempting to physically hurt Jews and Israelis. These games originate from across the globe including the Arab world, and are of growing interest to antisemitic groups.
- Games based in a Holocaust setting, but from a pro-Jewish perspective are also seen as problematic. The scheduled release of the game 'Sonderkommando Revolt' was considered controversial and the game was ultimately cancelled by its developer.^{xv}

B2.9 Orkut - Google's social network

- Report 7. Hezbollah and the Indian Nazi party use this network to spread their agenda and recruit supporters.

B2.10 Blogs and Forums

- The moral impunity that anonymity provides bloggers is a major challenge.
- Report 7. Nazi organization worldwide use blogs and forums to disseminate Holocaust denial and Antisemitic ideas.
- Report 15. The report contains contact information for Blogger and Blogspot.

B2.11 Email harassment

- Report 14 - Antisemitic elements target Jewish personnel and harass them via emails to their personal inbox.
- Report 15. The recipient of an abusive email should contact the email provider of the sender in order to cancel the sender's account, and possibly contact law enforcement agencies.
- Report 15. The report contains contact information for Yahoo, Google and MSN/Hotmail.

B2.12Talkbacks on News Sites

- Report 11. Mainstream news sites allow the publication of antisemitic talkbacks to their articles. These sites include The New York Times and the Washington Post.
- Report 24. Talkbacks made on legitimate articles regarding Jewish or Jewish related topics are oftentimes incredibly antisemitic.
- Report 26:
 - The Bernard Madoff financial scandal proved a bonanza for online antisemitic elements, leading to an upsurge of antisemitic comments in mainstream websites.
 - Most of the antisemitic comments tended to focus on alleged Jewish greed and thievery, as well as conspiracy theories linking financial losses to Israel.
 - Many of the comments were in mainstream news sites where people look for objective report on the current events.
 - Other comments were made on financial websites, blogs and discussion boards catering for those looking for financial news.

- Whereas before the Internet antisemitic elements had only their cohorts to share their views with, comments made in these news sites reach the eyes of many people who in other circumstances would never have been exposed to this propaganda.

B2.13 Google Earth

- Discussed in Report 19
- Google Earth was used to promote misinformation by displaying historically false and/or manipulated information for those viewing the map of Israel.
- This misinformation was an attempt to erase the connection of one people to a land and replace it with the connection of a different people.
- The platform of Google Earth was abused in this way as a means of spreading misinformation under the pretence of providing objectively reliable information.
- Google resolved this issue with changes to their policy and software which altered what could be included in the default view in Google Earth.

B2.14 Yahoo Maps / Weather

- Yahoo Maps - Jerusalem is shown as a series of a few major roads with Latinized Arabic names. The map cannot be enlarged. This may be the result of copyright issues, but the effect is still problematic.
- Yahoo weather created East Jerusalem in Palestine leading issues with the iPhone weather application.^{xvi}

B2.15 Wikipedia

- While Wikipedia is supposed to be a neutral source of information in practice it is an active battleground where much propaganda and anti Israel information is disseminated. Pro-Palestinian groups and Anti-Israel groups use Wikipedia as a platform to showcase their ideology in a seemingly objective fashion (Report 20).
- Empirical research shows criticism in Wikipedia of organisations who have used antisemitic discourse to promote their agendas has been systematically removed as part of a wider campaign to remove criticism of organisations that are critical towards Israel (Report 35).

B2.16 Internet Radio

- Report 22. The National Alliance (a white supremacy hate group) uses a weekly Internet radio broadcast in order to reach out to their followers everywhere. Broadcast are archived and available for listening to anyone with an Internet connection.
- Report 13. Broadcasts on Internet Radio are a medium that some hate organizations use in order to spread their hate propaganda at little or no cost.

SECTION C: Positive Initiatives

Acknowledging positive contributions and initiatives to combat online antisemitism. These initiatives include reports, conferences, and educational programming

C1 Reports

The Appendix to this Report lists 43 Reports into online hate. Some of these are major reports of inter governmental bodies, others are in the form of newspaper articles which provide the greatest detail available on a specific major incident or type of incident.

One key trend that emerges from the reports is the desire of governments and civil society to engage with technology companies. This has, in numerous cases, empowered technology companies as the only technical experts in a discussion, a position that has been repeatedly used to suggest technical solutions are impossible. While working with companies is important, the reports highlight the need for the involvement of independent technical experts.

The reports also highlight a trend of technology companies responding to change only as a result of huge public pressure. There are serious concerns about a lack of desire to address the problem of online hate by technology companies. The threat of stronger regulation by states may be essential to promote progress in the fight against online hate.

C2 Conferences

The Appendix to this Report lists 11 Conferences on the topic of online hate. Additional meetings of INACH and parts of the ICCA have also addressed the topic of online hate. Despite the importance of online hate, there have been relatively few gatherings on the topic. There is an urgent need for greater attention in this space. The next Global Forum conference in 2013 will seek to provide a focus in the area.

C3 Government Action related to online antisemitism

- Germany, Justice Minister appeal to foreign Internet providers to eliminate far-right extremism
 - In July 2009, Justice Minister Brigitte Zypries said her office would appeal to foreign Internet providers to use their own terms of service as grounds for eliminating neo-Nazi content.
 - She called for Internet service providers in the U.S. and elsewhere to remove neo-Nazi images, text and other content that can be viewed inside the country in violation of German laws forbidding the promotion of Nazi symbols.
- Italy held a Parliamentary hearing into online antisemitism on April 22nd 2010.
 - Experts who presented included Dr Andre Oboler and Stefano Gatti

- The hearing, organised by Fiamma Nirenstein, generated significant media attention in print, television and online.
 - A number of hate groups in Italy published antisemitic articles about the participants in response to the hearing.
 - As a result of the hearing and other parliamentary work, in December 2010 the Italian Parliament in passed new laws further criminalising online hate, and extending the law so it also applies to content hosted outside Italy.
- An Argentinean court ordered Google to drop some "suggested searches" through which the user was directed by the search engine to sites illegal under Argentinean law that incite to violence against people and/or propagate racist and antisemitic libels.
 - Google was also ordered to stop posting ads to those sites in order to deny the sites additional revenue
 - This was in response to work by the [Observatorio](#) Website which identified 76 sites that had a common denominator of incitement to hatred and the call to violence, some of the sites denied the existence of the Holocaust.
 - See C1.2 in appendix
- A French court (France's highest administrative court, the Council of State), banned the Beirut-based TV channel Al Manar television, holding that it had repeatedly violated France's hate laws and ignored pledges to avoid broadcasting antisemitism.^{xvii}

C4 Programmes to combat online antisemitism

1. "Click Against Hate"

Andre Oboler and B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission (Melbourne, Australia).^{xviii}

- A program for Jewish day schools on identifying and responding to antisemitism online
- Program focuses on Facebook, YouTube, blogs and the media and on identifying online off-shoots of specific types of traditional antisemitism and new antisemitism
- 5 sessions of 50 minutes to 1.5 hours duration to be given in class, and homework to be assessed by the class teacher and tied to curriculum
- Status: Will be running in schools from the middle of 2010 (sessions written, schools signed up, training taking place)

2. CIDI guide and campaign to remove online hate

CIDI, the Centre Information and Documentation Israel, has published instructions on its website explaining how to get antisemitic material removed from the internet.^{xix}

- CIDI is the antisemitism watchdog in the Netherlands; in the past we referred online antisemitism to Magenta, an organization dedicated to registration and combat of all forms of discrimination on the internet.
- Once an instance of antisemitism on the net has been reported, Magenta sets in motion the standard procedure for getting it removed.
- CIDI believes that this is not enough. Most people do not take the extra step to report the 'casual' antisemitism they find on mainstream news sites and in any case there are far too many instances of this to be handled by one organization.
- CIDI believes that individual web users have a responsibility too, and should, take action themselves. In many cases this can be as simple as clicking a report button next to the offensive words.
- CIDI is promoting the use of such buttons, paying particular attention to mainstream news sites.

3. Grassroots online initiatives against hate

- Online platforms are being used to show support against antisemitism and other forms of racism. Examples include the Facebook groups Stop Anti-Semitism, United Against Hatred, United Against Hate and others.
- Citizens' initiatives to combat hate – one example is "Coloradans United Against Hatred" (CUAH), a non-profit organization dedicated to eliminating the damage caused by hate groups. It focuses on hate group activity within the state of Colorado. Its board includes members of the Jewish, Black, Moslem, Hispanic, gay, and other communities affected by the actions of hate groups. Its mission is to provide a medium to educate people on the effects of hate group activity, provide funds or other assistance to help the victims of hate crimes and to assist in fighting the hate groups, and to provide information so that the public can take action against hate groups.
- The UK Prime Minister's Petition Website was used for a petition against the Goldstone Report. Only UK residents and UK citizens abroad can sign on this site; the Prime Minister guarantees they will respond to all signatories of petitions with over 500 signatures. As at 6 December there were over 3900 signatures making it #35 on the site (of 4711 total).^{xx}

4. CIF Watch

CIFWatch.com was started by group of volunteers to analyse and monitor antisemitism on The Guardian's Comment Is Free blog.^{xxi}

- CIFWatch followed a July 2008 Report on CIF (largely ignored by government).^{xxii}
- Exposed that Bella Mackie - daughter of Guardian Editor Alan Rusbridger - was attacking Melanie Phillips ("I imagine she's like that character in Little Britain who is violently sick every time she hears the words 'black or gay.' Except for Melanie, the word would be 'Muslim.'")
- CIFWatch is read by Matt Seaton - Editor of Guardian CIF
- CIFWatch reinforces the EUMC Working Definition of antisemitism

5. Use of media and online media to discredit haters

'John Sullivan,' an anti-Semite of English Christian origin, [is captured on video](#) attacking Jews and Judaism before entering a church for an anti-Israel and antisemitic 'carol service' organised by Palestinian Solidarity Campaign.^{xxiii}

- The incident was widely reported, including Ruth Gledhill in the Times blog, BBC, Radio 4.
- The case illustrates how antisemitism is promoted by anti-Israel events.
- There is also an example of how the internet can be used to expose and condemn antisemitism

C5 Expert Centers on Online Hate

Community Internet Engagement Project (2009-2011)

Zionist Federation of Australia (Australia).^{xxiv}

- A new department working to improve the Internet related infrastructure of the Jewish Community
- Training to develop skills in the community so more people can engage in combating online antisemitism
- Specific research focus on online antisemitism and emerging trends
- Focus on advising representative bodies on Internet policy
- The Center was closed and the online hate prevention work transferred to the new Online Hate Prevention Institute

Online Hate Prevention Institute

- Established in 2012 as dedicated and independent organisation focused on combating all forms of hate^{xxv}
- The organisation is an Australian Charitable Institution
- Its mandate is to invest 40% of its effort in the fight against online antisemitism
- The remaining effort is divided across all other forms of hate e.g. Homophobia, Islamophobia, hate against people with disabilities, hate against ethnic minorities, cyberbullying of individuals etc.

