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The Center for Countering Digital Hate is a non-profit NGO that seeks to disrupt the architecture of online hate and misinformation.

Digital technology has changed forever the way we communicate, build relationships, share knowledge, set social standards, and negotiate and assert our societies' values.

Digital spaces have been colonized and their unique dynamics exploited by malignant actors that instrumentalize hate and misinformation. These movements are opportunistic, agile, and confident in exerting influence and persuading people.

Over time these malignant actors, advocating diverse causes - from hatred of women to racial and religious intolerance to science-denial - have formed a digital Counter-Enlightenment. The disinformation they spread to bolster their causes has socialized the offline world for the worse.

The Center's work combines both analysis and active disruption of these networks. CCDH's solutions seek to increase the economic, political, and social costs of all parts of the infrastructure - the actors, systems, and culture - that support and profit from hate and misinformation.
Introduction

This report shows how social media companies fail to act on anti-Jewish hate on their platforms. As a result of their failure to enforce their own rules, social media platforms like Facebook have become safe places to spread racism and propaganda against Jews.

Our research concludes that the platforms are failing to remove hateful and antisemitic content even after it is specifically reported and flagged. Our methodology sidesteps debates about algorithms and claims by the companies about automated hate removal that they refuse to have independently verified. Instead, we measured the effectiveness of the platforms’ opposition to antisemitism by assessing what they do with user reports of anti-Jewish hatred.

CCDH researchers, using the platforms’ own reporting tools, reported hundreds of examples of clear, grotesque antisemitism to Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, YouTube and TikTok over a six-week period in 2021. We found that the platforms acted on fewer than 1 in 6 reported examples of antisemitism. The posts that we reported for this analysis received up to 7.3 million impressions. Facebook and Twitter showed the poorest rate of enforcement action.

Each of the posts identified and flagged by our researchers for antisemitic hatred clearly violated existing platform policies. Content containing Holocaust denial and antisemitic conspiracy theories about Jewish control of governments and banks, even alleging that Jews orchestrated the Covid pandemic and the Al Qaeda terrorist attacks of 9/11, were allowed to remain on platforms. Even after being reported at least once by users, Nazi symbolism, references to the white nationalist ‘Great Replacement’ conspiracy theory, and posts promoting violence against the Jewish community remain publicly visible.

Twitter continues to host hashtags ranging from #holohoax to #killthejews, while TikTok allows hashtags which organize and promote conspiracies such as #synagogueofsatan, #rothschildfamily, and #soros. These posts have gained 25.1 million views on the video-sharing platform. Jewish TikTok creators’ comment sections are rife with antisemitic abuse. Despite TikTok saying they “do not permit content that contains hate speech,” we found that TikTok closed just 5% of accounts reported for sending racist abuse to Jewish people.

We believe this sample to be a fraction of the antisemitic content hosted on major platforms and endemic to Big Tech’s failure to address the hatred that its platforms host. In the six months since Facebook promised to remove Holocaust denial, we find that 80% of posts that denied or minimized the Holocaust were not acted upon even when reported. Worse still, 89% of posts containing antisemitic conspiracy theories identified in this study are still free to be liked, shared, and spread on social media even after the companies were alerted.

So, what can be done?

Platforms must aggressively remedy their moderation systems which have been proven to be insufficient. And governments must find way to hold platforms accountable for their failures to act. We recommend five steps to achieve this. (1) Remove groups dedicated to antisemitism. (2) Ban antisemitic hashtags. (3) Close accounts which send racist abuse to Jewish people. (4) Hire, train, and support the moderators needed to
effectively remove dangerous anti-Jewish hate. (5) Legislators and regulators should ensure platforms are liable in the same way as any other person or corporation for the harms they create.

The unchecked proliferation of antisemitic posts across these major platforms is a measure of the spread of white supremacy and hate across social media. To protect our communities and fundamental precepts of tolerance and democracy, legislators and platforms must act now.

