

Fighting Hate and Bigotry on the Internet

Raphael Cohen-Almagor, *University of Hull*

Fighting Hate and Bigotry on the Internet

Raphael Cohen-Almagor, *University of Hull*

Abstract

Internet hate speech is a specific type of online content that is designed to threaten certain groups publicly and act as propaganda for offline organizations. Hate groups use websites for sharing ideology, propaganda, linking to similar sites, recruiting new converts, advocating violence and threatening others. This article analyzes the ways hate speech on the Internet can be countered. From the perspective of applied ethics, it discusses the issue in the context of moral and social responsibility, a neglected perspective in the New Media literature. The study discusses the targets of hate on the Internet, provides a framework within which problems can be identified and resolved by accentuating moral and social responsibility, and articulates possible policy solutions to combat this increasing problem.

KEYWORDS: ISPs, bigotry, hate speech, Internet hate, social responsibility

Author Notes: I thank Janet Spikes and Marco Zambotti for their excellent research assistance, and Rabbi Abraham Cooper, Oren Segal and Holly Hawkins for providing me with invaluable information. Much of this research was conducted under the generous auspices of The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. I thank Steve Newman, Robert Fortner, Wayne Sumner, the participants of Hate versus Democracy on the Internet conference, Fordham Center on Law and Information Policy, NY (March 2010) and the reviewers of Policy and Internet for their constructive comments, criticisms and suggestions. All websites were accessed during February 2010.

Introduction

The Internet has become an invaluable part of our lives. About a quarter of humanity, more than 2 billion people, use the Internet for social, financial, educational, medical, recreational, political, and military purposes. It is hard to think of a single aspect of life that is not supported by the Internet. As access to the Internet has become less costly, and creating web pages is now a relatively simple task, the number of websites and Internet users has grown exponentially.

The Internet contains the best and the worst written products of humanity (Levmore and Nussbaum 2011). While every medium contains these, on the Internet users are able to upload the information themselves quickly without any editorial filter or criticism. Being open for use and abuse, the Internet is therefore saturated with content that would unlikely be entertained by conventional media. As it provides cheap, instantaneous, and decentralized distribution, numerous points of access, no necessary ties to geography, no simple system to identify content, as well as sophisticated encryption tools, the Internet has become an asset for hate groups to transmit propaganda and provide information about their aims, allow an exchange between like-minded individuals, vindicate the use of violence, raise cash, and legitimize their actions while demoralizing and delegitimizing others. With the advent of the Internet, opportunities for disseminating hate have proliferated.

Hate speech is defined as bias-motivated, hostile, malicious speech aimed at a person or a group of people because of some of their actual or perceived innate characteristics. It expresses discriminatory, intimidating, disapproving, antagonistic, and/or prejudicial attitudes toward those characteristics, which include gender, race, religion, ethnicity, color, national origin, disability, or sexual orientation.¹ Hate speech is intended to injure, dehumanize, harass, intimidate,

¹ Many European countries have adopted similar definitions of hate speech. For instance, Denmark defines hate speech as publicly making statements that threaten, ridicule, or hold in contempt a group due to race, skin color, national or ethnic origin, faith, or sexual orientation (Danish Penal Code, *Straffeloven*, section 266 B). The Dutch Penal Code, Article 137c, holds: "He who publicly, orally, in writing or graphically, intentionally expresses himself insultingly regarding a group of people because of their race, their religion or their life philosophy, their heterosexual or homosexual orientation or their physical, psychological or mental disability, shall be punished by imprisonment of no more than a year or a monetary penalty of the third category." In Iceland, Article 233 of the Penal Code states: "Anyone who in a ridiculing, slanderous, insulting, threatening or any other manner publicly assaults a person or a group of people on the basis of their nationality, skin colour, race, religion or sexual orientation, shall be fined or jailed for up to 2 years." Norway prohibits hate speech, defined as "publicly making statements that threaten or ridicule someone or that incite hatred, persecution or contempt for someone due to their skin colour, ethnic origin, homosexual life style or orientation or, religion or philosophy of life" (Norwegian Penal Code, *Straffeloven*, section 135a). Sweden prohibits hate speech, and defines it as "publicly making statements that threaten or express disrespect for an ethnic group or similar

debase, degrade, and victimize the targeted groups, and to foment insensitivity and brutality against them. A hate site is defined as a site that carries a hateful message in any form of textual, visual, or audio-based rhetoric.

Defining what constitutes hate is not always simple. On the one hand, statements that assert that “Jews are money hungry,” “gays are immoral,” “abortionists are murderers,” “Israel is an apartheid state,” “niggers return to Africa,” and calls to boycott Israel² are all unpleasant yet legitimate speech. On the other hand, calls that incite violence against target groups fall under the definition of incitement: i.e., harmful speech that is directly linked to harmful action. Thus, when we speak of hate speech we speak of malicious speech that is intended to victimize and dehumanize its target, often (but not always) vulnerable minorities. Hate speech is fuzzier than incitement, and concretely more damaging than advocacy. Hate speech creates a virulent atmosphere of “double victimization”: the speakers portray themselves as being under attack, misunderstood, marginalized, or delegitimized by powerful forces (such as governments and conspiratorial organizations); the answer to their problem is the victimization of the target group. Their victimization is the speakers’ salvation.

The object of this article is not to contest law; it offers a discussion on moral and social responsibility, written and argued mainly in the realm of ethics, or rather applied ethics. Unfortunately, this is a neglected issue in the New Media literature; it is therefore time to initiate a discussion in the realm of morality and ethics, one that supplements the many discussions in the realm of law. This article addresses the abuse of the Internet by hate mongers. *The Internet is not the problem*. The problem arises where it is utilized to undermine our well-being as autonomous beings living in free societies. This study focuses on articulating possible solutions to specific problems, and on providing a framework within which these problems can be identified and resolved by focusing on moral and social responsibility. The next section introduces the underpinning concepts of this article: moral and social responsibility. This is followed by a discussion of targets of hate on the Internet. The last section offers practical proposals to address this increasing problem.

The article’s methodology is based on an extensive review of the literature, study of dozens of hate sites, all in English, and interviews and discussions held in Canada, the United States, Israel, and England during 2006–2010.³ This is not an easy study to undertake, not only because of its troubling and upsetting content but also because the sites are very volatile. One study named more than 30 blogs in 2007 (Chau and Xu 2007): none were in existence at the

group regarding their race, skin colour, national or ethnic origin, faith or sexual orientation” (Swedish Penal Code, Brottsbalken, Chapter 16, section 8).