Observatorio Web

A project of DAIA, the Latin American Jewish Congress and AMIA^{xxvi}

- Works to combat online hate through monitoring and activism
- Has been particularly successful with Google
- Focuses on Spanish and Portuguese language content
- Provides a contact point with technology companies
- Provides education to schools

INACH

The International Network Against Cyber Hate is a network of NGOs working on the problem of online hate.^{xxvii}

- INACH runs regular conferences on cyber hate
- INACH members undertake reporting in their various countries

ICCA Task Force on Online Hate

The ICCA has established a task force on online hate as well as a working group on this topic.

OSCE-ODIHR

The OSCE's ODIHR maintains a brief on Online Hate and have run conferences 2004, and twice in 2010.

SECTION D: Proposals

Proposing policy recommendations to combat online antisemitism

D1 Platform providers

1. A set of guidelines needs to be established defining antisemitic and racist behaviour and prohibiting it within platforms such as Facebook.
2. The working group endorses the EUMC Working Definition of Antisemitism for use in this context. The definition is maintained by the European Agency on Fundamental Rights,^{xxviii} and was used as the basis for classification in the US State Department's Report to Congress on Antisemitism.^{xxix}
3. The Taxonomy in this report is recommended for consideration. Providers should consider the combination of factors that apply to different modes of communication on their site and craft restrictions and penalties accordingly.
4. Anonymous access should be prevented by those who have been found to promote hate speech.
5. Those who have been found to promote hate speech should lose, at least for a time, the ability to have control over public spaces.
6. Users who are empowered should have a responsibility to play a part in administering the space they have control over. Failure to do so should result in penalties including the suspension or loss of that power.
7. Empowered users should be under greater expectations to act against online hate (see for example the recommendations to Facebook in the appendix)

D2 NGO's and Activist's role

8. Non-governmental organizations or individuals opposed to incitement to hatred should combat the incitement by:
 - a. NGOs need greater technical expertise
 - b. posting and maintaining websites against antisemitism,
 - c. setting up and communicating to a list serve,
 - d. maintaining and providing lists of offending sites,
 - e. joining and communicating within social sites,
 - f. regularly monitoring sites where antisemitism is likely to be or has previously been posted, reporting publicly on what is found
 - g. Collaborating with other groups looking at different social internet issues (including those concerned about the expression of other forms of online hate).
 - h. Showing ISPs, in their offices, hate sites that they may be hosting,

- i. linking to good resources outside of their own organisation and a willingness to share their experience with the other NGOs,
- j. Exchanging information to enhance the effectiveness of human rights-ISPs-State cooperation,
- k. Lobbying for international awareness about the abuse of technology for hate promotion and dissemination,
- l. Advocate support for the implementation and use of the EUMC/FRA Working definition on Antisemitism at the appropriate international bodies; lobby national EU governments to implement.
- m. Helping support groups and institutions that want to set up reporting mechanisms,
- n. Advancing our knowledge of emerging social networking and the psychology of people who use the Internet for various purposes, and
- o. Undertaking research into Internet related human behaviour with the aim of discovering effective approaches to increase moral and social responsibility of all parties concerned.
- p. Where jurisdictionally possible, strive to remove antisemitism or Holocaust denial by legal measures
- q. Create workshops, modules and teaching tools on Holocaust denial and antisemitism for Teachers and youth workers, possibly in cooperation with organizations specializing in media-awareness.
- r. Train moderators of public web forums and blogs in recognizing and removing/moderating antisemitism and Holocaust denial.
- s. Translate material related to combating online hate into other languages

D3 Parents, Teachers, Employers

- 9. Parents, teachers, employers and generally those with authority or responsibility over a computer should:
 - a. Parents should supervise children on the internet
 - b. Parents should consider installing computer blocking programs at home that block access to hate sites for minors,
 - c. Install computer blocking programs at work, school and public institutions such as libraries
 - d. Require employees while at work and students while at school not to access antisemitic sites or send antisemitic messages, and
 - e. Promote the concept of responding to antisemitism and other forms of online hate as a civic responsibility for all users.
 - f. Teach/instruct students, youngsters and employees in the recognition of holocaust denial and trivialization and antisemitism.
 - g. Employers should consider and regularly update best practise guidelines in this area.

D4 Internet service providers

4. Internet service providers, including website hosts, those providing internet connections and those providing online services should:
 - a. Engage with NGOs on issues of ISPs responsibility and accountability for content,
 - b. Develop corporate and morally responsible policies and procedures,
 - c. be familiar with and apply the EUMC Working Definition of antisemitism within their own policies,
 - d. block antisemitic sites,
 - e. deny hosting to antisemitic sites,
 - f. deny hosting to sites which provide links to antisemitic sites,
 - g. deny connectivity to promoters of antisemitism,
 - h. deny access to online services to those that use them to promote antisemitism,
 - i. insert provisions against antisemitism into Internet contracts,
 - j. create a systematic approach, with appropriate safeguards, for the removal of content from their servers when it is in breach of their policy,
 - k. take proactive steps, such as a regular review of sites they host, to prevent the presence of hate sites on their servers, and
 - l. maintain a dialogue with anti-hate speech advocates who can explain the nature of antisemitism and other forms of hate and its potential impact.
5. Connectivity providers (supplying ISPs) should:
 - a. Deny connectivity to antisemitism amenable internet service providers,
 - b. Contractually require that their service not be used for the promotion of antisemitism or other forms of hate
 - c. Provide a mechanism for receiving and working to resolve complaints escalated to them when their customer fails to take action, and
 - d. Require that their customers publish a link to the connectivity providers complaint procedure as part of the ISPs own complaint procedure
6. Landlords should deny premises to antisemitic amenable internet service providers

D5 Industry bodies

7. Internet service provider associations and Interest industry and professional bodies should:
 - a. establish codes of conduct,
 - b. establish mechanisms for the detection and reporting of antisemitic websites,
 - c. establish a complaints response mechanism,
 - d. establish an adjudication of disputes mechanism,
 - e. encourage a model global uniform internet contract with a provision against antisemitism, and
 - f. Publishing overviews and reports, on a regular basis, of complaints related to antisemitism. Such reporting should include the name of each hate sites, highlights of their content, their locations, their ISPs, and both successful and unsuccessful attempts to curtail their activities.

D6 Search Engines

8. All search engines should omit or label antisemitic sites
9. Search engine providers should be open about the reasons for labelling or omitting sites and provide details of the nature of the threat posed by the site

D7 Domain Name Registrars

10. Domain Name Registrars should deny antisemitic domains
11. Domain Name Registrars should deny any domains to promoters of antisemitism

D8 Consolidating information

12. The Coordinating Forum For Countering Antisemitism (Antisemitism.org.il) should be further expanded to include a comprehensive section on Internet based antisemitism and a stronger capacity to translate longer reports and publish in multiple languages
13. Standing permission should be given to the Forum by those producing content to reproduce and translate their articles if the copyright is protected

D9 Determining what is antisemitic

14. The EUMC Working Definition of Antisemitism is endorsed as a guide for those making decisions at all levels.^{xxx}

D 10 Copyright and Sharing

15. To enable a spread of educational material and counter speech, such material should generally be published under a license that permits sharing and reproduction e.g. Creative Commons

D11 Classification of online spaces for policy purposes

16. The Internet should not be treated as a monolith entity. For policy and regulation purposes we recommend the taxonomy presented in this report be applied, differentiating between communication types within platforms as well as between platforms. For the moderation category we recommend online space be divided into 4 classes based on their ability to prevent online hate:
 - a. **Pre-moderated** Platforms with public publishing and pre-publishing gate-keeping approval e.g. some blogs / news sites with comments which only appear once approved, and platforms where the public cannot post content and all content is therefore authorised by the publisher e.g. conventional websites.
 - b. **Post Moderated** Platforms with public publishing and post-publishing active moderation e.g. Comment is Free (Guardian UK), some forums, some Facebook groups
 - c. **Exception Moderated** Platforms with public publishing and passive moderation (e.g. complaints process) e.g. Facebook, YouTube etc.

