Report of the Online Antisemitism Working Group

Andre Oboler and David Matas (Co-Chairs), Working Group 3 - Antisemitism Online: Cyberspace and the Media, the Global Forum to Combat Antisemitism, 16-17 December 2009, Jerusalem, Israel.[i]

Introduction

This report represents the work of the participants of the Working Group on Online Antisemitism which met at the Global Forum to Combat Antisemitism in Jerusalem, Israel, in December 2009. The report draws on the expertise, knowledge and ideas of experts from around the world, both before, during and after the conference.

The document was created using a Wiki. An initial draft was put together by the chairs, and working group members, and other experts who could not attend the working group, were given editing access. Over a period of one month before the conference the participating edited the document directly through the Wiki software. Periodic versions were also released via e-mail, and suggested changed and additions received via e-mail, to overcome the technology barrier this system created for some experts. In Jerusalem, the working group met in person during two sessions. The document was divided into thematic categories and for each category a short presentation was made, followed by a discussion, review and amendments to the documents content on that theme. At the request of the working group the final text agreed in Jerusalem was returned to the Wiki, with an invitation for members to add additional points over the coming month. These points were then discussed with contributors and editing of the final text was frozen while the document was available review. This document is the final version including contributions agreed in the month following the conference.

Divided into five sections, this report examines both problems and positive developments related to online antisemitism. The report also provides recommendations for Governments, NGOs, the Internet industry, educators, parents and those who wish to take a stand against antisemitism online. Some of the recommendations are simple and immediate, others are ambitious long term goals. As so little work has been undertaken in this area, and society is still catching up with the rapid pace of technology, this report is presented in point form and covers a wide and disparate range of issues.

An accompanying explanatory document, prepared by the working group, will be released later this year. The explanatory document will elaborate on points and idea presented in this document.

We thank the members of the working group for their commitment and collective efforts in producing this report, and we thank the department for Combating Antisemitism at the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs for their facilitation.

Andre Oboler and David Matas

Co-Chairs of the Online Antisemitism Working Group

31st of January 2010

SECTION A: Areas of Concern

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

Platform Specific Concerns

1. 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 the terms of use.
2. Facebook complaints seem to often be ignored or take a very long time to be processed.
3. Facebook users can be deleted by Facebook because of their content or profile messages, yet they are able to sign up for a new account, making use of the same email address and cellphone 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.
4. 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 can not be reported if the user has not posted a video.
5. Yahoogroups and Googlegroups host antisemitic sites. Yahoo even has a fascism category with a link inviting you to "Create a new fascist group".
6. The moral impunity that anonymity provides bloggers is a major challenge.
7. Yahoo Maps - Jerusalem is shown as a series of a few major roads with Latinized Arabic names. The map cannot be enlarged. This may the result of copyright issues, but the effect is still problematic.

Community Response Concerns

8. More systematic community effort is needed to report conspiracy theories. This reporting could be done on community web sites.
9. More effort is needed to systematically expose the propagation of conspiracy theories within different online communities.
10. Organisations focus on their own areas and more communication, coordination and pooling of resources is needed.
11. 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.
12. Progressive political blogs in the U.S. are becoming increasingly hospitable to Antisemitism and need to be more systematically monitored.

Main Stream Media Concerns

13. As long as the mainstream media don't report on antisemitism, people won't take action and it won't be on the agenda.

14. The mainstream media needs to work closely with experts in order to ensure reporting doesn't fuel antisemitism.

Principles

15. Net neutrality is sometimes presented as being in opposition to taking responsibility against antisemitism. This doesn't seem to apply to fraud, phishing, etc. so should not apply to hate.

SECTION B: Key Incidents

Highlight key incidents in 2008 and 2009 (since the last Global Forum)

1. 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, was an example of replacement geography advanced by technology. [ii]
   - 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 Andre Oboler, a campaign by ZOA and JIDF, and discussions with Google this problem was corrected.

2. Holocaust denial defined as "not hate" by Facebook. [iii]
   - Facebook ignored complaints about Holocaust denial and glorification of Nazism for a long time.
   - This included ignoring a special feature in the press in Germany where this activity is illegal.[iv]
   - Facebook finally responded by removing the section of its Terms of Service which said users had to abide by their local law or it would be a breach of the terms of service.
   - They also removed the prohibition on many forms of problematic behaviour including racism.
   - Finally they declared that Holocaust denial did not breach the clause prohibiting "hateful" content as they didn't consider Holocaust denial, in and of itself, to be hateful.

3. Long-term and ongoing Facebook case studies originating in Canada prove that neo-Nazi groups network with international extremist groups. Facebook internal policies and Facebook user agreements must be amended. Also, 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 able to be averted through the consistent monitoring on behalf of Canadian Police.