² Boycott Israeli Apartheid: <http://apps.facebook.com/causes/809?m=de0957a2>.

³ One interview was held in 2002.

time of writing this article, some three years later. Raymond A. Franklin compiled “The Hate Directory” in October 2002, comprising hundreds of web pages, file archives, mailing lists (listservs), news groups, Yahoo clubs and groups, MSN groups, and racist games. The vast majority of the links in the 95-page-long directory were not operative in February–March 2010. Franklin published an updated version of the Hate Directory in November 2009,⁴ almost double the size at 170 pages, but many of these sites soon ceased to exist or were relocated to other servers. Information about hate sites is in flux, and needs to be updated all the time: the discussion groups fluctuate; sometimes they are elusive, changing names and location. But one thing is certain: the number of hate sites is growing.

The interviews and discussions were conducted in English and Hebrew with over 50 leading Internet scholars, security experts, and human rights activists, usually in the interviewees’ offices, sometimes in hotels, restaurants, and coffee-shops, and sometimes at the author’s office in the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington DC. The interviews were semi-structured, and varied in length from 1 to 2.5 hours.

Interview transcripts were verified and authorized by the speakers. Where security experts have not wished to be attributed, their wish has been respected. All files are retained with the author.

Moral and Social Responsibility

It is important for the purposes of this article to distinguish between legal, moral, and social responsibility. Legal responsibility refers to addressing issues by agencies of state power. Moral responsibility indicates that autonomous agents have an understanding of the options before them, have access to evidence required for making judgments about the benefits and hazards of each option, and are able to weigh the relative values of the consequences of their choice. Social responsibility relates to the societal implications of a given conduct. It refers to the responsibility of individuals, groups, corporations, and governments to society. People are not islands. We live within a community and have some responsibilities to it: both positive and negative. That is, we have a responsibility to better the society in which we live, and a responsibility to refrain from acting in a way that knowingly might harm our community. Of course, there are many ways to better society, but the responsibility is always ethical in nature. The assumption is that we are rewarded by the social framework in which we live, and that we care about society and would like to maintain it and contribute to it. The

⁴ Raymond A. Franklin, “The Hate Directory” (November 1, 2009), <http://www.hatedirectory.com/hatedir.pdf>; <http://www.hatedirectory.com/>.

contribution is proactive: we take active steps to do good and to avoid harm (Kaliski 2001; Marshall 1994; Christians and Nordenstreng 2004; Bunton 1998), we care for one another, communicate with respect, and do not stand idly by while seeing that others might be in danger. Both the private and the public sector are morally accountable. As Novak (1996) and Trevino and Nelson (1999) have argued, adopting social responsibility norms is the right way to behave.

Adopting norms of social responsibility is particularly important when dealing with anti-social speech that is still legal. While the law may shield this abhorrent speech, especially in the United States (the land of the First Amendment), Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and web-hosting services may discriminate against content that is morally repugnant and hateful. For example, America On Line (AOL) rules prohibit the “distribution of content that is harmful, abusive, racially or ethnically offensive, vulgar, sexually explicit, or in a reasonable person’s view, objectionable. Community standards may vary, but there is no place on the service where hate speech is tolerated.”⁵ This issue will be expanded on in the last section, on countering hate.

Hate on the Internet

The story of hate on the World Wide Web begins on January 11, 1995 with the establishment of the extremist Stormfront site by Don Black (Koppel 1998).⁶ Racist leaders such as David Duke and Don Black have long been trying to burnish the reputation of the Ku Klux Klan (KKK); to replace the stereotyped image of “ignorant yokels in sheets” with one of scrubbed, educated, articulate, earnest young white men (Hoffman 1996). Black has said: “The Internet is that opportunity we’ve been looking for ... We never were able to reach the audience that we can now so easily and inexpensively” (Werts 2000).

Since its creation, Stormfront has served as a supermarket of net hate, giving a voice to many forms of anti-Semitism and racism. In its first two years, Stormfront featured the writings of the former KKK Grand Wizard David Duke, of William Pierce of the neo-Nazi National Alliance, as well as of representatives of the Holocaust-denying Institute for Historical Review and other extremists. In addition to many articles, Stormfront houses a library of neo-Nazi graphics available for downloading, lists phone numbers for racist computer bulletin boards, and links to other hateful websites (Kessler 1999).

By 1997, Black’s site had become home to the web pages of other extremists, such as Aryan Nations and Ed Fields, publisher of *The Truth At Last*, a

⁵ <http://legal.web.aol.com/aol/aolpol/comguide.html>.

⁶ <http://www.stormfront.org>.

hate-filled racist newspaper. In addition to the highly successful Stormfront site which boasts a traffic rank of 10,779 on the Internet (4,584 place in the United States), with 1,592 sites linking in,⁷ Black also operates Martinlutherking.org, designed to resemble a documentary-style site, but rather than containing historical information, it instead contains defamatory material on the civil-rights leader. Black counts on the fact that many of the school children and young adults who do research online will not be able to distinguish between Martinlutherking.org and a legitimate site (Gruen 2004). On anti-African-American sites, members of this minority are depicted as the enemy: as brutal, primitive, and biologically inferior, whose presence represents a corrosive element for the whole of American society. In Africa, they were eating one another. They bring their jungle culture to America. They are referred to as niggers, “mud people,” a source of social pollution and cultural decadence which clashes with the ethnic, civil, and economic superiority of the whites. In 2006, there were 28 anti-Black hate groups, with 820 bloggers, on one blog hosting site, Xanga (Chau and Xu 2007).

Some of the anti-Black sites are also anti-immigration (especially Latino) and anti-Muslim.⁸ The material on these sites explains that minorities endanger the position of whites in the United States. They increase their numbers by tempting white women. Indeed, interracial marriage is one of the ideas—some claim *the* idea—that most upsets racists on the Internet, and which is likely to drive them to advocate anti-Black hate crime. A reiterated theme is the need to secure white supremacy in the United States now for “our people” and for the coming generations—“a future for White children” (Glaser, Dixit, and Green 2002).

A second hated group on the Internet is the gay community. Gay men are portrayed as seeking to sexually ensnare young white males. Gay behavior is perceived by bigots as contradictory to nature, perverted, sinful, morally abominable, and a threat to the religious values of the white community. Homosexuals do not reproduce and thus threaten the survival of their own race. Furthermore, they spread contagious and deadly diseases and are no less than angels of death. They should be hunted down in the same way witches were once hunted in Europe.⁹

While many racist, White Power websites (for example, Stormfront) contain anti-gay propaganda, some focus their hatred primarily on gays and lesbians. Perhaps the most vile and best-known anti-gay website is *God Hates*

⁷ <http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/stormfront.org>.