- d. **Complaint moderated** Platforms with public publishing and no moderation e.g. sites without a mechanism to report and have problem content quickly reviewed, and where moderation can only be undertaken by writing to the website host or platform provider with a complaint, usually of a legal nature
- 17. Complaint-moderated platforms that allow user generated content should be eliminated by requiring that platforms provide a transparent complaints process
- 18. Exception Moderated platforms should be required to rule on reported content within a reasonable time frame. The length of the time frame should be determined with reference to the other factors in the TEMPIS Taxonomy. The greater the social impact, both in theory based on the nature of the space and in practice based on the rate of growth of the hateful content, the shorter the time in which a response should be required. For example 14 days may be reasonable if the complaint is not an immediate danger (if it is it should be reported to law enforcement immediately) and if the social impact is low. A much shorter period, for example 48 hours, may be appropriate where it appears the hate is going viral.
- 19. Something reported as being an immediate danger should be assessed within 24 hours. An example of an immediate danger would be a call for specific violence that provides a specific target, e.g., the address of a Synagogue. If something is an immediate danger the complaint should be handled immediately after this is realized by the platform provider. If something is not deemed an immediate threat it will still be considered within a reasonable time of when it was first reported (e.g. the 14 days)
- 20. In social media platforms users with privileged positions e.g. admins in a Facebook group or the poster of a video on YouTube should have a responsibility for post-publishing moderation. If they allow public user input (e.g. comments in YouTube or they set a group's wall as public in Facebook) all complaints (without the complainant's details) should be immediately shared with them and they should be given the opportunity to post-moderate, either agreeing the content is inappropriate (removing it and terminating the complaint) or verifying they disagree (leaving it for platform level consideration). If they take no action and the item in question is removed via the complaints process, their moderation will be considered lacking and on repeat problems the settings for their video or group may be changed by the system (e.g. to disallow further comments or make a wall private or lock it all together). It may be appropriate for repeat offenders who refuse to manage the space they control within a platform to eventually lose the right to have such privileges to manage space within the online community.
- 21. In websites (including news sites) and pre-moderated sites, efforts should be made not to promote racial hatred. This should be considered by those approving content and there should be a complaints process to consider and correct any mistakes.

D12 Law of the Internet

- 22. Legislators should:
 - a. prohibit use of the Internet to promote hatred,
 - b. provide both civil and criminal remedies,

- c. require a choice of forum for invoking these remedies (to prevent concurrent cases in multiple jurisdictions over the same issue between the same parties), and
 - d. Update vilification legislation to ensure effectiveness in an Internet context.
- 23. Parts of the law of the Internet need to be global, and there is precedent for this in the law of the sea. Some efforts have been made in this direction by the Council of Europe, so far without success.
- 24. Laws written for printed material need to be examined to see how they can be applied to the Internet
- 25. There is a need to focus on the sites and platforms that have heavy usage and large audiences
- 26. Larger operators, some of whom have user bases larger than many countries, should take into consideration laws in the order of:
 - a. Local law requiring an action
 - b. Local law prohibiting an action
 - c. Compliance with international law and particularly the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (S19 and S20 are particularly relevant)
 - d. Resolutions of the UN General Assembly may be useful in deciding policy objectives.^{xxx}
- 27. Where a local law requires global compliance and the operator is bound by this (e.g. because they are based there) the restriction should be global
- 28. Where a local law is only local in nature or the operator is not bound by it outside of that country, due regard should be given to whether the law advanced or hinders the agreed rule in international law. If the local law advances international law, and is permitted to the provider as a global remedy, it should be implemented globally. For example the removal of Nazi memorabilia by Ebay, was required by a local law but implemented globally.
- 29. Education is needed to create clearer understanding both within and beyond the Jewish community on the difference between legitimate criticism of Israel's actions and antisemitism
 - a. This is particularly needed within the academic sector.
 - b. The establishment of a specific site addressing this issue would be valuable.

D13 Carrier immunity

- 30. This is too broad and needs to be limited in the case of antisemitism and other forms of hate. While real time communication may be immune, stored communication e.g. user published content, can be brought to a service providers attention and the provider can then do something about it. Opting not to do something about it after a reasonable time should in all cases open the service provided up to liability.
- 31. The liability for online antisemitism should more closely mirror that already established for copyright violations, an area that is more maturely developed.
- 32. Liability should cascade up from a provider to their host, with each level becoming liable if they choose not to act within a reasonable time period of them being notified.

D14 Community Responses

- 33. More systematic community effort is needed to report conspiracy theories. This reporting could be done on community web sites.
- 34. More effort is needed to systematically expose the propagation of conspiracy theories within different online communities.
- 35. Organisations focus on their own areas and more communication, coordination and pooling of resources is needed.
- 36. Jewish communities need to be far more open in talking about and reporting antisemitism in order to place it on the public agenda and create awareness of the issue.
- 37. Progressive political blogs in the U.S. are becoming increasingly hospitable to antisemitism and need to be more systematically monitored.

D15 Mainstream Media

- 38. As long as the mainstream media do not report on antisemitism, people will not take action and it will not feature on the agenda.
- 39. The mainstream media needs to work closely with experts in order to ensure that reporting does not fuel antisemitism.
- 40. Comments on online news stories that spread hate remain a concern, more attention and general standards are needed.

D 16 Net Neutrality

- 41. Net neutrality is sometimes presented as being in opposition to taking responsibility against antisemitism. This does not seem to apply to fraud, phishing, etc, so neither should it apply to hate.

D17 Other proposals

- 33. While the German Government's dialogue with ISPs encouraging them to use terms of service to remove Nazi content is welcomed, it is doubtful how effective this will be with U.S. companies in particular. Legal action, such as that undertaken in France, may be required. Such action is best initiated by the State.
- 34. A hoax checking site, as a repository of false quotations and doctored quotations
- 35. Research into topologies of Internet hate is needed
- 36. Money needs to be dedicated for grassroots initiatives and involvement of qualified experts (lawyers, translators).
- 37. The study of online hate is a new field and additional research is needed, this requires an investment in research into online hate and online hate prevention

D18 Global Forum

- 38. The Global Forum needs to engage with other experts involved in combating other forms of Online Hate so lessons can be shared
- 39. The is work to be done in the area of online hate prevention and this should remain a key focus area of the Global Forum to Combat Antisemitism

SECTION E: Challenges

Defining areas needing further work on a global level

1. We have a lack of metrics on:
 - a. The number of problem items in specific platforms e.g. reported groups in Facebook, reported Videos on YouTube
 - b. The number of items resolved on specific platforms e.g. groups shut down, videos removed, complaints reviewed or dismissed
 - c. Facebook needs to allow international law enforcement entities access to information more easily. At present warrants are required/ MLAT/ etc. There is a need to have a designated individual on the Facebook team to deal specifically with law enforcement issues pertaining to antisemitic content and hate.
 - d. The time delay between something being reported and action being taken in a specific platform
2. We need stronger relationships between expert reporting organizations and platform providers
 - a. Platforms need to be encouraged to use experts in determining when something is antisemitic
3. UK libel laws deter identification of antisemitism: the law needs changing but it also needs to give more protection against antisemitism.^{xxxii}
4. EUMC Definition needs to be upgraded from a "Working Definition" to a Definition agreed at Council (Ministerial) level in the EU
5. Recommendations of Expert Groups are being ignored in some cases
 - a. In the UK, out of 35 recommendations of the All Party Committee on Antisemitism (2006), maybe 3 have been implemented - and those have not been by government
6. How do we come close to matching the resources at the disposal of the antisemites?^{xxxiii}
 - a. "In Britain, dozens of "centres of Islamic studies" were set up in universities, in order to make Muslim students more moderate. A report however by Prof. Anthony Glees titled "Extremism fear over Islam studies donations" found that the Saudis poured GBP 233 million into these centres. The result was the radicalization of young Muslims in the UK. Here too, billionaire bin Talal is in the background. He donated GBP 8 million to an Islamic centre in Oxford. A poll conducted in Britain revealed that one third of Muslim students justify murder in the name of religion."
 - b. Inconsistencies exist in the educational/knowledge level of Law Enforcement in the area of Internet hate and antisemitism etc, thereby making it difficult at times for law enforcement to be proactive when monitoring online content. An online course, perhaps, made available for minimal or no cost, geared to the basics of what is hateful/unacceptable and what is not, should be offered in order to raise levels of awareness and assist in keeping the Internet a "cleaner" place

7. Microsoft Word marks antisemitism as a spelling error, and considers the correct spelling to be “anti-Semitism”. This is against the opinion of experts on the matter and obscures the issue of antisemitism.
8. Complaints procedures impossibly stacked against complainant, e.g., BBC
9. The mere fact that something is being done by a Jewish person should not insulate the act from criticism that it is antisemitic. The actions of some Jews, particularly their commentary in the media “as a Jew”, is sometimes antisemitic and may encourage antisemitism.
10. Some Jewish communities are not taking antisemitism seriously, in such a climate monitoring and responding to online antisemitism originating in those locations has additional difficulties
11. We need better ways of sharing information on online antisemitism, particularly in social media. These require inclusion with existing country reports. The online world must be treated as a country for reporting purposes.
12. State sponsored online hate is an increasing issue, Iran in particular is promoting various forms of antisemitism online, including Holocaust denial.

Appendix A: Positive Initiatives (Expanded Details)

Expanded C1 - Reports covering online hate

The following reports are mostly new, but some older reports are included for a comprehensive listing.

C1.1 Report on 1st-Amendment.net

- Author - [Reported by Stan Nadel](#) to "H-NET History of Anti-Semitism List"
- key findings/ recommendations:
 - 1st-amendment.net web hosting company hosts at least 15 antisemitic sites
 - Complaint was sent to the hosting company and ignored. Complaint was posted on an antisemitic website.
 - 1st-amendment.net is believed itself to be a neo-Nazi/antisemitic operation

C1.2 Argentinean Jewish organization Battle Google over Search Suggestions of Antisemitic sites

- http://www.worldjewishcongress.org/en/news/10256/argentine_jewish_community_wins_injunction_against_google_over_suggested_searches_
- <http://www.daia.org.ar/Site2009/nota.php?id=1990> - in Spanish
- <http://www.daia.org.ar/Site2009/nota.php?id=1991>
- Authors - [DAIA](#), [Observatorio WEB](#), [Latin American Jewish Congress](#), [AMIA](#).
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - The [Observatorio](#) Website identified 76 sites that had a common denominator of incitement to hatred and the call to violence.
 - Some of the sites deny the existence of the Holocaust.
 - An Argentinean court ordered Google to drop some "suggested searches" through which the user was directed by the search engine to sites illegal under Argentinean law that incite to violence against people and/or propagate racist and antisemitic libels.
 - Google was also ordered to stop posting ads to those sites in order to deny the sites additional revenue

C1.3 Global anti-Semitism Report 2010

- Author - Stephen Roth Center (Tel Aviv University).
- <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2010/general-analysis-10.pdf>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Countless antisemitic diatribes, speeches, press articles and especially electronic posts in almost every possible form on the internet were recorded in 2010.
 - Media featuring antisemitic themes, such as the blood libel, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, and the Jews' responsibility for various disasters, as well as the equation of Israel and Zionism with Nazism were rife in the Islamist media and internet sites

- A leader of a group of youths in Kyrgyzstan who participated in riots against Jews called for the killing of all Jews in an interview on a Russian news website.
- The columnist Javier Monagas Maita posted an article on the pro-Chavez Aporeia website stating that Israel converted Palestine into an immense concentration camp and steals vital transportable organs of its inhabitants.
- Towards the end of 2010 there was a noticeable decline in antisemitism in the Venezuelan media after a meeting between Chavez and the local Jewish community, but some die hard antisemitic websites continue with their usual virulence.
- In Hungary the nationalist party JOBBIK (Movement for Better Hungary) published antisemitic propaganda on its website (kuruc.info) which is linked to a network of extremist sites.
- The official Muslim Brotherhood of Egypt website publishes statements denying the Holocaust and comparing Israel to the Nazi regime.