Imran Ahmed
Chief Executive Officer
Center for Countering Digital Hate
Our methodology

CCDH researchers assessed each platform’s enforcement effectiveness by (1) finding antisemitic posts, (2) recording and reporting them from ordinary user accounts and then (3) auditing what enforcement actions the platforms took.

1 Find Hate
Locate accounts
Identify hashtags
Identify search terms

2 Record & Report
Record posts
Report posts

3 Data Audit
Quality check
Standards check
Action taken

1 Find Hate
In total 714 posts that breach platform standards on anti-Jewish hate were collected from Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, YouTube and TikTok over a period of six weeks, starting on 18th May and finishing on 29th June. Posts were collected from three different sources:

1. Searches for terms associated with antisemitic content, for example “Rothschilds”
2. Hashtags associated with antisemitic content, for example “#fakejews”
3. Antisemitic accounts and groups identified by our wider research

2 Record & Report
For each post that contravened community standards, researchers collected the following information in our database:

- Screenshot of the post
- URL link to the post
- Date the content was posted
- Date the content was reported
- Platform on which it was posted
- URL and follower count of the account or group hosting the post
- Types of antisemitic content featured in the post
- Number of likes, comments, shares, and views
- Any further important observations of interest

These posts were reported to platforms using their own reporting tools as they were collected, using accounts established on each platform for the purposes of this research.

This set of 714 posts was then audited by another researcher who verified that the posts breached platform standards.

3 Audit Action
Once this had been completed, researchers checked every post and recorded any action taken by platforms, including whether the post had been removed or labelled, and whether the account or group that hosted the content had been removed.
We recorded and reported 714 antisemitic posts seen up to 7.3 million times

In conducting our research, we recorded 714 posts from Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, YouTube and TikTok containing antisemitic content. The table below shows how many posts were recorded on each platform.

We also estimated the potential impressions received by each post based on the number of followers of the account or group hosting the post or based on the number of views the post received where that figure is provided by the platform. In total, posts in our sample had an aggregate reach of up to 7.3 million impressions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Instagram</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th>YouTube</th>
<th>TikTok</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posts</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressions</td>
<td>375,929</td>
<td>447,527</td>
<td>719,283</td>
<td>3,673,305</td>
<td>2,156,487</td>
<td>7,372,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of antisemitic content that were widely distributed

YouTube failed to act on this video claiming that Jews made a “declaration of war” on Nazi Germany which received over 200,000 views and carries advertising

Facebook failed to act on this video viewed over 75,000 times which claims the Rothschild dynasty was involved in 9/11
Platforms failed to act on 84% of reports of anti-Jewish hate

We found that 84% of posts containing anti-Jewish hate were not acted on by social media companies after our researchers reported them as containing anti-Jewish hate.

Of the 16% of reported posts that were acted upon:

- 7.0% of posts were removed from the platform
- 8.8% belonged to accounts that have been removed, resulting in the post’s removal
- 0.1% of posts were labelled as false and remained on the platforms with a disclaimer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Reported</th>
<th>Post Removed</th>
<th>Account Removed</th>
<th>Flagged</th>
<th>Acted On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5 (3.9%)</td>
<td>8 (6.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
<td>14 (10.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>15 (5.4%)</td>
<td>37 (13.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>52 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TikTok</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>16 (13.5%)</td>
<td>6 (5.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>9 (6.6%)</td>
<td>6 (4.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15 (11.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5 (9.6%)</td>
<td>6 (11.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (21.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>50 (7.0%)</td>
<td>63 (8.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.1%)</td>
<td>114 (16.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YouTube responded to 21% of reports by removing videos or the channels that hosted them. Instagram responded to 13% of reports by removing accounts, contributing to an overall action rate of 19%. Facebook performed worst of all, acting on just 10.9% of posts, despite introducing tougher standards on antisemitic content in 2020.