⁸ *American Renaissance*, <http://www.amren.com/index.html>; Jewish Task Force, <http://www.jtf.org/>.

⁹ <http://www.anti-gay.com>; see also Roversi (2008).

Fags,¹⁰ maintained by Benjamin Phelps, grandson of Westboro Baptist Church (WBC) leader Fred Phelps. Other notorious sites are Forerunner International: Homosexuality,¹¹ the Traditional Values Coalition,¹² and Exodus International.¹³

Many of the hate sites on the web are very religious in nature. Religion is depicted as the rock around which life should be organized, providing the answer (indeed, the only answer) for all people's questions; suggesting that we have little choice in making decisions, as everything has already been decided for us by God. They encourage people to be absolutely committed to their faith and trust in the Almighty to guide their way.

The third most hated group is "the conspirators," i.e., the Jews. According to these hate sites, the Jews are situated in power positions in society, united by a secret pact to set in motion a global conspiracy to rule the world. They lie in order to achieve this aim and are successful in brainwashing the minds of Christian-Americans. They control the academia, the media, the banks, MTV, and the feminists. There are sites to educate you on what Jews look like, that describe their power, and how they control America and the world (ZOG=Zionist Occupied Government) (see Appendix). The Creativity Movement explains that "CREATIVITY is a religion for the survival of the White Race. Time is running out. The time for action is NOW! The jew is the master of perversion. When Creativity triumphs the White Race will be jew-proof for all time. White Men of the World, UNITE! You have nothing to lose but jewish tyranny" (sic).¹⁴

Anti-Semitic sites include African-American literature about the so-called "Secret Relationships between Jews and Blacks" which essentially describe how Jews have exploited black people through the ages.¹⁵ Many anti-Semitic sites contain anti-Israeli/anti-Zionist propaganda (see Appendix). Some anti-Semitic sites not only promote exclusion of the Jewish people, but deny the Holocaust (Appendix), while others combine Jewish hatred, Holocaust denial, Jewish and Israeli conspiracies, and revisionist history (i.e., maintaining that while there was no Jewish Holocaust, there is Holocaust in Gaza; also that Israel is a nuclear state that threatens world peace, and was responsible for the greatest terrorist attack in

¹⁰ <http://www.godhatesfags.com/>.

¹¹ <http://forerunner.com/forerunner/X0227.html>.

¹² <http://www.traditionalvalues.org/>.

¹³ <http://www.exodusinternational.org/>. See also <http://www.defendthefamily.com/pfrc/books/sevensteps/Epilogue/index.html>.

¹⁴ <http://creativitynsw.com/>.

¹⁵ Nation of Islam, *The Secret Relationship between Blacks and Jews* (Chicago, IL, October 16, 1991), <http://www.mailstar.net/secret.html>. See also Black and Jews Newpage, <http://www.blacksandjews.com/Welcome.html>; Quotes and Facts about Blacks and Jews, <http://iamthewitness.com/doc/The.Secret.Relationship.Between.Blacks.and.Jews.htm>.

human history, September 11, 2001).¹⁶ Extensive documentation, including free video downloads, is offered to support all this “unrefuted truth.” Among the most visited sites promoting Holocaust denial are the Institute for Historical Review, originally established for this purpose,¹⁷ the Historical Review Press,¹⁸ Bradley Smith and his Committee for Open Debate of the Holocaust (largely focusing on U.S. college campuses),¹⁹ and sites sponsored by Arthur R. Butz,²⁰ David Irving,²¹ Ahmed Rami,²² and Ernst Zündel.²³ All portray themselves as gutsy political libertarians who have developed bastions of unbiased, unorthodox historical research. One site conveniently assembles information about all revisionist “scholars,” explaining: “All productive and worthwhile historical writing is ‘revisionist’ in the sense that it takes into account newly available historical evidence and new insights and perspectives.”²⁴

Holocaust denial is a form of hate, and those who deny the Holocaust deny history and immense human suffering (Cohen-Almagor 2009). Holocaust denial might create a climate of xenophobia that is detrimental to democracy, generating hate through the rewriting of history in a vicious way to portray Jews as the anti-Christ, and as destructive forces that work against civilization. Hateful messages desensitize members of the public on very important issues: they build a sense of the possible acceptability of hate and resentment of the other, which might be more costly than the cost of curtailing speech (Cohen-Almagor 2009). At best, Holocaust denial reveals an ignorance and laziness in pursuing and revealing historical truth; at worst, it intends to express bigotry and hate (see Appendix).

The most elaborate hate sites cover all of the above: African-Americans and non-white immigrants, Muslims, Jews, and gay people. They are quite eclectic, offering a wide range of racial publications,²⁵ some in a number of languages. Stormfront contains discussions in many European languages;²⁶ www.natvan.com of the National Alliance is published in sixteen languages. Extensive websites contain documents, journals, newspapers, videos, radio, TV

¹⁶ Holy War: <http://holywar.org/>; Jew Watch: <http://www.jewwatch.com/>; The Christian Party: <http://www.fathersmanifesto.net/wtc.htm>; David Duke: <http://www.whitecivilrights.com/?p=1929>.

¹⁷ <http://www.ihr.org/>.

¹⁸ Historical Review Press (HRP):

<http://www.ety.com/HRP/revisionholocaust/holocaustindex.htm>.

¹⁹ Committee for Open Debate of the Holocaust: <http://www.codoh.com/>.

²⁰ <http://www.codoh.com/butz/>; <http://www.revisionists.com/revisionists/butz.html>.

²¹ David Irving: <http://www.fpp.co.uk/>; www.fpp.co.uk/online/index.html;
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4449948.stm>.

²² Ahmed Rami: <http://radioislam.org/islam/english/toread/jewslave.htm>;

<http://radioislam.org/adl/net.htm>; http://www.adl.org/poisoning_web/rami.asp.

²³ <http://www.zundel.org/>.

²⁴ www.Revisionists.com. See also Appendix.

²⁵ See, for instance, The Racial Nationalist Library, <http://www.racerealist.com/1b.htm>.