C1.4 The 2009 Wiesenthal report on Facebook YouTube and more

- Author - Simon Wiesenthal Center.
- <http://www.vho.org/aaargh/fran/livres9/Wisenthal0905.pdf>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Antisemitic groups all over the world are using Facebook, YouTube and other Internet platforms to promote Antisemitic propaganda.
 - Examples are given of Holocaust denial, terrorism and classic antisemitic motifs that are promoted through Facebook.
 - Antisemitic individuals with a heavy web presence (e.g. Frank Weltner from the JewWatch website) are using platforms such as YouTube to spread their agenda by other means.
 - Online games are also used to promote hate against Jews and other minority groups.
 - Zionist conspiracy groups are using the Internet and the social networks to spread their ideas.
 - While disavowing Holocaust denial Facebook continues to allow itself to be used as a platform for Holocaust denial.

C1.5 Anti-Israel Internet game

- Author - Simon Wiesenthal Center
- <http://www.wiesenthal.com/site/apps/s/content.asp?c=lsKWlBpJLnF&b=4442915&ct=5852965>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated 2001.
 - A Syrian anti Israeli internet game aimed at reaching the younger audience.
 - In the game one throws stones at Israeli soldiers, Once the game is over, a message appears against a black background saying: Well maybe you have killed some Israeli Soldiers...in the computer world." On the next page, there is a picture of a Palestinian funeral with text saying: "This is the real world. Stop the killing of the innocents of Palestine...Before the game is really over."

C1.6 Terrorists use Internet and social networks

- Author - Simon Wiesenthal Center.

- <http://www.wiesenthal.com/site/apps/s/content.asp?c=lsKWlbPJLnF&b=4442915&ct=7323487>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated 2009.
 - South-east terrorists make use of an extensive online presence to spread Jihad agendas, and are very active in social networks such as Facebook.
 - Social networks are used to gather followers and link them to extremist groups.

C1.7 Wiesenthal focus on social networks

- Author - Simon Wiesenthal Center.
- http://www.wiesenthal.com/atf/cf/%7B54d385e6-f1b9-4e9f-8e94-890c3e6dd277%7D/LA-RELEASE_2.PDF
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated 2009.
 - SWC identified 160 hate sites in 1996 and over 10,000 hate sites in 2009
 - Islamic elements attack Israel via Twitter as well.
 - The Nazi Party of India and Hezbollah use Orkut (a Google owned and operated social media platform popular in Brazil and India) to promote their messages.
 - Blogs and forums exist for the sole purpose of antisemitic propaganda.

C1.8 Six hate websites in Canada have been pulled down

- Author - Simon Wiesenthal Center.
- <http://www.wiesenthal.com/site/apps/s/content.asp?c=lsKWlbPJLnF&b=4442915&ct=5852797>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated 2004.
 - Six hate websites dealing with terrorism and antisemitism have been pulled down due to an alert by Canadian Friends of the Wiesenthal Centre.

C1.9 Al Aqsa Brigade uses Internet site to recruit volunteers for online attack

- Author - Simon Wiesenthal Center.
- <http://www.wiesenthal.com/site/apps/s/content.asp?c=lsKWlbPJLnF&b=4442915&ct=5852241>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated 2004.
 - Palestinian terror organization used a website for logistical purposes and to recruit volunteers for a coordinated online attack against unnamed 'Zionist' site.

C1.10 Facebook drops "The Third Palestinian Intifada" page

- Author - Simon Wiesenthal Center.
- <http://www.wiesenthal.com/site/apps/s/content.asp?c=lsKWlbPJLnF&b=4442915&ct=9310071>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated March 2011

- After a prolonged worldwide campaign Facebook agreed to drop the page calling for a third Intifada.

C1.11 Many Antisemitic comments in Yahoo! after Goldman Sachs investigation

- Author - Simon Wiesenthal Center.
- <http://www.wiesenthal.com/site/apps/s/content.asp?c=lsKWlbpJLnF&b=4442915&ct=8217679>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Outrageous antisemitism displayed via Internet message boards on Yahoo! And other forums in the wake of the Goldman Sachs investigation
 - The comments used old stigmas about Jewish control of the financial system.
 - A direct connection was made to Israel along with a call to kill the Jews.

C1.12 Antisemitic article removed from the World Economic Forum's online magazine

- Dated 2006.
- Author - Simon Wiesenthal Center.
- <http://www.wiesenthal.com/site/apps/s/content.asp?c=lsKWlbpJLnF&b=4442915&ct=5850745>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Upon receiving a letter by the SWC, The World Economic Forum removed an antisemitic article posted in its online magazine. The article, titled Boycott Israel, stated *"Global civil society ought to boycott Israel until it ends its apartheid-like treatment of Palestinians."*
 - Antisemitic elements attempt to publish their propaganda in semi of even non political online platforms in order to receive more credibility.

C1.13 A summary of the 1998-2008 decade by the Wiesenthal Centre.

- Author - Simon Wiesenthal Centre.
- <http://www.kintera.org/site/apps/s/link.asp?c=fwLYKnN8LzH&b=4145951>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - This Report sums up the situation in regards to online terror and hate in the last decade.
 - The report shows a huge increase in the number of antisemitic and terror websites since the beginning of the decade.
 - The focus point is on the effect the propaganda has on youth. The report offers methods for combating propaganda and provides tools for educating youth.
 - The report reviewed hate games used to impress youth.
 - Every aspect of the Internet is being used by extremists of every ilk to repackage old hatred, demean the 'Enemy', to raise funds, and since 9/11, recruit and train Jihadist terrorist
 - One of the dangers of the internet is that the general public is easily exposed to extremist material that would not be present in traditional mainstream media.

- Extremists are leveraging 2.0 technologies to dynamically target young people through digital games, Second Life scenarios, blogs, and even YouTube and Facebook style videos depicting racist violence and terror.
- The report review general online themes of antisemitism - such as Jewish world domination and Holocaust denial.

C1.14 JPPI 2010 report

- Author – The Jewish Public Policy Institute (JPPI).
- <http://jppi.org.il/uploads/Anti%20Semitism.pdf>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Antisemitism in cyberspace is virtually impossible to quantify, both because of the highly dynamic of the medium, and because the information on the net is infinite, and it is impossible to reach it all.
 - In the last few years there has been a worrying increase in the number of antisemitic events in cyberspace.
 - This report uses other reports to create an overview of activity.
 - The JIDF (Jewish Internet Defence Force) was established in order to combat online anti-Semitism. This organization mounted public campaigns to compel Facebook to pull down hate group pages.

C1.15 RESPONDING TO CYBERHATE - toolkit for action

- Author - The ADL.
- http://www.adl.org/internet/Binder_final.pdf
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated August 2010.
 - This report does not review online antisemitism, rather it focuses on how to combat online antisemitism and hate.
 - The report sets out guidelines for what different players in the online world can do to counter hate. It determines that the relevant players are users, parents, governments and service providers.
 - When a user encounters a hate video, blog, group or any other media form, s/he should among other things write to the ISP or the site's management and explain why the site is a violation of their terms of use and/or fosters hate/antisemitism.

C1.16 INVESTIGATING HATE CRIMES ON THE INTERNET

- Author - Partners Against Hate (funded by the U.S. Department of Justice).
- http://www.partnersagainsthate.org/publications/investigating_hc.pdf
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated September 2003.
 - This report deals with the legal application of online hate crimes, mainly in the United States.
 - The report provides legal definitions of key terms, and reviews the judicial history of hate crimes in the US.
 - The report also deals with jurisdiction and enforcement issues.
 - The report is dated and it is likely that since then there have been many new developments.

C1.17 Hate on the internet - a guide for families and educators

- Author - Partners Against Hate.
- http://www.partnersagainsthate.org/publications/hoi_full.pdf
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - From December 2003, and is therefore dated.
 - The report is in fact a guide for families and educators about the dangers that children may encounter online.
 - There is a review of the major threats that existed at the time - KKK, Holocaust denial sites, Neo Nazis and more.
 - Children encounter hate online through websites, chat rooms, USENET newsgroups, online bulletin boards, instant messaging and email newsletters.
 - The guide reviews the actual process of how children encounter hate online and reviews different ways to minimize exposure to, and combat hate online.
 - The guide states that an education promoting critical thinking in children/students is the best tool against hate
 - At the end of the guide there is a comprehensive reference list to online hate articles and reports of the time.

C1.18 INACH's 2010 annual report

- Author - INACH (International Network Against Cyber Hate).
- http://www.inach.net/INACH_report_2010.pdf
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - INACH is a network of organization (which includes the ADL) from all around the world, and its goal is to combat online hate.
 - The report reviews the trends of online hate in 2010 and states that INACH strives to 'bring the online in line with human rights.'
 - Web 2.0 offers digital haters more and varied ways to express hate speech and empowers them by providing the tools to reach their audience
 - The report presents the annual activity of all the organizations and the profile of each one.
 - The organizations all work against hate
 - INACH calls on Facebook and other social network providers to pull down antisemitic pages and groups.