**Facebook labelled a piece of viral Holocaust denial instead of removing it**

Just one post in our sample of 714 was labelled instead of being removed completely. That post, shown opposite, promotes an article from a known far-right website that claims, “the Holocaust of six million Jews is a hoax”. The article is accompanied by a photoshopped image of the gates to Auschwitz edited to carry the words “muH Holocaust”, referring to a white supremacist meme minimizing the Holocaust.

Statistics from Facebook’s own CrowdTangle analytics tool show that the article has received over 246,000 likes, shares, and comments across Facebook.

Facebook’s unusual decision to label rather than remove thousands of posts promoting this antisemitic hatred has contributed to it reaching hundreds of thousands of its users.
Platforms fail to act on 89% of antisemitic conspiracy theories

To investigate platforms’ actions against different types of anti-Jewish hate, we tagged posts in our sample according to their content. Posts were tagged with each type of anti-Jewish hate they displayed: for example, a post might refer to antisemitic conspiracies about the Rothschilds as well as Jewish involvement in 9/11 and those will both be noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Puppeteers</th>
<th>Illuminati</th>
<th>Rothschilds</th>
<th>Soros</th>
<th>Covid</th>
<th>9/11</th>
<th>All Conspiracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actioned</td>
<td>16 (8.3%)</td>
<td>11 (7.6%)</td>
<td>8 (7.5%)</td>
<td>4 (11.1%)</td>
<td>1 (4.4%)</td>
<td>4 (17.4%)</td>
<td>55 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Actioned</td>
<td>177 (91.7%)</td>
<td>134 (92.4%)</td>
<td>99 (92.5%)</td>
<td>32 (88.9%)</td>
<td>22 (95.7%)</td>
<td>19 (82.6%)</td>
<td>422 (88.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, we identified 477 posts that contained anti-Jewish conspiracy theories, representing 67% of our total sample. Platforms acted on just 11.5% of these posts. This is a significantly lower than the rate of action against antisemitic posts in our wider sample, showing that platforms are particularly poor at acting on antisemitic conspiracy theories.

“Jewish Puppeteer” tropes

Tropes about “Jewish Puppeteers” controlling finances, political figures and world events were common in our sample. Platforms failed to act on 92% of these posts, even when accompanied by clear antisemitic caricatures such as the example shown opposite.

“Jew World Order”

Platforms failed to act on 92% of posts implicating Jewish people in a vast global conspiracy sometimes referred to as the “illuminati” or “New World Order.” Twitter even failed to act on posts with the hashtag “#JewWorldOrder” such as the post shown opposite.
The Rothschild Family

Conspiracy theories about the Rothschild family feature in over 100 posts in our sample. The Rothschild name is often invoked as a coded way of directing hatred towards Jews in general, and is used as a hashtag in nearly 250,000 posts on Instagram. Instagram failed to act on the post opposite, which places three members of the Rothschild family at the heart of a variety of conspiracies.

George Soros

George Soros is the target of a wide range of antisemitic conspiracy theories, many of which spread the false notion that he is directing the Black Lives Matter movement to pursue an anti-American agenda. Instagram failed to act on this post depicting Soros as “the puppet master behind BLM and ANTIFA.”

Jewish involvement in Covid and vaccines

Despite promises to crack down on both anti-Jewish hate and Covid misinformation, platforms acted on just 4% of posts that claimed Jewish people were behind the pandemic or to blame for supposedly dangerous vaccines. Instagram failed to act on the opposite post that uses a racist caricature to imply Jews “created the coronavirus.”