²⁶ <http://www.stormfront.org/forum/>.

shows, books, games, survival information, homeschooling information, cartoons, artwork, jokes, quotes, poems, free stickers, and merchandise. In addition, there are also anti-religious (see Appendix), anti-abortion,²⁷ anti-liberal, anti-Communist, and anti-feminist sites (Delgado and Stefancic 2004).

Countering Hate

Speech vs. Speech

The preferred strategy advocated by many (especially American) Internet experts and human rights activists is to tackle net hate by more communication, by openness, and by exposing the problem in the free marketplace of ideas.²⁸ We need to show that all human beings deserve respect and concern, all have dignity, and that a racially based society negates the liberal-democratic values that we all hold dear: pluralism, diversity, individuality, liberty, equality, tolerance, and justice. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has a website about combating anti-Semitism;²⁹ another example is the Nizkor project led by Ken McVay, which is designed to combat Holocaust denial.³⁰ It is possible to set up a listserv to provide information and analyses to interested parties: sending newsletters to subscribers or creating informational websites are initiatives that can be undertaken by anyone.

However, countering hate speech with more speech is not enough, and it is irresponsible to assume that it can be adequate. Internet hate is concrete, tangible, and harmful. Allowing hate mongers and racists to release their pent-up emotions in the form of speech, and then countering this with more speech under the assumption that this would not result in violence, and that their targets will be

²⁷ See Appendix. Until it was shut down, the Nuremberg Files website instigated violence against abortionists; see *Planned Parenthood of the Columbia/Willamette Inc. et al v. American Coalition of Life Activists*, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (May 21, 2002); *Planned Parenthood of the Columbia/Willamette Inc. et al v. American Coalition of Life Activists*, No. 95-1671-JO, 41 F.Supp.2d 1130 (March 16, 1999); *Planned Parenthood of the Columbia/Willamette Inc. et al v. American Coalition of Life Activists*, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (March 28, 2001). However, the same information can be found at present at another site, *Alleged Abortionists and their Accomplices*: <http://www.christiangallery.com/atrocity/aborts.html>.

²⁸ Interviews with dozens of American free speech/New Media activists, Washington DC (September 2007–July 2008). See also Black (1960), Meiklejohn (1965), Emerson (1970), Bollinger (1986), Smolla (1993), Gates et al. (1995), Fiss (2000), and Newman (2010). For views that balance freedom of expression with other values such as privacy and the dignity of a person, see Matsuda et al. (1993), Tsesis (2002b), Delgado and Stefancic (2004), and Cohen-Almagor (2005; 2006).

²⁹ <http://www.adl.org>.

³⁰ <http://nizkor.almanac.bc.ca>.

much safer, ignores reality (Cohen-Almagor 2010a). Far more should be done in this regard.

Education

As previously stated, we have a responsibility to better our society. Caring for one another, doing good, and avoiding harm entail activity at primary and high schools designed to alert one about hate on the Internet and its forms and attractions (music, video games, activities for children); why racial purity is empirically unattainable; why racism is anti-democratic and logically incoherent; why racist exclusion is inhumane and harmful; and who is targeted. The education program should reflect on the history of hate and the connection between hate and some of the most horrific human-inflicted catastrophes (Nazi Germany, Yugoslavia, Rwanda). Here I commend the work of Partners Against Hate,³¹ the Family Online Safety Institute,³² and Enough is Enough.³³ AOL was a party to another initiative, Take 25, initiated by the U.S. National Center for Missing & Exploited Children. The goal of Take 25 is to heighten awareness about children's safety issues: with a focus on prevention, the campaign encourages parents, guardians, and other trusted adult role models to spend time talking to children and teaching them ways of being safer.³⁴

In June 2008 the UK Government published a guidance toolkit ("Learning Together to Be Safe") on preventing violent extremism. The toolkit emphasizes the importance of working with children and young people and encourages local partnerships to engage with schools and colleges. It is designed to raise awareness in schools of the threat from violent extremist groups and the risks for young people; to provide information about causes of violent extremism, about local and national preventative actions and about where schools can get additional information and advice; to provide advice on managing risks and responding to incidents locally, nationally, or internationally that might have an impact on the school community; to help schools understand the positive contribution they can make to empowering young people to create communities that are more resilient to extremism; and to protect the well-being of particular pupils or groups who may be vulnerable to being drawn into violent extremist activity.³⁵

³¹ http://www.partnersagainsthate.org/about_pah/index.html; Partners Against Hate et al., *Investigating Hate Crimes on the Internet* (Washington DC, September 2003).

³² <http://www.fosi.org/cms>.

³³ <http://www.internetsafety101.org/dangers.htm>.

³⁴ <http://www.take25.org/page.asp?page=47>.

³⁵ Teachernet, Preventing violent extremism: <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/wholeschool/violentextremism/>. For a Canadian perspective, see Taylor (2006).

In Australia, the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission launched "Click Against Hate," a program for Jewish day schools on identifying and responding to anti-Semitism online.³⁶

Hate Watch

Names of hate sites should be published, highlighting their content, their locations, and their ISPs, as well as successful and unsuccessful attempts to curtail their activities. The idea behind hate watch is to compile a continually updated list of these hate sites, in order to alert people about the sites, include them in blocking programs, and send them to indexed search engines so that hate sites can be properly labeled. Lists of websites can be sent to access providers as part of a campaign to have the sites shut down.

At present, a number of sites monitor and document hate literature on the Internet. Some notable examples are B'nai B'rith Canada's League for Human Rights, which hosts a hate hotline,³⁷ Hate Watch of the Southern Poverty Law Center,³⁸ and the Simon Wiesenthal Center, which has identified thousands of offensive websites.³⁹ Wiesenthal's annual CD, *Digital Hate*, lists sites that promote anti-social and illegal activities, ranging from hate music to suicide bombing. Deborah Stone, of the Australian B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission (Australia), also reports on anti-Semitism on the Internet.⁴⁰

Citizens' Initiatives to Combat Hate

One example of a citizen initiative to combat hate 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, Muslim, Hispanic, gay, and other communities affected by the actions of hate groups. Its mission states that it is intended to provide a medium to educate people as to the effects of hate group activity, to provide funds or other assistance to help the victims of hate

³⁶ <http://www.antidef.org.au/www/309/1001127/displayarticle/click-against-hate--1011350.html>; discussions with Australian Internet experts and human rights activists, Jerusalem (December 16–18, 2009).

³⁷ <http://www.bnaibrith.ca/league/league.htm>.

³⁸ <http://www.splcenter.org/blog/?source=redirect&url=hatewatch.org>.