4. Swedish Blood Libel

- - Unsubstantiated allegations from Palestinians reported in Aftonbladet, Sweden, in summer 2009, to the effect 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.
  - Medically impossible, and factually a total fabrication without substantiation, but it received wide exposure and fomented a great deal of secondary press and anti-Israel sentiment, leading to condemnations.

5. The BBC's Jeremy Bowen was found by BBC Trust to have breached BBC guidelines on impartiality and accuracy. [v]

6. 'John Sullivan' captured on film going into anti-Israel antisemitic 'carol service' organised by Palestinian Solidarity Campaign.[vi]
   - Widely reported including Ruth Gledhill in Times blog, BBC Radio 4.
   - Shows how antisemitism is promoted by anti-Israel events.

7. Antisemitism on progressive blogs: [vii]
   - 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 staples 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; Israel is demonized
   - In part because of the huge size of the blogosphere - there are thousands of bloggers at Daily Kos alone - such hateful commentary often escapes the kind of scrutiny that the traditional media faces.
   - Recent JCPA report on this phenomena

8. Popular student forums being used to harbor and spread hate
   - The Kick a Jew group (mostly in the USA) on Facebook - inciting violence against Jews
   - Punch a Jew in the Face (mostly in Australia) event on Facebook - inciting violence against Jews
   - The Bored of Studies student websites (in Australia) hosted antisemitic propaganda and hate groups (content now removed)

SECTION C: Positive Initiatives

Acknowledging positive contributions and initiatives to combat online antisemitism

1. **Government Action** Germany, Justice Minister appeal to foreign Internet providers to eliminate far-right extremism
    o 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.
    o 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.

2. **Report** The B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission produced a report analysing the Australian based newmatilda.com news site over a three month period. [viii]
    o The site displayed strong bias against Israel in its choice or articles and failed to remove antisemitic postings.
    o This was taken up in a parliamentary grievance speech.
    o As a result the website suspended its comments facility on Israel articles and has improved although not totally ameliorated its position.
    o Contact: Deborah Stone (executivedirector@antidef.org.au)

3. **Report** To hate, click here: antisemitism on the internet by Deborah Stone, B'nai B'rith Anti Defamation Commission (Australia). [ix]
    o 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.
    o 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.
    o Contact: Deborah Stone (ExecutiveDirector@antidef.org.au)

4. **Program** "Click Against Hate" by the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission (Melbourne, Australia). [x]
    o A program for Jewish day schools on identifying and responding to antisemitism online

- o Program focuses on Facebook, YouTube, blogs and the media and on identifying online off-shoots of specific types of traditional antisemitism and new antisemitism
- o 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
- o Status: Will be running in schools from the middle of 2010 (sessions written, schools signed up, training taking place)
- o International Contact: Andre Oboler (andre@oboler.com), Within Australia: Deborah Stone (ExecutiveDirector@antidef.org.au)

5. **Department** Community Internet Engagement Project by the Zionist Federation of Australia (Australia). [xi]
   - o A new department working to improve the internet related infrastructure of the Jewish Community
   - o Training to develop skills in the community so more people can engage in combating online antisemitism
   - o Specific research focus on online antisemitism and emerging trends
   - o Focus on advising representative bodies on Internet policy
   - o Contact: CIE Director, Andre Oboler (andre@oboler.com)

6. **Program** CIDI, the Center Information and Documentation Israel, has published instructions on its website explaining how to get antisemitic material removed from the internet. [xii]
   - o 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.
   - o Once an instance of antisemitism on the net has been reported, Magenta sets in motion the standard procedure for getting it removed.
   - o CIDI believes that this is not enough. Most people don't 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.
   - o 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.
   - o CIDI is promoting the use of such buttons, paying particular attention to mainstream news sites.

7. **Website** CIFWatch.com was started by group of volunteers to analyse and monitor antisemitism on The Guardian's Comment Is Free blog. [xiii]

   - o CIFWatch followed a July 2008 Report on CIF (largely ignored by government). [xiv]
   - o 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

8. **Petition** 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). [xv]

9. **Conference** WUJS3G "Unlocking Our Future", World Union of Jewish Students
- Congress taking place in December 2009 will focus on how the young generation of the Jewish people can engage
- The Congress will be attended by Jewish student leaders from around the world
- One of the six tracks will focus on online antisemitism in social media and specifically the use of such media to de-legitimization of Israel.
- Contact: Chaya Singer (chaya@wujs.org.il)

10. **Conference** World Blogging Forum, Romania 2010
- Under Patronage of the Romanian Presidency, supported by the Agency for Governmental Strategies in partnership with the Romanian Chamber of Deputies
- "Antisemitism Online – cyberspace and the media" will be a major theme for the conference
- The conference will bring together influential people in online media from 50 countries
- Contact: Bogdan VACUSTA (worldbloggingforum@gmail.com)

11. **Grassroots Action** 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.

12. **Grassroots Action** Grassroots real world initiatives against hate
- 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.

Information on other positive initiatives can be sent to andre@oboler.com and will be added as an appendix to the explanatory notes.