Jewish involvement in 9/11

Platforms failed to act on 83% of the conspiracy theory posts in our sample that claimed Jews had planned the 9/11 attacks. YouTube failed to act on the video opposite, which uses a racist caricature to claim that Jewish people were involved in 9/11 and has been viewed nearly 73,000 times.
Platforms fail to act on three-quarters of extremist anti-Jewish hate

Posts in our sample were tagged if they contained extremist anti-Jewish hate. Posts were tagged with all types of anti-Jewish hate they contained: for example, some posts contained Holocaust denial as well as Nazi hate symbols. In this section we examine the following types of anti-Jewish hate:

- Holocaust denial or minimization
- References to inciting explicit violence towards Jewish people
- Racist caricatures of Jewish people
- References to the blood libel
- Nazi, neo-Nazi, or white supremacist content

In total we identified 277 posts that contained extremist anti-Jewish hate, representing 39% of our total sample. Platforms acted on just 25% of these posts. While this is higher than the rate of action against posts in our wider sample, it is particularly concerning that three-quarters of these extreme posts were not dealt with.

Alarmingly, platforms were particularly poor at acting on posts that denied or minimized the Holocaust, with 80% of such posts attracting no enforcement action. Platforms appeared to perform slightly less badly on posts referring to violence against Jewish people, but still left 62% intact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Holocaust</th>
<th>Neo-Nazi</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Caricatures</th>
<th>Blood Libel</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actioned</td>
<td>22 (19.8%)</td>
<td>31 (29.3%)</td>
<td>23 (30.7%)</td>
<td>14 (29.8%)</td>
<td>10 (25.6%)</td>
<td>70 (25.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Actioned</td>
<td>89 (80.2%)</td>
<td>75 (70.7%)</td>
<td>38 (62.3%)</td>
<td>33 (70.2%)</td>
<td>29 (74.4%)</td>
<td>207 (74.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breaking down action against extremist anti-Jewish hate by platform again shows that Facebook has the poorest rate of action, removing or labelling just 18% of posts. This is especially poor considering that Instagram has the highest rate of action against such posts at 32%, despite being owned by Facebook and sharing its policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Instagram</th>
<th>TikTok</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th>YouTube</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actioned</td>
<td>8 (17.7%)</td>
<td>35 (32.4%)</td>
<td>13 (20.0%)</td>
<td>13 (22.8%)</td>
<td>3 (23.1%)</td>
<td>70 (25.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Actioned</td>
<td>28 (82.3%)</td>
<td>73 (67.6%)</td>
<td>52 (80.0%)</td>
<td>44 (77.2%)</td>
<td>10 (76.9%)</td>
<td>207 (74.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holocaust denial
Over 100 posts in our sample denied or minimized the Holocaust. YouTube in particular is still hosting five videos with over 800,000 views that deny aspects of the Holocaust or claim that Jews made a “declaration of war” on Nazi Germany. Twitter failed to act on the post opposite with the well-known antisemitic hashtag “#holohoax” and claims that Anne Frank’s diary was fabricated. It also uses the phrase “oy vey, the goyim know,” a phrase used by white supremacists to refer to conspiracy theories about Jewish control of the media, banks, and governments.

Nazi symbolism
Platforms failed to act on 70% of posts that contained neo-Nazi or white supremacist imagery. In several cases, posts with overt extremist imagery, such as images of Hitler or the swastika, were not acted upon. Instagram failed to act on the post opposite which features Nazi propaganda attacking Jews.

The Great Replacement
White supremacist slogans and symbols also featured in our sample. Instagram failed to act on the opposite post, which promotes the “Great Replacement” conspiracy theory, falsely claiming Jews are orchestrating “a silent race war against the white race and Christianity.”
Violence towards Jewish people

Over 60 posts in our sample referred to past violence against Jews or promoted violence against Jewish people today. Instagram has failed to act on this post which uses a Holocaust reference to suggest that Jewish people should be sought out and killed with the hashtag “#thirdreichmemes”.

Racist caricatures of Jewish people

Platforms failed to act on 70% of posts that feature racist caricatures of Jewish people. Many of these took the form of “The Happy Merchant,” an antisemitic meme that originates with white supremacists and — using harmful antisemitic stereotypes of physical and ethical characteristics — depicts Jews as being greedy and conniving. Instagram failed to act on this post which uses “The Happy Merchant” to depict Jews as violent and untrustworthy.