³⁹ <http://www.wiesenthal.com/site/pp.asp?c=lsKWLbPJLnF&b=4441251>.

⁴⁰ Deborah Stone, *To hate, click here: antisemitism on the internet*, Special Report, No. 38 (August 2008), <http://www.antidef.org.au/www/309/1001127/displayarticle/adc-news-december-2009--1011568.html> or <http://www.antidef.org.au/secure/downloadfile.asp?fileid=1010474>.

crimes and assist in fighting the hate groups, and to provide information so that members of the public can take action against hate groups.⁴¹

Another initiative is LAMBDA, which focuses on support, education, and advocacy through organization of the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) community to provide a source for accurate information about and within their community. It aims to improve the public's awareness and understanding of the GLBT community by providing technical assistance, seminars, workshops, and public education campaigns. LAMBDA aims to create change through the empowerment of GLBT people, the fighting of homophobia, prejudice, and ignorance, and the expansion of understanding sexual orientation and related issues.⁴²

Internet Users' Initiatives to Combat Hate

Facebook hosts different forums to discuss the hate challenge; among them are United Against Hatred⁴³ and United Against Hate.⁴⁴ On such forums Internet users call upon ISPs to adopt a code of responsible conduct, including an anti-hate provision, and insist that ISPs enforce and abide by their own codes of conduct.

Content Filters

Filtering, monitoring, and auditing tools are generally divided into two categories: client-side and server-side. Client-side software is installed locally on the user's computer and maintained by the user. Its effectiveness is dependent on the user's installation, configuration, regular maintenance, and use of the software. Client-side filtering tools are quite popular because they are relatively straightforward to implement and offer parents and guardians an easy way to provide a safer Internet environment. In the server-side approaches, filtering of inappropriate content is performed before the content reaches a user's computer, restricted according to the standards of the website or service platform. Server-side filtering is often used to refer to content filtering at the ISP level, for example where they block access to all websites associated with a blacklisted IP address or filter content that matches a list of blacklisted keywords.⁴⁵

⁴¹ <http://www.cuah.com/index.htm>.

⁴² <http://www.lambda.org/>.

⁴³ <http://www.facebook.com/topic.php?uid=58653965167&topic=7617>.

⁴⁴ <http://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=230091163153&ref=ts>.

⁴⁵ Final Report of the Internet Safety Technical Task Force, *Enhancing Child Safety and Online Technologies* (Berkman Center for Internet and Society, 2008, Appendix D); author interviews with Internet experts, Washington (May 9–15, 2008).

Filters can be installed at institutions (schools, universities, workplaces) and at homes. Ideally, human rights organizations should sponsor these filters so people aren't reluctant to use them because of the cost involved. Among the growing number of fairly effective filtering devices are NetNanny, SurfWatch CyberPatrol, and HateFilter. These empower parents and employers wanting to prevent children and employees from browsing Internet sites with objectionable messages. The software functions by scanning web pages for specific words or graphic designs and then restricting user access to them. For example, HateFilter, developed by the Anti-Defamation League, specifically targets several hundred sites that have already been identified as hate sites. When it is activated, the HateFilter denies access to Internet sites advocating hatred, bigotry, or violence against Jews, minorities, and homosexuals.⁴⁶

A more refined method is proxy filtering. Proxy servers which produce local copies of popular websites and are commonly deployed by ISPs to save bandwidth can be used to decide whether requests for individual web pages should be allowed or not. This avoids overblocking, but can be very expensive. If the system were to inspect the entire networks, it could slow down Internet traffic substantially.

Hybrid IP and proxy filtering is a useful response to the relative expense of proxy filtering and the significant over-blocking which results from IP filtering. This system first checks against a list of IP addresses, but does not block them immediately. Instead, all requests for "problematic" IP addresses are channelled to a proxy server which inspects them for individual web pages and blocks them if required. The initial layer makes it possible for the majority of Internet traffic to proceed without a full scrutiny, thus reducing the expense of straight proxy filtering, while the second layer helps minimize the problems of over-blocking. Hybrid IP and proxy filtering is the basis for the British Telecom Cleanfeed system for blocking child sexual abuse content. It seems to resolve the trade-off between cost and accuracy: it is neither too crude nor too expensive. Yet, like all other methods of filtering, it fails to capture dynamic content (for example, chat and instant messaging) and relies on blacklists of banned web pages, which raises some concerns (Stevens and Neumann 2009; Deibert et al. 2008). Another idea is to ask responsible ISPs to conduct a two-tier monitoring: First, software would look for a string of keywords and check them in the context in which they were uttered. Thus, for instance, sites like Nizkor that frequently cite anti-Semitic materials in order to refute them would not be censored. Second, people would inspect the flagged statements and filter the hate. Undoubtedly, technical progress will uncover new filtering methods to enable the optimal solution of blocking only the targeted information; no less and no more.

⁴⁶ Interview with Brian Marcus, former Director of ADL Internet Monitoring, Washington (June 5, 2008).

Install Computer Blocking Programs at Work and School

Governments at all levels employ between 30 and 60 percent of the workforce: public schools attract an even higher percentage of the school age population. It should be a matter of government policy that no government employees should access hate websites, unless this access is related to their work. Generally speaking, workers have no business with hate sites. As discussed above, both the private and the public sectors should adopt social responsibility norms. It should be an education policy that students, at least students at public schools, should not access hate sites unless the study is directly related to their education. Employees and students should never send hate emails, harassing others with their hatred.

The insistence of employers and schools that employees and students not access hate sites during work and school would have a dramatic impact on the penetration of these sites. The mere statement of a hate site no access policy and no hate email policy would be a stance against the promotion of hatred.⁴⁷ The purpose of this measure is also to delegitimize and marginalize: it is a responsible statement against hate, and for human dignity.

Responsibility of ISPs

ISPs and web-hosting companies should develop standards for responsible and acceptable practices for Internet users. ISPs' terms of service usually grant ISPs the unilateral right and ability to block service to those who violate the terms. Being for profit, ISPs can be reluctant to do this. However, ISPs will commonly deny service, or remove materials from the server, in the event of copyright violation: ISPs are inclined to abide by such requests.⁴⁸

Quite a few ISPs, web-hosting companies, and social networking sites also bar blatant expressions of bigotry, racism, and/or hate (as mentioned for AOL above).⁴⁹ Judicial-Inc declares itself to be a Pro-Christian website with approximately 110,000 monthly readers. In effect, it is an anti-Semitic site of the worst kind. All of Judicial's 4,200 web pages were hosted by Godaddy.com, and

⁴⁷ David Matas, "Combating hate on the internet without recourse to law," Panel contribution for the INACH Conference 2009 "Freedom of Speech versus Hate Speech" (November 9, 2009, Amsterdam, The Netherlands). Discussion with Matas, Jerusalem (December 17, 2009).