SECTION D: Proposals

Proposing policy recommendations to combat online antisemitism

Platform providers

1. A set of guidelines needs to be established defining antisemitic and racist behaviour and prohibiting it within platforms such as Facebook.

NGO's role

2. Non-governmental organizations or individuals opposed to incitement to hatred should combat the incitement by:

    a. posting and maintaining websites against antisemitism,
    b. setting up and communicating to a list serve,
    c. maintaining and providing lists of offending sites,
    d. joining and communicating within social sites,
    e. regularly monitoring sites where antisemitism is likely to be or has previously been posted, reporting publicly on what is found
    f. joining with other groups looking at different social internet issues (including those concerned about the expression of other forms of hate online).
    g. Showing ISPs, in their offices, what they are hosting,
    h. linking to good resources outside of their own organisation and being willing to share their experience with the other NGOs,
    i. Exchanging information to enhance the effectiveness of human rights-ISPs-State cooperation,
    j. Lobbying for international awareness about the harms and abuse of technology,
    k. Helping support groups and institutions that want to set up reporting mechanisms,
    l. Advancing our knowledge of emerging social networking and the psychology of people who use the Internet for various purposes, and
    m. Undertake research into internet related human behaviour with the aim of discovering effective approaches to increase moral and social responsibility of all parties concerned.

Parents, Teachers, Employers

3. Parents, teachers, employers and generally those with authority or responsibility over a computer should:

    a. install computer blocking programs at home that block access to hate sites for minors,
    b. install computer blocking programs at work, school and public institutions,

    c. require employees while at work and students while at school not to access antisemitic sites or send antisemitic messages, and

    d. promote the concept of responding to antisemitism as a civic responsibility for all users.

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. Development of corporate responsibility policies and procedures,
   c. be familiar with and apply the EUMC Working Definition of Antisemitism,
   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,
   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 antisemitism amenable internet service providers

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.

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

Domain Name Registrars

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

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

Determining what is antisemitic

14. The EUMC Working Definition of Antisemitism is recommended as a guide for those making decisions at all levels.[xvi]

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

Classification of sites for policy purposes

16. The internet should not be treated as a monolith. For policy and regulation purposes we recommend web-based systems should be divided into 5 classes. In order of their ability to avoid online antisemitism they are:
    a. **Websites** Uni-directional platforms e.g., websites without ability for visitors to add content
    b. **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
    c. **Post Moderated** Platforms with public publishing and post-publishing active moderation e.g. Comment is Free (Guardian UK), some forums, some Facebook groups
    d. **Exception Moderated** Platforms with public publishing and passive moderation (e.g. complaints process) e.g. Facebook, YouTube etc.
    e. **Unmoderated** Platforms with public publishing and no moderation e.g. sites without a mechanism to report and have problem content quickly reviewed
17. Unmoderated platforms 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, for example 14 days if the complaint is not an immediate danger (if it is it should be reported to law enforcement immediately).
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 groups wall as public in Facebook) all complaints (without the complainants 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 items 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, there should be efforts 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.

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 it is effective 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. [xvii]
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.

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 mature.
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.

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's doubtful how effective it 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).

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. [xviii]
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? [xix]
    a. "In Britain, dozens of "centers of Islamic studies" were set up in universities, in order to make Muslim students more moderate. But there is a problem. A report by Prof. Anthony Glees "Extremism fear over Islam studies donations" found that the Saudis poured GBP 233 million into these centers. 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 center 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 antisemtism 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 helps cloud 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.

[i] The Global Forum Website can be seen at:
http://www.gfantisemitism.org/Conference2009/Pages/default.aspx

[ii] 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

[iii] 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

[iv] 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

[v] See: http://www.bbc.co.uk/bbctrust/assets/files/pdf/appeals/esc_bulletins/2009/mar.pdf

[vi] See: http://www.hurryupharry.org/2009/12/02/carols-with-caryl-and-more/

[vii] 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

[viii] Available online: http://www.antidef.org.au/secure/downloadfile.asp?fileid=1011170

[ix] Available online: http://www.antidef.org.au/secure/downloadfile.asp?fileid=1010474

[x] More information available at: http://www.antidef.org.au/www/309/1001127/displayarticle/click-against-hate--1011350.html

[xi] More information on CIE can be seen at the website: http://www.internetengagement.com.au

[xii] Information is provided on the CIDI website: www.cidi.nl

[xiii] For more information see: http://cifwatch.com/the-indictment-of-the-guardian/

[xiv] The report is available online:
http://www.zionismontheweb.org/CommentIsFree_ParliamentASCttee_July08.pdf

[xv] See the petition at: http://petitions.number10.gov.uk/NoToGoldstone/

[xvi] 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

[xvii] 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.

[xviii] See: http://www.libelreform.org/

[xix] See: http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1259010971584&pagename=JPArticle%2FShowFull