The Blood Libel

Platforms failed to act on 74% of posts that alluded to the centuries-old “Blood Libel” that Jews murder Christians and use their blood for rituals. Instagram failed to act on this post, which reproduces and reiterates the slur through a grotesque and antisemitic painting that promotes the blood libel against Jews.
Antisemitic Facebook Groups are permitted to operate after exposure

Many of the antisemitic Facebook posts featured in this report were sourced from Facebook Groups dedicated to spreading antisemitic hatred. Collectively these Groups have 37,500 members. At the time of this report, none of these Groups had been removed, despite having been reported at least once in the past two months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expose Soros &amp; Other Far-Left Financiers</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expose the Talmud</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing the New World Order!</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing Zionism, lies and deception</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing Zionism’s Insidious Crimes</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>9,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Soros: The Enemy Within</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL LIES AND DECEITS version española</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW WORLD ORDER PROPHECY</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>5,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Talmud Exposed</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothschild Zionism</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAND UP AND UNITE AGAINST THE SYSTEM</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The RothschildJesuit Conspiracy</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37,530</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of content from antisemitic Facebook Groups

Facebook failed to act against this post made by the administrator of the 3,800-member Facebook Group “Official Talmud Exposed.” The post promotes an article titled “The Jews Who Rule America.”
Facebook failed to act on this post in the 1,300-member Group called “Rothschild Zionism” which claims that “the [coronavirus] was made in [an] Israeli lab”.

Facebook failed to act against this post in the 1,600-member Facebook Group “Exposing Zionism, lies and deception.” The post links the Rothschild family to “eugenics,” “mind-control” and “child sacrifice & abuse.”

Facebook took no action against this post in the “Israel Lies and Deceits” Group with 1,700 members which claims that Jews control the US government.
Instagram, TikTok and Twitter allow hashtags used for antisemitic content

Hashtags allow users on Instagram, TikTok and Twitter to tie their posts to topics, making it easy for users to find other posts related to that topic. Platforms use hashtags to direct users to more content, keep them on platform and serve them more ads that generate revenue.

There are 447 posts analyzed by this report that feature hashtags used to share antisemitic content. Together they have generated up to 3.3 million impressions on Instagram, TikTok and Twitter.

**Instagram hashtags used for antisemitic content host 350,000 posts**

This report analyses antisemitic Instagram posts featuring variations of the hashtags #rothschild, #fakejews, #goyim and #soros. Instagram’s own analytics show that these hashtags have been used in 350,000 posts across the platform.

Instagram failed to act on this post promoting antisemitic conspiracies about Jewish control of banking and governments which uses the hashtag #rothschild.

Instagram took no action against this post which uses racist caricatures to suggest that Jews control US politics. It uses the hashtags #nameethejew and #zionistcontrol.
TikTok hashtags used for antisemitic content have had 25 million views

Some of the antisemitic TikTok posts featured in this report use the hashtags #rothschildfamily, #synagogueofsatan and #soros. Content posted using these hashtags has been viewed 25.1 million times according to TikTok’s own analytics.\(^{12}\)

TikTok failed to act on this post which claims that Jews are plotting “world conquest through world government” and uses the hashtag #synagogueofsatan.

TikTok failed to remove this post which claims that the Rothschilds control US banking. It was shared using the hashtag #rothschildfamily.
Twitter allows antisemitic hashtags such as #holohoax and #killthejews

While Instagram and TikTok have acted to block some hashtags used to share antisemitic content, Twitter still allows users to find content using hashtags such as #holohoax, #fakejews, #jewishlies, #killthejews and more.\textsuperscript{13}

Twitter failed to act on this post blaming Jews for “80% of this world’s problems” and using the hashtags #KillTheJews and #HolocaustNOW.

Twitter failed to act on this post that used the hashtag #holohoax to promote the hateful claim that the topic of the Holocaust is invoked by Jews to maintain control of banks, governments, and the media.
YouTube has repeatedly failed to act on antisemitic videos seen by millions

YouTube has still failed to act on 41 antisemitic videos in our sample. These videos have a combined 3.5 million views and have been on YouTube for an average of six years.