C1.19 Google Earth and Historical Revisionism

- Author – Dr. Andre Oboler.
- <http://www.oboler.com/?p=535>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated June 2008.
 - Google Earth is used to promote misinformation by displaying historically false and/or manipulated information for those viewing the map of Israel.
 - This misinformation is an attempt to erase the connection of one people to a land and replace it with the connection of a different people.
 - The platform of Google Earth is abused in this way as a means of spreading misinformation under the pretence of providing objectively reliable information.

C1.20 Anti-Israel Subversion on Wikipedia

- Author – Dr. Andre Oboler.
- <http://www.oboler.com/?p=517>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated May 2008.
 - While Wikipedia is supposed to be a neutral source of information in practice it is an active battleground where much propaganda and anti Israel information is disseminated.
 - Pro-Palestinian groups and Anti-Israel groups use Wikipedia as a platform to showcase their ideology in a seemingly objective fashion.

C1.21 The rise and eventual fall of an anti-Israel Facebook group

- Author – Dr. Andre Oboler.
- http://www.covenant.idc.ac.il/en/vol3/issue1/The_Rise_and_Fall_of_a_Facebook.html
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated August 2009.
 - This article tells the story of the rise of the hate Facebook group "*Israel" is not a country!*... ... *Delist it from Facebook as a country!*" and its fall.
 - At its peak the group numbered more than 48,000 members and contained a lot of propaganda against Israel and Jews.
 - Facebook initially refused to delete the group, claiming that it was not racist.
 - The group was finally deleted by Facebook, but not before the JIDF temporally took over the group and a Wikipedia debate determined that there was sufficient evidence to show that it was indeed an antisemitic Facebook group.

C1.22 National Alliance report

- Author - ADL.
- http://www.adl.org/learn/ext_us/N_Alliance.asp
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - The report focuses on the National Alliance (a white supremacy hate group) and its history, membership, ideology, methodologies, forms of communication and ties to other extremist groups.
 - The group has its own updated and advanced web site which it uses to promote hate.
 - Another method of spreading ideas is through internet radio, on which the National Alliance has a weekly broadcast.

C1.23 The Big Lie Of Israeli 'Organ Harvesting' on the Internet

- Author - ADL.
- http://www.adl.org/PresRele/Internet_75/5693_75.htm
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - The articles tell the story of the creation, broadcast and dissemination of the lie concerning organ harvesting by Israeli soldier-physicians in Haiti.

- The lie began from a single YouTube video created by a man from Seattle.
- Within a day the video was picked up by news agencies in countries hostile to Israel and on antisemitic websites
- This story shows just how fast a story can spread globally, and just how little it takes to get it started.

C1.24 Internet and the Holocaust Memorial Museum shooting

- Author - ADL.
- http://www.adl.org/ADL_Opinions/Extremism/20090617-op-ed+CBSNews.com.htm
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated June 2009
 - The article recounts the story of the Holocaust Memorial Museum shooting by James Von Brunn, a white supremacist activist.
 - The Internet's freedom and ease of networking was a big part of Brunn's life before the shooting itself.
 - Many of the talkbacks made on legitimate news articles regarding Jewish or Israel related topics are incredibly antisemitic.
 - The more people encounter antisemitic propaganda the more they get used to it and consider it normal.

C1.25 Financial Crisis Sparks Wave of Internet Antisemitism

- Author - ADL.
- http://www.adl.org/main_internet/Anti-Semitism_Financial_Crisis.htm
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated October 2008
 - As the financial crisis continues to affect markets around the world, online antisemitic elements utilize the opportunity to promote conspiracy theories about Jewish involvement in the crisis.
 - These conspiracy theories are repeated and believed by many in the world and cause a surge in antisemitism.
 - One Conspiracy theory is that before collapsing, Lehman Brothers bank transferred a huge sum of money to Israeli Banks.
 - Another conspiracy theory claims that the Jews were behind the 9/11 attack since 4,000 Jews did not report to work that day.
 - These lies are based on old antisemitic themes, e.g. portray the Jews as greedy and possessing the power to control the world. The lies are spread successfully and quickly via the internet.

C1.26 Antisemitic comments in Mainstream Web Sites

- Author - ADL.
- http://www.adl.org/main_Anti_Semitism_Domestic/Anti-Semitism+and+the+Madoff+Scandal.htm
- key findings/ recommendation:

- The Bernard Madoff financial scandal proved a bonanza for online antisemitic elements, leading to an upsurge of antisemitic comments in mainstream websites.
- Most of the antisemitic comments tended to focus on alleged Jewish greed and thievery, as well as conspiracy theories linking financial losses to Israel.
- Many of the comments were in mainstream news sites where people look for objective report on the current events.
- Some of the other comments were made in financial websites, blogs and discussion boards catering for those looking for financial news.
- Whereas before the Internet antisemitic elements had only their cohorts to share their views with, in all of the mentioned platforms the comments made reached the eyes of many people who in other circumstances would never have been exposed to this propaganda.

C1.27 Facebook, Holocaust Denial, and Antisemitism 2.0

- Author – Dr. Ander Oboler.
- <http://www.icpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?DRIT=3&DBID=1&LNGID=1&TMID=111&FID=624&PID=0&IID=3075>
- key findings/ recommendation:
 - Dated September 2009
 - The article reviews the issue of Holocaust Denial groups in Facebook.
 - Facebook was informed that there were Holocaust Denial groups in Facebook which are in direct contradiction to its Terms of Use and local law in several countries.
 - Facebook's response was to change their Terms of Use so that there would be no requirements on its part to take down these groups from Facebook. In the new Terms of Use reference to compliance with local law also vanished.
 - Following these changes, based on the argument of free speech, Facebook declared that it would not take down the Holocaust denial groups.
 - In doing so, Facebook created a safe haven for Holocaust denial, and enabled this kind of antisemitism within the Facebook community.
 - Facebook's policy demonstrates a lack of understanding regarding antisemitism and Holocaust denial in particular, and a lack of engagement with the problem of antisemitism 2.0.

C1.28 A Campus Front for White supremacy

- Author - ADL.
- http://www.adl.org/main_Extremism/youth_western_civilization.htm?Multi_page_sections=sHeading_2
- Key findings/recommendations:
 - The report reveals that a group (Youth for Western Civilization) that operates in campuses across the USA, is in fact a cover for White Supremacy extremists.
 - The group is active in Facebook and has both student and non student members.

C1.29 Report on New Matilda

The B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission produced a report analysing the Australian based newmatilda.com news site over a three month period.^{xxxiv}

- The site displayed strong bias against Israel in its choice of articles and failed to remove antisemitic postings.
- This was taken up in a parliamentary grievance speech.
- As a result the website suspended its comments facility on Israel articles and has improved although not totally ameliorated its position.

C1.30 To hate, click here: antisemitism on the internet

Deborah Stone, B'nai B'rith Anti Defamation Commission (Australia).^{xxxv}

- This report examines the sources of antisemitism on the internet and considers the possibilities for controlling internet hate. It explores the regulatory context in Australia and the models available in other jurisdictions. It argues for the extension of Australian internet regulation to include hate. It warns regulation alone is unable to stop the tide of hate now being disseminated.
- The author argues for a multi-pronged approach to fighting antisemitism and racism on the internet including developing positive web-based resources, utilising search engines, working with internet service providers and developers to improve tools available, engaging in web-based dialogue and developing resources to support critical thinking, values education and defensive behaviours.

C1.31 “Online Antisemitism 2.0 and Social Acceptability”

Andre Oboler, in Eunice Pollack (Ed), *Antisemitism on the Campus: Past & Present*, Academic Studies Press, 2011

- This article deals with the threat to students from online hate and includes a discussion on search engines, social media and related issues
- An abridged version was presented at the ICCA meeting in Canada in 2010

C1.32 *A legal model for government intervention to combat online hate*

Andre Oboler, *Internet Law Bulletin* 14(2), May 2011. Key recommendations include:

- Specific technical remedies can be written into law
- Rights can be abrogated or altered by statute, but the law will need to enter the digital world and regulate the activity rather than the technology.
- Governments may request, or legislate to require, technical mechanisms to intervene directly online. It is important any such moves have appropriate checks and balances.
- <http://www.oboler.com/?p=1222>

C1.33 Time to Regulate Internet Hate with a New Approach?

Andre Oboler, *Internet Law Bulletin*, 13(8) (2010). Key recommendations include:

- A new approach should aim to make racism not only illegal but social unattractive. The platform providers are the key to making this happen online.

- Reasonable steps that platform owners could take range from removing content, through to disabling the accounts of problem users. Other options include suspending accounts for a fixed period of time and revoking privileges.
- Only a legal obligation to take reasonable steps in reasonable time will ensure sufficient effort is invested in responding effectively to hate.
- <http://www.oboler.com/?p=379>

C1.34 The ICCA tackles online hate

Andre Oboler, Internet Law Bulletin, 13(9&10) (2011)

- Report on the Experts Working Group on Online Antisemitism at the Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism
- <http://www.oboler.com/?p=1139>

C1.35 The Framing of Political NGOs in Wikipedia through Criticism Elimination

Andre Oboler, Gerald Steinberg and Rephael Stern, The Framing of Political NGOs in Wikipedia through Criticism Elimination, Journal of Information Technology and Politics, 7(4), 2010. pages 284 – 299.

- This article demonstrates a systematic use of criticism elimination, a process whereby activists in Wikipedia white wash the pages of organisations they support.
- The article categorizes the editors responsible into four types and gives examples of each.
- Some of the whitewashing examples show the removal of criticism of organisations who had used antisemitic themes in their publicity or campaigns.