⁴⁸ Interview with Dr. Herb Lin, National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC (May 15, 2008). See Cohen-Almagor (2010b).

⁴⁹ <http://www.atlas-sys.com/products/aeon/policy.html>;
http://www.illuminate.com/license_agreement.jsp; Evehosting.co.uk;
<http://host2host.com/contract.htm>;
<http://www.nyophosting.com/././././Files/Internet/Responsibility/- NYOP Hosting - Name Your Own Price Hosting-.htm>.

the company decided to suspend the Judicial account, apparently with no notice.⁵⁰ Zionist Watch, another anti-Semitic site, was hosted by WordPress until it was suspended for a violation of the company's terms of service which expressly prohibit hate content.⁵¹ Yahoo! prohibits uploading, posting, or otherwise transmitting harmful, threatening, hateful, or racially, ethnically, or otherwise objectionable content.⁵² Facebook, the largest social networking site with more than 750 million users, prohibits posting content that is hateful or threatening.⁵³ XOOM.com of San Francisco, California, bans "hate propaganda" and "hate mongering."⁵⁴ Fortunecity requires its users to agree to "not upload, post, email, transmit or otherwise make available (collectively, 'Transmit') any content that is unlawful, harmful, threatening, abusive, harassing, tortuous, defamatory, vulgar, obscene, libellous, invasive of another's privacy, hateful, or racially, ethnically or otherwise objectionable."⁵⁵ The decision makers of these companies have access to the necessary evidence for making judgments about the benefits and hazards of entertaining hate speech; they are able to weigh the relative value of the consequences of their choices, and they have decided against providing a platform for hate mongers to disseminate their propaganda. However, having codes without adhering to and enforcing them is meaningless. These responsible codes should be steadfast. ISPs, web-hosting companies, and social networks are expected to abide by their *own* terms of conduct (Cohen-Almagor 2009; 2010a).

This is stressed because Facebook, for instance, hosts the National Association for the Advancement of White People.⁵⁶ Conduct a simple search on Facebook: "Holocaust denial" and you will get some results, among them two "Holocaust denial" groups and one "Against Holocaust Denial Laws."

Proactive Steps Taken by ISPs

Anti-hate speech advocates should explain to ISP managers the nature of the contested hate, its potential harms, and why corporate responsibility to the community entails removal of the content from their servers. This may lead to ISPs taking proactive steps to prevent the presence of hate sites on their servers, i.e., not only taking action after being alerted, but taking proactive steps to block and eliminate such sites. In order to make the right decision in pursuing desirable ends via just means, choice is important; moreover, the decision should be

⁵⁰ http://judicial-inc.biz/1_master_supreme.htm.

⁵¹ <http://zionistwatch.wordpress.com/>; <http://en.wordpress.com/tos/>.

⁵² <http://info.yahoo.com/legal/us/yahoo/geocities/gctos/>.

⁵³ <http://www.facebook.com/terms.php?ref=pf>.

⁵⁴ ADL, *Combating Extremism in Cyberspace* (2000): 11.

⁵⁵ <https://secure.fortunecity.com/order/register/agreement.php?siteid=55527>.

⁵⁶ <http://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=2255936485>.

conducive to the well-being of the community in which we live. Whatever responsible steps corporations take to promote Internet security, it is imperative that these steps should be transparent, clear, known, and reasoned to the public.

An example of cooperation between an Internet monitoring organization and an ISP concerns the Anti-Defamation League (ADL). In December 2008, YouTube contacted the ADL for its expertise in dealing with net hate. In one outgrowth of that partnership, the ADL is now a contributor to YouTube's newly launched Abuse and Safety Center, where Internet users are empowered to identify and confront hate, and to report abuses. The Center features information and links to resources developed by the ADL to help Internet users respond to and report offensive material and extremist content that violates YouTube's Community Guidelines on hate speech.⁵⁷ However, you will still find quite a few questionable video clips on YouTube (see Appendix).⁵⁸

Like ISPs, connectivity providers that supply ISPs and Domain Name Registrars should insist, as a condition for the provision of their service, that it will not be used for the promotion of hate. Every access provider should insert into its subscription contract an anti-hate provision.

Pressuring ISPs to Remove Hate Sites

There have been attempts by the Simon Wiesenthal Center and the ADL to convince ISPs to remove objectionable websites from their servers. Sometimes this effort has succeeded and other times not. Given the expansive and international nature of the Internet, sites can easily migrate from one ISP to another. Pressuring ISPs has come under criticism by civil liberties groups. While approving of the Wiesenthal Center's campaign to expose hate group sites, the American Civil Liberties Union has criticized their attempts to pressure ISPs (Resnick 2006). Civil liberties organizations equate tolerance with free expression, but even they recognize that free speech has limits. They do not countenance fraud, criminal conspiracy, libel, and child pornography (Resnick 2006).

⁵⁷ http://help.youtube.com/support/youtube/bin/answer.py?hl=en_uk&answer=126264; [http:// help.youtube.com:80/support/youtube/bin/request.py?contact_type=abuse](http://help.youtube.com:80/support/youtube/bin/request.py?contact_type=abuse); "YouTube Taps ADL As Partner In Fight Against Hate," at http://www.adl.org/PresRele/Internet_75/5416_75.htm.

⁵⁸ One of this article's reviewers commented that YouTube is fairly ineffective because there is an enormous amount of hate content there, and it is virtually impossible to convince YouTube officials to remove any content. Effectiveness, I think, has a number of different metrics. First, I agree that YouTube hosts quite a lot of hate but at the same time the fact that there is lots of hate does not mean there is no reduction based on reporting through the safety center. Second, it is important that YouTube has taken an affirmative stand in this matter. Clearly stating that hate has no home on YouTube is itself an important and meaningful act. One hopes it will yield more responsible results in the future.