This shows that platforms must be proactive in identifying and removing hateful content, as well as being responsive to reports of it, before offending posts have time to reach a wider audience.

YouTube failed to act on this video which has amassed over 70,000 views since being posted in 2009. It promotes the conspiracy theory that Hitler was Jewish.

This video posted by a channel called “Trump is a Jew Shill” has amassed over 80,000 views and features racist caricatures of Jewish people. YouTube has failed to act on the video for over four years.
TikTok removes just 5% of accounts that racially abuse Jewish users

On TikTok, antisemitic abuse frequently takes the form of racial abuse sent directly to Jewish users as comments on their videos. Our researchers collected 78 such comments in total, reported them to TikTok and measured the platform’s response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Account Removed</td>
<td>4 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Removed</td>
<td>15 (19.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>59 (75.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our research shows that TikTok failed to act against 76% of antisemitic abuse sent to Jewish users in comments. When TikTok did act, it more frequently removed individual antisemitic comments instead of banning the users who sent them. TikTok banned accounts sending direct antisemitic abuse in just 5% of cases.

Example comments that TikTok failed to act on

This racist comment was posted in response to a video about Holocaust denial by doubting that 6 million Jews died in the Holocaust and refers to Jews as the “long nose tribe”.

This reply to the same video says the Holocaust “never happened” and recommends a film the Washington Post describes as a “pro-Adolph Hitler documentary.”

This comment responds to a video about the need to stamp out antisemitism by saying “I thought I killed them all”.
Recommendations

It may seem extraordinary to the public, but, unlike any other company, social media companies do not have any liability for the way their products are abused, even if they encourage abuse, amplify it, or fail to act on it. Companies have no legally enforceable duty of care to their users. This is the direct effect of the perhaps well-intentioned but nevertheless highly consequential and controversial Section 230 of the US Communications Decency Act of 1996, enacted 25 years ago.

The original intent of the legislation was to encourage tech giants to keep platforms free of malignant content, without fear of litigation by those aggrieved by moderators' decisions. In exchange, platforms would be free of liability for the content posted by third parties. This is why it is known as the "good Samaritan" law. But whereas the spirit of the original Internet was one of optimism and hope, some tech companies have grown so enormous and exorbitantly wealthy that they have continued to prioritize profit over any good Samaritan principles.

This report is another important proof point those platforms are failing to respect the spirit of that legislation and uphold their responsibilities to users. Platforms are failing to act on anti-Jewish hatred. This is not unique, but a feature of platforms that fail to moderate themselves. Similar research by the Center has shown that they are failing to act on fewer than one in eight posts containing dangerous misinformation about Covid and vaccines, even while a declared public health crisis continues to take American lives.15

CCDH is campaigning for the following actions:

1. Legislators should ensure there are financial disincentives for the tolerance of hateful extremism

   Big Tech profits from both hate and the controversy surrounding that hate, which drives attention and traffic to their platforms.

   If legislators want to stop hate corroding our society, they must learn from others' success in dealing with social media platforms which give a megaphone to racism, abuse, and hate.

   The United States has a commendable commitment to free speech. This protects platforms from any government regulation of speech on their platforms. However, it is time for Section 230 to be reformed. When a platform fails to act in a reasonable way, after sufficient warnings, and when it fails to deploy its vast resources to avoid harms generated on their platform, courts should be free to decide if someone harmed by their inaction has suffered a tort that deserves restitution and compensation. This would create an economic disincentive to inaction. It is almost certain, given the spirit of these platforms, that they would seek to maximize speech on their platforms, knowing that every single post attracts views and eyeballs that can be monetized. This is less an incentive for over-moderation than it is a disincentive to a lack of moderation.