C1.36 Role of the Internet industry in addressing hate on the Internet

This is the report of May 2010 OSCE-ODIHR expert meeting on Hate on the Internet. The report can be downloaded from: <http://www.osce.org/odihr/68743>

- The main goal of this meeting was to engage with the internet industry in a discussion about future cooperation to engage effectively with the problem of online hate, without curtailing freedom of expression.

C1.37 Incitement to Hatred vs. Freedom of Expression: Challenges of combating hate crimes motivated by hate on the Internet

This is the report of the March 2010 OSCE-ODIHR expert meeting on Hate on the Internet. The report can be downloaded from: <http://www.osce.org/odihr/68750>

- The main goal of this meeting was to discuss the issue. The report includes a summary of topics discussed and recommendations for consideration by OSCE participating States, ODIHR, civil society and the Internet industry.

- The meeting noted there was an expanding body of evidence which confirmed the relationship between online hate and hate crimes, and it concludes that neither individual States nor intergovernmental organizations can tackle this issue successfully without close cooperation from other actors.

C1.38 Relationship Between Racist, Xenophobic and Anti-Semitic Propaganda on the Internet and Hate Crimes

This is the report of the first OSCE-ODIHR expert meeting that took place in Paris, June 2004.

- This was the first OSCE meeting on the relationship between cyber hate and hate crimes
- A summary report can be seen at: <http://www.osce.org/item/3833.html>

C1.39 OSCE-ODIHR activities on hate on the internet (October 2010)

This is a report of activities against cyber hate of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights at the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. The report can be seen at: <http://www.osce.org/odihr/73461>

C1.40 Anti-Semitism in Progressive U.S. Blogs/News Websites

Adam Levick, Anti-Israelism and Anti-Semitism in Progressive U.S. Blogs/News Websites: Influential and Poorly Monitored, Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism Series, No. 92, The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 1 January 2010. Available online at: <http://www.jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?DBID=1&TMID=111&LNGID=1&FID=381&PID=0&IID=3211>

C1.41 Anti-Semitic Cartoons on Progressive Blogs

Adam Levick, Anti-Semitic Cartoons on Progressive Blogs, JCPA, 1 September 2010. Available online at <http://www.jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?TMID=111&FID=624&PID=0&IID=4636>

C1.42 In-Depth Media Analysis about the BBC

This report by Honest Reporting covered content on the BBC website between January 1st and March 31st of 2010. The report found substantive double standards with regards to reporting involving Israel. The report can be seen at http://www.honestreporting.com/a/special_reports/bbc2010.pdf

C1.43 Final Report of the Fact-Finding Inquiry on Anti-Semitism, Italian Parliament

This report includes a section online antisemitism (pages 26-28 of the English version). It discussed the “Mancino Law” and the need for law reform both internationally and domestically.

Expanded C2 - Conferences that included a focus on online antisemitism

C2.1 Global Forum to Combat Anti-Semitism

- Date - February 2008, see Report 27
<http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/About+the+Ministry/MFA+Spokesman/2008/Global+forum+for+combating+antisemitism+concludes+annual+conference+25-Feb-2008.htm>
- Definition of anti-Semitism 2.0 - Anti-Semitism 2.0 is the use of online social networking and content collaboration to share demonization, conspiracy theories, Holocaust denial, and classical Antisemitic motifs with a view to creating social acceptability for such content.

C2.2 WUJS3G "Unlocking Our Future", World Union of Jewish Students

- Congress that took place in December 2009 focused on how the young generation of the Jewish people can engage
- The Congress was attended by Jewish student leaders from around the world
- One of the six tracks focused on online antisemitism in social media and specifically the use of such media to de-legitimize Israel.

C2.3 Global Forum for Combating Anti-Semitism 2009

- Date - December 2009
- http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/MFA+events/Conferences/Global_Forum_Combating_Antisemitism_third_international_conference_Dec_2009
- The conference dealt with new forums and trends in anti-Semitism.
- One of the work groups was Anti-Semitism Online: Cyberspace and the Media.

C2.4 ICCA London Convention

- Date - February 2009
- <http://www.antisem.org/london-declaration/>
- The convention ended in a declaration which called for The OSCE to seek ways to coordinate the response of member states to combat the use of the Internet to promote incitement to hatred.
- The declaration also called for Law enforcement authorities to use domestic "hate crime", "incitement to hatred" and other legislation as well as other means to mitigate and, where permissible, to prosecute "Hate on the Internet" where racist and antisemitic content is hosted, published and written.
- Finally it called for an international task force of Internet specialists comprised of parliamentarians and experts to be established in order to create common metrics to measure antisemitism and other manifestations of hate online and to develop policy recommendations and practical instruments for Governments and international frameworks to tackle these problems.

C2.5 ICCA Ottawa Convention

- Date - November 2010.
- <http://www.antisem.org/archive/ottawa-protocol-on-combating-antisemitism/>
- The convention was alarmed by the explosion of antisemitism and hate on the Internet, a medium crucial for the promotion and protection of freedom of expression, freedom of information, and the participation of civil society.
- The members reiterated the necessity of establishing an International Task Force of Internet specialists comprised of parliamentarians and experts to create common indicators to identify and monitor antisemitism and other manifestations of hate online and to develop policy recommendations for Governments and international frameworks to address these problems.

2.6 INACH annual conference in New York City (September 29 – 30, 2005)

This conference brought together American and European experts from academia, government, law enforcement and non-governmental organizations to examine the issues posed by online hate and ways in which governments and watchdog groups can work cooperatively to counteract it. Presenters and participants discussed the differences between the U.S. and European models of dealing with hate speech, and included practical ways those differences could be bridged while respecting freedom of speech.

2.7 INACH annual conference in Berlin (November 8-9, 2007)

Preachers of hate use the world-wide Internet ever more professional. Their on-line calls to violence and hate - so-called Cyber Hate - lead, as can be proven, to real violence in the material world. This relationship is pointed out by INACH (International Network Against Cyber Hate) during its two-day conference "Hate on the net - what we can do against it" in Berlin. In order to counter this hate, the network produced a resolution in which it requests the European Union and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to take effective measures against right-wing extremists, antisemitic and other hateful activities on the Internet.

2.8 INACH International conference in Vienna (November 22 – 23, 2010)

Subtitled: Modern times, new networking: Youth, Hate and Web 2.0, Vienna, Austria.

This conference covered the massive increase of incitement to racial hatred and the dissemination of extreme right-wing ideas through Web 2.0 services. Around 70 participants – representatives from anti-racism and anti-discrimination organizations, IT and internet industry, from justice, government, education and science agreed on the harmfulness of cyber hate and vowed to work together to mitigate the problem. Philippe Schmidt, Chair of INACH, made it clear that ISPs can fulfil their social responsibility by helping human rights succeed - e.g. the protection of human dignity, the right to non-discrimination and the right of freedom of speech, and by setting policies going well beyond legal provisions. Additionally, ISP codes of conduct should make transparent what is allowed and where limits are exceeded. ISPs should also establish reporting points to monitor the guidelines.

C2.9 OSCE-ODIHR expert meeting (Warsaw, 22 March 2010)

Titled: Incitement to Hatred vs. Freedom of Expression: Challenges of combating hate crimes motivated by hate on the Internet. See Report C1.37.

C2.10 OSCE-ODIHR expert meeting (Amsterdam, 10 May 2010)

Titled: "Role of the Internet industry in addressing hate on the Internet", see the meeting report C1.36

C2.11 OSCE-ODIHR expert meeting (Paris, June 2004)

Titled: "Relationship Between Racist, Xenophobic and Anti-Semitic Propaganda on the Internet and Hate Crimes" see the meeting report C1.38. This was the first OSCE meeting on the relationship between cyber hate and hate crimes.

Appendix B: Communications with Facebook

The following communications with Facebook took place as a follow up to the Working Group's meeting in July 2011.

Letter 1- Letter to Facebook

Mark Zuckerberg

Chief Executive Officer

Facebook

12 July 2011

The Online Antisemitism Working Group of the Global Forum for Combating Antisemitism requests Facebook to change its policy about Holocaust denial. Facebook has as one of its terms of service that "You will not post content that: is hateful ... ". Complaints about posting of Holocaust denial have led in many instances to the determination that the posting was hateful. Nonetheless Facebook makes a distinction between Holocaust denial and incitement to hatred. In the view of the Working Group there is no meaningful distinction between the two and Facebook's insistence on the distinction should be abandoned.

The Holocaust is one of the most comprehensively documented events of all history. There are many perpetrators who have been accused, tried, convicted, and punished. Their trials have left extensive records including the testimony of witnesses and filings of exhibits. There are museums and libraries throughout the world filled with documents and artifacts of the Holocaust, including Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, the Holocaust Museum in Washington, the Auschwitz Camp Museum in Poland and the Berlin Documentation Centre in Germany. The remains of extermination camps still exist, such as Birkenau near Auschwitz and Majdanek. There are films, memoirs, TV programs all grounded in the Holocaust. There are monuments where the victims were killed and the survivors now live, commemorating what happened.

One has to ask what Holocaust denial means, given this historical record. When a person says that the Holocaust did not exist, given all these court cases, all the monuments and museums, all the

memoires and films, that person is alleging a fraud on a massive scale. If the Holocaust did not happen, the survivors, the museum curators, the historians, the librarians, the prosecutors, the judges and juries, the movie and TV producers, the reporters are not just confused or forgetful. They are lying.

Holocaust denial, by its very nature, is an allegation of massive fraud. The allegation of massive fraud is not separate from the allegation that the Holocaust never happened but, by its very nature, is implicit in it. Some forms of Holocaust denial actually assert this fraud. Others do not. However, it is not necessary to say the word "fraud"; the allegation of fraud is there even where it is unspoken.

One has to ask further who would be behind such a fraud, if one accepts the fraud in the first place. The answer of Holocaust deniers is the Jews. Although much Holocaust evidence comes from non-Jews and much of the documentation is Nazi German documentation, information from survivors and the organized Jewish community is essential to the memory of the Holocaust. Again, some Holocaust denial material explicitly accuses the Jewish community of perpetrating the fraud of the Holocaust. However, even the Holocaust denial material that says nothing about Jewish fraud implies this accusation. It is impossible to extricate Holocaust denial from this allegation of Jewish fraud, even where it is not explicit.