According to Brian Marcus, who headed the ADL's Internet division, private companies may decide not to post messages containing hate speech because this might be bad for their business. The ADL approached the CEO of a web-hosting company in Texas, asking him where he would draw the line between legitimate and illegitimate speech. The CEO answered that hate is protected speech, but threats are not. Marcus indicated that one of the sites he hosted claimed that all members of minorities should be hanged from street lamps. The CEO was surprised. For him, this was a threat. This is not a threat according to the American law (Andrews 1999; Cohen-Almagor 2006), but for this CEO it was too much. He was then shown some 150 other such sites. After deliberation, the company closed some 110–120 of these problematic sites.⁵⁹

What ISPs and hosting companies could certainly do is provide a uniform channel for user complaints. Such a channel (which could be as simple as a link to the CyberTipline) could easily be placed on the complaints or customer service page of the service provider (Thornburgh and Lin 2002).⁶⁰ In France, where there is a legal requirement for ISPs to inform officials, this method could work quite efficiently. In other countries, voluntary participation is to be encouraged.

Omit or Label Hate Websites in Search Engines. In 2002, Google, the world's most popular search engine, quietly deleted more than 100 controversial sites from some search result listings.⁶¹ However, it did it secretly, without public discussion or explanation, and, as a result, was subjected to incisive criticism. Most of the sites that were removed from Google.fr (France) and Google.de (Germany) were anti-Semitic, pro-Nazi, or related to white supremacy (McCullagh 2002). The removed sites continue to appear in listings on the main Google.com site.

Labeling, Naming, and Shaming. ISPs and web-hosting services that refuse to cooperate, and that continue to provide a platform for hate, may be named and shamed. The former UK Culture Minister, Barbara Follett, and her Tory shadow, Ed Vaizey, have backed the idea that web providers must be embarrassed into dealing with violent, sexually explicit web content (Wintour 2008). The same can be proposed about hate: web-hosting companies that are friendly to racial propaganda should be named and shamed. The present host of Stormfront is a Texan company called The Planet that has very loose Terms of Service that would

⁵⁹ Interview with Brian Marcus, former ADL Director of Internet Monitoring, Washington DC (April 16, 2008).

⁶⁰ Interview with Herb Lin, Washington DC (May 15, 2008).

⁶¹ <http://www.webmasterworld.com/forum3/6269.htm>.

allow anything that is legal.⁶² The First Amendment and profit conveniently go hand in hand. If all the above does not help, human rights organizations should call to ban the services of hateful ISPs. If ISPs fear the loss of business, they may change their decisions and assume responsibility.

International Cooperation. The Internet is international in scope and therefore combating Internet hate requires global cooperation. In 1996, a governmental organization in Germany, Jugendschutz.net, and a Dutch NGO, Stichting Magenta, Meldpunt Discriminatie Internet, were the first organizations in the world to start a dedicated outfit to address the problems of racism, anti-Semitism, hate against Muslims, gays, and other discrimination or incitement to hatred; each in their own country. In 2002, they founded the International Network Against Cyber Hate (INACH). The vision of INACH is to act collectively against discrimination, promoting dignity, respect, citizenship and responsibility, enabling Internet users to exercise freedom of expression while respecting the rights and reputations of others.⁶³ INACH monitors the Internet and publishes overviews and reports about the situation in different countries. Today, the network comprises 18 organizations in Europe and North America, acting as an umbrella organization for hotlines specializing in racist and hateful content.

Law and Adherence to International Conventions

The international community has a responsibility to unite in order to combat anti-social activities. On some global issues there is a need for international cooperation to respond to global concerns. Indeed, the international community has legal, social, and moral responsibilities. More and more countries understand the need to cooperate in order to tackle Internet abuse, and there is more awareness of the threats and of the needs in order to provide social security. As the Internet is an international medium, countries realize the urgency for transnational coordination.⁶⁴ At present, given the magnitude of anti-social and violent phenomena on the Internet, lack of such coordination is simply irresponsible.

One obstacle to international efforts to fight hate is that there are different definitions of hate. In Germany, for instance, Scientology is considered as a dangerous cult: the German government maintains that Scientology is dangerous

⁶² <http://content.theplanet.com/Documents/legal/Planet-TOS.pdf>. Senior ADL directors spoke with the owner of The Planet, but to no avail: they said it was a waste of time (discussion with senior ADL directors, New York, March 22, 2010).

⁶³ <http://www.inach.net/inach-conf-2009-program-public.pdf>.

⁶⁴ <http://www.securitymanagement.com/article/internet-hate-tough-problem-combat-005259>.

for its members and possibly dangerous for society.⁶⁵ In other countries, this is not the case. Having said that, I'd like to highlight international conventions that are pertinent to the fight against hatred. Former Canadian Minister of Justice, Professor Irwin Cotler, has explained in an interview that international treaties are important because they state that hate speech does not enjoy the protection of free speech; that hate speech is outside the ambit of protected speech.⁶⁶

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) declares (Article 1): "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood." It further states in Article 2:

"Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty."

The 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights states that "any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law" (ICCPR 1966, Article 20-2). Similarly, the UN International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD 1969, Article 4) requires its signatories to outlaw "all dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred, incitement to racial discrimination," violent acts or incitement to violence against any race or ethnic group, and also "the provision of any assistance to racist activities, including the financing thereof." They condemn all propaganda and all organizations which are based on ideas or theories of superiority of one race or group of persons of one colour or ethnic origin, or which attempt to justify or promote racial hatred and discrimination in any form (ICERD 1969).

In Europe, there are several important documents that should be observed. The European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1950) holds (Article 10) that the exercise of these freedoms may be subject to such formalities, conditions, restrictions, or penalties as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society, in the interests of public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, "for the protection of health or morals, for the protection of the reputation or rights of others...." Furthermore, the

⁶⁵ Official German responses to Scientology:
<http://home.snafu.de/tilman/krasel/germany/stat.html>; see also Purvis (2007).

⁶⁶ Interview with Prof. Irwin Cotler, Montreal (July 24, 2002).

Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948) requires contracting parties to punish direct and public “incitement to commit genocide.”

Some European countries are working together to combat cyber crime and cooperate to criminalize acts of racist and xenophobic nature committed through the use of computer systems.⁶⁷ The First Additional Protocol to the Council of Europe’s *Convention on Cybercrime* (2003) stresses that “all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.”⁶⁸ It requires the adoption of measures prohibiting the transmission of racist or xenophobic messages through computer systems. It criminalizes Internet hate speech, including hyperlinks to pages that contain offensive content. Specifically, it bans:

“any written material, any image or any other representation of ideas or theories, which advocates, promotes or incites hatred, discrimination or violence, against any individual or group of individuals, based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin, as well as religion if used as a pretext for any of these factors.”⁶⁹

This is another important milestone in the fight against hate. The implementation and enforcement of this Protocol, however, depends on resources assigned to this cause by the respective governments.