   Other countries, such as the United Kingdom and Germany are choosing different approaches. In Germany, under the "NetzDG law", platforms which fail to swiftly remove harmful content face significant financial penalties. That content includes Holocaust denial and common racist tropes.
Opponents warned that the NetzDG law would lead to overly sensitive censorship and infringements on free speech. So far, it has not. But it certainly has protected millions of people from vicious racism. Once there is a financial incentive to comply with local laws, the social media companies are suddenly able to act: it is no coincidence that Facebook was quick to establish a vast hub of moderators in Berlin.

The UK’s Online Safety Bill could, if it passes Parliament, and if the new regulator of digital spaces, OFCOM, does its job as intended, be a watershed moment for social media companies. The challenge is, in fact, not whether the UK government is arrogating to itself the levers required for effective regulation. It’s whether they have the understanding, the confidence and the finesse to use those powers with surgical precision, excising the cancer of hateful extremism but not the vital beating heart of free speech.

2. Platforms should hire, train and support moderators to remove hate

The clear examples of anti-Jewish hatred exposed in this report show that tech giants’ current efforts to moderate their platforms are not fit for purpose.

Platforms could re-invest some of their immense earnings to hire, train and support the moderators needed to effectively remove dangerous anti-Jewish hate.

While we welcome moves from Facebook to introduce clearer policies on anti-Jewish hatred, the fact that it performs worst of all platforms in our study at removing antisemitic content shows that any new policies will not be effective without hiring and training moderators who recognize hatred when they see it.

3. Facebook should remove groups dedicated to antisemitism

In conducting our research for this report, we identified Facebook Groups dedicated to sharing antisemitic content. There is no moral justification for allowing public and private groups dedicated to fomenting hatred of Jewish people - these groups and their organizers should be removed from Facebook’s platform.

4. Instagram, TikTok and Twitter must act on antisemitic hashtags

Similarly, this report identifies hashtags that are viewed by millions and regularly used to share antisemitic content. Platforms should be bearing down on anti-Jewish hatred, not facilitating its spread. These racist hashtags must be banned.

5. Close user accounts which publish racism on social media platforms

This should apply to anti-Jewish racism and any other form of racism. There should be no tolerance of racism in public spaces. There is no constitutional right to use a privately-owned platform to publish racist material.
Appendix: Platform standards on hate speech and anti-Jewish hate

All five platforms studied by this report – Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, YouTube and TikTok – have rules that prohibit hate speech against individuals or groups based on protected characteristics including ethnicity, nationality, race, or religion.

In addition, all five prohibit have generalized rules that apply to some common forms of antisemitic content, including:

- Hateful conspiracy theories
- Genocide denial
- Dehumanization
- Hate symbols

Only Facebook and Instagram, which Facebook wholly owns, maintain rules that explicitly ban common forms of anti-Jewish hate including:

- Comparing Jewish people to rats
- Denying or distorting information about the Holocaust
- Claiming that Jewish people run the world or control major institutions such as media networks, the economy, or the government

According to these standards, all the platforms studied by this report should remove clear examples of antisemitic content when they are reported to them.

Facebook

Facebook’s community standards prohibit hate speech, defined as “a direct attack against people on the basis of... race, ethnicity, national origin, disability, religious affiliation, case, sexual orientation, sex, gender identity and serious disease.” It further defines “attacks” as “violent or dehumanizing speech, harmful stereotypes, statements of inferiority, expressions of contempt, disgust or dismissal, cursing and calls for exclusion or segregation.”