If we continue to follow this line of inquiry, one has to ask how such a fraud could be committed. How could the media, the libraries, the museums, the courts be filled with information about the Holocaust, if the Holocaust never happened? The answer deniers give or imply is Jewish control of the media, the libraries, the museums and the courts. Holocaust denial is a mutation of the standard historical antisemitic smear that Jews control the world for their own evil interests. Here too, some forms of Holocaust denial state this explicitly. Even the forms of Holocaust denial that do not have this antisemitic conclusion out front have it hidden in the background.

On the descent to hatred, the largest movement a person has to make is the leap from the historical record to Holocaust denial. Once that leap has been made, the belief in Jewish fraud is a small and inevitable step.

Finally, we have to ask, continuing to assume the fraud, why the Jewish community would carry out such a hoax. The answer Holocaust deniers give, sometimes explicitly, but otherwise implicitly, is for sympathy, for support for Israel, for reparations. Again, here we see Holocaust denial as a modern dress for a traditional antisemitic slur, the slur that Jews are greedy and manipulative.

It is no coincidence that the complaints against Holocaust denial on Facebook have led to many findings of violations of the term of service against posting hateful material. The Holocaust denial material that remains is also clearly hateful and of concern. Incitement to hatred against Jews is in fact part and parcel of the very nature of Holocaust denial. This has been repeatedly held by courts and international bodies. We would be happy to send details if this is of assistance to you.

We call on Facebook to abandon its insistence on treating Holocaust denial in a context free manner, in which it is considered nothing more than the rejection of a historical event. The context makes it clear that there is no meaningful distinction between Holocaust denial and incitement to hatred against Jews. To treat Holocaust denial as the only acceptable form of hate on Facebook is a far greater exception than to accept that this particular 'denial of a historical event' is a special case of

historical revisionism that poses a particular danger to a segment of society. We ask that Facebook recognize Holocaust denial as a form of hate speech, issue a statement to this effect, and do its utmost to remove Holocaust denial from the Facebook platform.

Sincerely yours,

David Matas and Andre Oboler
Co-chairs, Online Antisemitism Working Group
The Global Forum to Combat Antisemitism
<http://www.gfantisemitism.org>

Letter 2 – Facebook's reply

29 August 2011

Dear Mr. Matas and Mr. Oboler,

I am writing in response to your letter to Mark Zuckerberg of 12 July 2011. We appreciate the dialogue on this issue and are committed to providing an environment on Facebook where people can share their views while respecting the rights of others.

While we may disagree with you on how best to handle this specific type of content, I am confident that we are aligned on the vast majority of issues involving online hate speech. We are proud of our efforts in this area and have received praise for our thoughtfulness and responsiveness from a number of groups similar to yours.

We find Holocaust denial to be repugnant and ignorant, just as we object to many of the other ideas expressed on our site and on the Internet as a whole. We have spent considerable time internally discussing the issue and have consulted numerous outside experts, inviting some of them to speak to our employees. We have also participated in a number of workshops and conferences on how best to combat online hate speech.

We have found that the best way to minimize hateful and threatening speech on Facebook is to look at the actual words people are using. Our policies prohibit direct statements of hate and clear threats of violence against specific people or groups of people. This approach helps because it enables us to maintain consistency and efficiency across the hundreds of thousands of reports we receive daily. For this reason, we have come to the conclusion that the mere statement of denying the Holocaust is not a violation of our policies. We recognize people's right to be factually wrong about historical events.

It is important to note, however, that in practice, we end up removing the vast majority of Holocaust denial content that is reported to us because it is explicitly hateful or threatening. As you probably know, most instances of Holocaust denial on Facebook (or anywhere else) are accompanied by

threats or clearly anti-Jewish statements, which again, run afoul of our policies. We remove these as quickly as possible when they are reported to us, and the result is that there is actually very little of this kind of content on Facebook. In fact, in most cases, just one statement that violates our policies is enough for us to remove a Holocaust denial group or Page. We also remove this content when it has been created by an inauthentic account, which is often the case, since people do not want their real identity to be associated with such statements.

Many of the team at Facebook have direct personal connection to the Holocaust, through parents or grandparents who were forced to flee Europe or relatives who could not escape. We believe in Facebook's mission that giving people tools to make the world more open is the best way to combat ignorance and deception, though we recognize that others may disagree.

Thank you again for your willingness to engage with us on this issue.

Sincerely,

Richard Allan
Director, Public Policy
Facebook

Letter 3 – Reply to Facebook's Letter

Richard Allen
Director, Public Policy
Facebook

19 September 2011

Dear Mr Allen,

Thank you for your letter of 29 August 2011. We appreciate Facebook's continued discussion on the issue of Holocaust denial and Facebook's terms of service. We also appreciate the open channels of communication on a wider range of issues related to online hate, including your consideration of our policy proposal on the responsibility of privileged users.

Your letter indicates that some of the issues we addressed have been taken on board in the internal discussions at Facebook. In particular we note that the letter does not deny that Holocaust denial is hateful content. This is a proposition on which there is a uniformity of opinion amongst the expert, which Facebook none the less has in the past appeared to reject. Your letter instead suggests there are "direct statements of hate" which are prohibited, and then there is Holocaust denial which Facebook regards as something else, presumably an indirect statement of hate.

The issue of Holocaust denial and indirect hate was examined by a Law Panel of the Institute for Jewish Policy Research in the United Kingdom.¹ The first point to note is that in the UK indirect hate speech is considered more dangerous than direct hate speech and may already be unlawful. We would add that indirect hate speech in social media, specifically antisemitism 2.0 in the case of Holocaust denial, magnifies the danger.²

The panel also found:

“[T]here is an inherent antisemitism in Holocaust denial, although it may not necessarily be obvious or immediately apparent. This is because Holocaust denial does not always encourage hostility to Jews in an explicit way, in comparison to cruder forms of antisemitism”

They went on to say:

“Holocaust denial is antisemitic not only because of the negative image of the Jew it implicitly depicts, but also because of its direct impact upon the feelings of Jews: it produces immeasurable offence and anger, and can cause those who are directly targeted by the material to feel fearful and intimidated.”

The panel concluded by saying:

“[T]he inherent antisemitism of Holocaust denial is one of many manifestations of bigotry and hatred that can fracture relations between groups and engender intense insecurities. As such, the responses to Holocaust denial—by the law, educational establishments, and community organizations—must be informed and vigorous, and should build on and contribute to the wider endeavours of anti-racist campaigning and education.”

We believe the report strongly supports the idea that giving an exception to indirect hate, and particularly Holocaust denial that falls within the category of indirect hate, would be a mistake. The impact on the victims is as serious as direct expressions of hatred.

The question for Facebook, which as your letter says, has policies which “prohibit direct statements of hate and clear threats of violence against specific people or groups of people”, is whether there should be any exceptions. Prohibiting Holocaust denial, in light of the evidence about its nature and impact, would add more consistency to Facebook’s policies, greater efficiencies to the process of review, and would avoid one form of hate appearing to be acceptable or somehow less hateful.

Holocaust denial that is expressed as indirect hate is at least readily identifiable. There are other forms of indirect hate, against many groups in society, which may be less obvious. If only direct hate

¹ Anthony Julius, Geoffrey Bindman, Jeffrey Jowell, Jonathan Morris, Dinah Rose and Malcolm Shaw, “Combating Holocaust denial through law in the United Kingdom”, Institute for Jewish Policy Research (2000) <http://www.jpr.org.uk/Reports/CS_Reports/no_3_2000/index.htm>

² Andre Oboler, Facebook, Holocaust Denial, and Anti-Semitism 2.0, Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism Series, No. 86, The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 15 September 2009

is considered a violation of the terms of service, Facebook will be adopting a position that allows this hate to spread. An example would be the many groups on Facebook set up under titles such as “a gypsy stole my phone”. The Roma, Sinti and other travellers are unlikely to take comfort from the fact that this racist stereo typing is indirect.

We thank you for the progress that has been made, and we look forward to continuing the discussion on these emerging issues. In the mean time, we reiterate our request for Facebook to recognize Holocaust denial as an unacceptable form of hate speech, issue a statement to this effect, and do its utmost to remove all Holocaust denial from Facebook.

Specifically we hope Facebook will publically agree that:

- a) Holocaust denial is a form of hate speech
- b) All hate speech should be treated the same
- c) All hate speech should and will be disallowed by Facebook’s terms of service

We also hope Facebook will agree to take action so that:

- a) Hate speech, including Holocaust denial, is removed in reasonable time
- b) Repeated posting of hateful content results in a warning to the poster
- c) Further repeated posting of hateful content is regarded as a serious breach of the terms of service and leads to temporary or permanent account suspension or suspension of specific privileges or functionality

We appreciate the continuing dialogue on the wider issue of online antisemitism and online hate and will continued to keep you informed of our work in this area and to inform you of any systematic problems we observe within the Facebook platform. If there are any policy issues on which Facebook would like an independent opinion, we would be happy to respond to consultation requests.

Sincerely yours,

Andre Oboler and David Matas
Co-chairs, Online Antisemitism Working Group
The Global Forum to Combat Antisemitism
<http://www.gfantisemitism.org>

Appendix C: Recommendations Provided to Facebook

Responsibilities of Privileged Users

Dr Andre Oboler and Adv David Matas
Online Antisemitism Working Group Co-Chairs
Global Forum to Combat Antisemitism

Background

This paper is an elaboration on recommendation D 20 of the 2009 Report of the Online Antisemitism Working Group of the Global Forum to Combat Antisemitism.³ This paper has been prepared in response to a request for elaboration by Facebook's Richard Allan at the 2011 Working Group meeting.