In the last year, Facebook has supplemented its policies on hate speech with specific rules against antisemitic content. These new rules explicitly prohibit:

- Comparing Jewish people and rats
- Claiming that Jewish people run the world or control major institutions such as media networks, the economy, or the government
- Denying or distorting information about the Holocaust

Facebook’s standards also ban “organizations that proclaim a violent mission or are engaged in violence to have a presence on Facebook” including “organized hate.” Facebook stated that this policy is intended to cover “white nationalism and white separatism” as well as “white supremacy.”
Like its parent company Facebook, Instagram’s community guidelines prohibit “content that contains credible threats or hate speech” adding that “it’s never OK to encourage violence or attack anyone based on their race, ethnicity, national origin, sex, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, disabilities or diseases.” Instagram’s community guidelines contain a link to Facebook’s definitions of hate speech, which includes its parent company’s rules against:

- Comparing Jewish people and rats
- Claiming that Jewish people run the world or control major institutions such as media networks, the economy, or the government
- Denying or distorting information about the Holocaust

Facebook’s standards also ban “organizations that proclaim a violent mission or are engaged in violence to have a presence on Facebook” including “organized hate.” Facebook stated that this policy is intended to cover “white nationalism and white separatism” as well as “white supremacy.”

Twitter’s hateful conduct policy states that users “may not promote violence against or directly attack or threaten other people on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, caste, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, religious affiliation, age, disability, or serious disease.” It adds that Twitter “[does] not allow accounts whose primary purpose is inciting harm towards others on the basis of these categories.”

In addition to this blanket ban on racist attacks, Twitter does not allow users to “harass” protected groups by referring to genocides including the Holocaust. Twitter restricts the use of the following hateful images in some tweets and unsolicited messages, but does not ban them outright:

- Symbols associated with hate groups, such as the swastika
- Images depicting others as less than human, for example as animals
- Images targeting a protected category or mass murder, such as yellow Star of David badges in reference to the Holocaust

YouTube states that “hate speech is not allowed on YouTube” and prohibits “content promoting violence or hatred against individuals or groups” based on ethnicity, nationality, race, or religion, amongst other protected characteristics.

YouTube does not explicitly define any forms of antisemitic hate speech, but does give the following examples which are applicable to some antisemitic content:
• Claiming a group “has an agenda to run the world and get rid of us”
• Conspiracy theories saying individuals or groups are evil, corrupt, or malicious
• Content containing hateful supremacist propaganda including the recruitment of new members or requests for financial support for their ideology.
• Denying that “a well-documented, violent event took place.”

TikTok

TikTok’s community guidelines state “we do not permit content that contains hate speech or involves hateful behavior, and we remove it from our platform.” It also promises to “suspend or ban accounts that engage in hate speech violations, or which are associated with hate speech off the TikTok platform.” It lists race, ethnicity, national origin, and religion amongst its protected attributes.

TikTok does not explicitly define any forms of antisemitic hate speech, but does give the following examples which are applicable to some antisemitic content:

• Depicting groups of people “as animals... or other non-human entities”
• “Promoting or justifying exclusion, segregation, or discrimination against them”
• “Content that denies well-documented and violent events have taken place affecting groups with protected attributes”
• “Conspiracy theories used to justify hateful ideologies”

“Content that praises, promotes, glorifies, or supports any hateful ideology”


4 Instagram Hashtag Posts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hashtag</th>
<th>Posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#rothschild</td>
<td>198,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#rothschilds</td>
<td>25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#rothchild</td>
<td>12,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#rothchilds</td>
<td>11,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#rothschildzionism</td>
<td>1,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>248,641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retrieved 16 July 2021

5 See Section 4, this report.


11 Instagram Hashtag Posts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hashtag</th>
<th>Posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#rothschild</td>
<td>198,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#rothschilds</td>
<td>25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#rothchild</td>
<td>12,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#rothchilds</td>
<td>11,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hashtag</td>
<td>Views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#rothschildzionism</td>
<td>1,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#fakejews</td>
<td>16,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#goyim</td>
<td>10,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#thegoyimknow</td>
<td>9,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#soros</td>
<td>66,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350,026</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retrieved 16 July 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TikTok Hashtag</th>
<th>Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#rothschildfamily</td>
<td>9,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#synagogueofsatan</td>
<td>127,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#soros</td>
<td>15,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,127,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retrieved 16 July 2021

12 These charts show exactly how racist and radical the alt-right has gotten this year,
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