Need

Online hate is a large and growing problem in social media platforms. The link between manifestations of hate on the Internet and real world hate crimes has been highlighted by the OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR).⁴ New approaches are needed in light of Web 2.0 technologies, and social media in particular.⁵ Technical difficulties have also been identified due to the volume of data.⁶

Solution

With power comes responsibility

In social media platforms users with a privileged position and the ability to remove other people's content, or to exclude another user from a space, should have a reciprocal responsibility to use their authority to remove problematic content which would otherwise need to be removed by the platform itself.

By sharing responsibility with the user community, the platform providers lower the burden their staff currently face in directly responding to this problematic content. The authority needed is no higher than currently exists. Repercussions beyond removing the content or excluding the user from that particular page / group remain at the discretion of the platform provider.

Beyond cleaning up the platform, policies such as this promote good citizenship and educate users to stand up against hate speech.

³ <http://www.gfantisemitism.org/Conference2009/Pages/default.aspx>

⁴ Report of the OSCE-ODIHR Expert Meeting, Incitement to Hatred vs. Freedom of Expression: Challenges of combating hate crimes motivated by hate on the Internet, Warsaw, 22 March 2010
<<http://www.osce.org/odihr/68750>>

⁵ Ibid

⁶ <http://www.osce.org/odihr/68743>

Empowering platform providers

Exception reporting showing users whose actions multiple administrators have seen fit to responded to may trigger a review by platform staff. Such user may face higher sanctions such as having privileges removed, or their account temporarily or permanently disabled.

In taking such action, the platform is not acting along, but is acting in response to the wishes of the user community who originally filed and judged the complaints.

Ensuring moderation occurs

For this system to work, privileged users must be able to anonymously see complaints lodged about content in spaces they control. It is also necessary for them to respond to each complaint with one of the following actions:

- Dismissing the complaint (no action)
- Accept complaint as a minor violation (and remove offending content)
- Accept complaint as a serious violation (and remove the user)
- Marking the report itself as abuse (report the person who sent the report)

If no privileged user responds within a reasonable time, a reminder should be sent to all privileged users for that space. The reminder should tell them they have pending complaints to review. If still no action is taken a warning should be issued telling them they risk losing their privileged status in the given space if no action is taken within a specified number of days. Following a second warning their access should be reduced to that of a regular user (with the exception of being able to review complaints) and they should be informed of this and warned that a failure to either review complaints or remove themselves as a privileged user in that space may result in system wide restrictions. Following a further period without review activity their privileged status should be removed within that space and their privileged access in other spaces suspended for a set number of days.

Each time the above process runs to completion, the suspension of privileges at a system wide level should be for a longer period. Another option would be to prevent repeat offenders from becoming privileged users in the future, however this removes the incentive for good behaviour even by repeat non-performers.

Penalties for the space can also be considered, such as disabling posting while there are no active moderators.

Ensure moderation is accurate

It is important to ensure moderation is not only occurring but is reasonably accurate. This can be achieved by a combination of random checks by platform staff and reviewing through exception reporting.

The reviewing through exception reporting would involve platform staff selectively auditing the actions of privileged users whose reporting is too far away from the average. This may indicate either an abuse of the privileged status or a privileged user acting responsibly in a space that is attracting a disproportionate level of problematic content. Either way this is a situation the platform provider should review.

The random reviews will catch other situations, such as spaces designed to spread hate where users are reporting those who complain and moderators are verifying those reports.

Random reviews can also be triggered when a privileged user is reported in their capacity as a regular user of the platform.

Benefits

This system will cause cultural change by educating users on the responsibility that comes with power, and on the need to uphold the platforms terms of service. It will also enable a far larger amount of problematic content to be removed far more quickly.

Evaluation

The change can be evaluated on a quantitative level by the number of items removed and also by the average turnaround time on complaints.

Costs

The above changes involve some development of the platforms. The staff needed to make the system work can be reassigned from their current work directly reviewing content, so there is no added staff cost.

ⁱ <http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/material/pub/AS/AS-WorkingDefinition-draft.pdf>

ⁱⁱ US State Department, *Contemporary Global Anti-Semitism: A Report Provided to the United States Congress*, 2008. Online at <http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/102406.htm>

ⁱⁱⁱ Apple drops iPhone 'intifada' app that encourages users to launch violence against Israel, *Daily Mail Online*, 23 June 2011 <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2007174/Apple-drops-iPhone-intifada-app-encourages-users-launch-violence-Israel.html#ixzz1QUzSoTnM>

^{iv} Disputed Territory: War in Gaza Provokes Protest (And Conversation) In Second Life Israel, *New World Notes*, January 7 2009 <http://nwn.blogs.com/nwn/2009/01/israel-attack-o.html>

^v Oliver Milman, RedBubble relents over Hipster Hitler t-shirt storm, *StartupSmart*, 7 June 2011 <http://www.smartcompany.com.au/legal/20110607-redbubble-relents-over-hipster-hitler-t-shirt-storm.html>

^{vi} Andre Oboler, *The iFascists*, Blog Central at the Jerusalem Post, 2 February 2010

^{vii} Duncan Kennedy, Mussolini iPhone application is withdrawn, *BBC News*, 3 February 2010 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/8497291.stm>

^{viii} iMussolini app removed from app store, *Textually*, 5 Feb 2010 <http://www.textually.org/textually/archives/2010/02/025423.htm>

^{ix} Jonathan Leggett, Third Intifada iPhone app pulled from Apple App Store, 23rd June 2011 http://top10.com/mobilephones/news/2011/06/third_intifada_iphone_app_pulled_from_app_store/

^x Andre Oboler, Google Earth: A New Platform for Anti-Israel Propaganda and Replacement Geography, *Jerusalem Issue Briefs*, Vol. 8, No. 5, JCPA, 26 June 2008. Available online at: <http://www.jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?DBID=1&LNGID=1&TMID=111&FID=376&PID=0&IID=2250>

^{xi} Andre Oboler, Facebook, Holocaust Denial, and Anti-Semitism 2.0, *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism Series*, No. 86, The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 15 September 2009. Available online at: <http://www.jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?DRIT=3&DBID=1&LNGID=1&TMID=111&FID=624&PID=0&IID=3075>

^{xii} Christoph Gunkel, Facebook und Google Earth: Antisemitismus im Web 2.0, *F.A.Z.*, October 14 2008. Available online at:

<http://www.faz.net/s/RubCF3AEB154CE64960822FA5429A182360/Doc~E131A1CEB38A14371865189591440F0A4~ATpl~Ecommon~Scontent.html>

^{xiii} Adam Levick, Anti-Israelism and Anti-Semitism in Progressive U.S. Blogs/News Websites: Influential and Poorly Monitored, Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism Series, No. 92, The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 1 January 2010. Available online at:

<http://www.jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?DBID=1&TMID=111&LNGID=1&FID=381&PID=0&IID=3211>

^{xiv} Adam Levick, Anti-Semitic Cartoons on Progressive Blogs, JCPA, 1 September 2010. Available online at

<http://www.jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?TMID=111&FID=624&PID=0&IID=4636>

^{xv} Jessica Elgot, Holocaust game is cancelled, The Jewish Chronicle, December 16, 2010 online at

<http://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/42700/holocaust-game-cancelled>; Andre Oboler, Commandment 614:

Learning about the Holocaust may not be fun, Jerusalem Post Blogs, 27 January 2011 online at

<http://blogs.jpost.com/content/commandment-614-learning-about-holocaust-may-not-be-fun>; Lesley Broff, Sonderkommando Revolt: Controversial Video Game Rewriting Holocaust History, Questional, January 18, 2011 online at: <http://questional.com/blog/155-sonderkommando-revolt-controversial-video-game-rewriting-holocaust-history/>

^{xvi} Honest Reporting, Yahoo Divides Jerusalem, June 15 2010 <http://honestreporting.com/yahoo-divides-jerusalem/>

^{xvii} Doreen Carvajal, France bans Al Manar TV channel, 15 December 2004

http://www.nytimes.com/2004/12/15/news/15iht-t5_17.html

^{xviii} More information available at: <http://www.antidef.org.au/www/309/1001127/displayarticle/click-against-hate--1011350.html>

^{xix} Information is provided on the CIDI website: www.cidi.nl

^{xx} See the petition at: <http://petitions.number10.gov.uk/NoToGoldstone/>

^{xxi} For more information see: <http://cifwatch.com/the-indictment-of-the-guardian/>

^{xxii} The report is available online:

http://www.zionismontheweb.org/CommentsFree_ParliamentASCttee_July08.pdf

^{xxiii} See: <http://www.hurryupharry.org/2009/12/02/carols-with-caryl-and-more/>

^{xxiv} More information on CIE can be seen at the website: <http://www.internetengagement.com.au>

^{xxv} www.ohpi.org.au

^{xxvi} <http://www.observatorioweb.org/>

^{xxvii} <http://www.inach.net/>

^{xxviii} <http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/material/pub/AS/AS-WorkingDefinition-draft.pdf>

^{xxix} US State Department, *Contemporary Global Anti-Semitism: A Report Provided to the United States Congress*, 2008. Online at <http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/102406.htm>

^{xxx} The EUMC Working Definition of Antisemitism is available from Fundamental Rights Agency of the EU:

<http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/material/pub/AS/AS-WorkingDefinition-draft.pdf>

^{xxxi} See Andre Oboler, Facebook, Holocaust Denial, and Anti-Semitism 2.0, Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism Series, No. 86, The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 15 September 2009; Raphael Cohen-Almagor, "Holocaust Denial Is A Form of Hate Speech", Amsterdam Law Forum, Vol. 2, No 1 (2009), pp. 33-42.

^{xxxii} See: <http://www.libelreform.org/>

^{xxxiii} See: <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1259010971584&pagename=JPArticle%2FShowFull>

^{xxxiv} Available online: <http://www.antidef.org.au/secure/downloadfile.asp?fileid=1011170>

^{xxxv} Available online: <http://www.antidef.org.au/secure/downloadfile.asp?fileid=1010474>