At the same time I would like to emphasize that legal measures are always the last resort: remedies which do not engage the law should be preferred to remedies requiring reliance on the law. Only if the non-legal recourses fail should we have recourse to law. Legal measures should not relieve the international community of its responsibilities to educate and gain awareness at all levels—primary and high schools as well as universities—of the values of liberal democracy that we hold dear. Education is vital in enshrining the values of liberty, tolerance, pluralism, and diversity in the minds of people. Education should alert and raise awareness to Internet hate and its harms and perils, accentuating that hate speech has led to hate crimes; indeed, to some of the most ghastly, dark days of humanity. The fight against hate is hard and complex. Law alone will not suffice.

⁶⁷ OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, *Consolidated Summary* (Vienna, June 19–20, 2003).

⁶⁸ <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/189.htm>.

⁶⁹ Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime, concerning the criminalization of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems (Strasbourg, 28.I.2003), <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/html/189.htm>.

Conclusion

Hate speech aimed at reducing an identifiable group's rights or at instigating violence against it is not a legitimate form of political discourse, and it does not further democratic ideals. To the contrary, destructive messages cause conflict and division rather than seeking mutual grounds for compromise designed to benefit all sections of society, while respecting the individual rights of its members. Unrestrained bias foments disunity and endangers civil liberties. The Internet is being used to undermine democracy by providing a far-reaching medium for drawing together distant hate groups (Tsesis 2002a).

The Internet's short history provides a crash course in understanding why a balanced approach is needed to address and resolve conflicting freedoms. Here I would like to invoke Aristotle's Rule of the Golden Mean; i.e., that for every polarity there is a mean, which when practiced is a good benchmark for a life of moderation.⁷⁰ People should have the freedom to express themselves, within reason: two underpinning principles, in the heart of liberal democracy, are respect for others and not harming others (Cohen-Almagor 1994; 2005). We should strive to uphold these also on the Internet.

In consequence, some limits need to be enforced. Ethics is concerned with accountability for the consequences of our conduct, for improving the society in which we live and shaping it in a just fashion (Floridi and Sanders 2005). There are no easy solutions to the problems posed by the Internet. To have an effective policy, there is a need for international and responsible cooperation; a need which is especially pressing on issues such as hate and bigotry. People have moral, social, and legal responsibilities to unite in order to combat hateful anti-social activities.

The Internet is universal in nature, but societies do not adopt a universal common denominator to define the boundaries of freedom of expression. These boundaries vary from one society to another, and are influenced by historical circumstances and cultural norms. Germany, Israel, and countries that existed under the Nazi occupation are far more sensitive to National Socialism than the United States, and rightly so. While the United States protects Nazi speech, racism, and Holocaust denial, we would be most troubled if Germany were *not* to adopt restrictive measures against Internet sites that promote National Socialism and that deny the Holocaust.

To address the challenge of hate on the Internet there is a need to exchange information in order to enhance the effectiveness of rights advocates—ISP—State cooperation; to lobby for international awareness about the harms and abuse of technology; to help support groups and institutions that want to set up

⁷⁰ http://www.odemagazine.com/blogs/roundtable/316/the_wisdom_of_aristotle_s_golden_mean.

tip-lines alerting one about hate; and to advance our knowledge of emerging social networking and the psychology of people who use the Internet for various purposes. Clearly, there is a lot to learn about human behavior online, and what can be done to increase the moral and social responsibility of all parties concerned.

Hate poses a serious challenge, calling for serious consideration and redeeming answers. Responsible ISPs and web-hosting companies should weigh the benefits of freedom of expression, on the one hand, and the benefits of social responsibility, on the other, investing in greater efforts in ridding their services of Internet hate and resisting financial temptations to host it. The remaining sites will be tagged, named, and shamed. These sites should be delegitimized and warned against.

Appendix: Examples of Internet Hate Websites

Holocaust Denial Sites

<http://vho.org/aaargh/engl/engl.html>; <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org/>;
<http://www.toben.biz/>; <http://www.air-photo.com/english/>;
<http://www.blacksandjews.com>; <http://www.ety.com/HRP>; <http://holywar.org>;
<http://www.holocaustdenialvideos.com>;
<http://www.landoverbaptist.net/showthread.php?t=9197>;
http://www.goodnewsaboutgod.com/studies/spiritual/home_study/holocaust_lie.htm.

Anti-Israeli/Zionist Sites

Church of True Israel: <http://www.churchoftrueisrael.com/nsforum/>;
Holy War: <http://holywar.org/>; The Crime of the Century:
<http://www.stormfront.org/posterity/ci/smith6.html>;
David Duke: <http://www.davidduke.com/>; <http://www.duke.org/>;
<http://www.whitecivilrights.com>; <http://www.davidduke.org/>;
Final Conflict: <http://finalconflictblog.blogspot.com/>;
Libertarian National Socialist Green Party: <http://www.nazi.org/>;
The Voice of Palestine: <http://www.palestine-info.co.uk/en/>; North American
Committee Against Zionism and Imperialism (NACAZAI):
<http://www.nacazai.org/>; Revolution Muslim: <http://www.revolutionmuslim.com/>.

Anti-Jewish Sites

<http://www.jewwatch.com/>; <http://jewishfaces.org/>; <http://www.faem.com/>;
1001 Quotes By and About Jews: <http://www.stormfront.org/posterity/index.html>;
<http://jewishtribalreview.org/>; <http://www.kriegsberichter.com/>.

Anti-Religion Sites

Sites attacking all religions: Exposing Satanism:
<http://exposingsatanism.org/index1.htm>; Truth and Grace:
<http://truthandgrace.com/>; Peace of Mind: <http://peace-of-mind.net/>;
Odinist (pagan site promoting “Faith, Folk and Family”):
<http://www.odinist.com/>. Anti-Christianity sites: ALTAR OF UNHOLY
BLASPHEMY: <http://www.anus.com/altar/index.html>; Set Free,
<http://www.jcnot4me.com/>. Anti-Islam sites:
<http://www.glistrup.nu/forum/forum.cfm>;
Truth and Grace, <http://truthandgrace.com/ISLAM.htm>.
Anti-Hinduism sites: jesus-is-lord.com; Most Holy Family Monastery:
http://www.mostholyfamilymonastery.com/H.O.W._of_JP2_and_V2sect_regardin_g_pagans_and_infidels.html; Peace of Mind: <http://peace-of-mind.net/>;
Truth and Grace: <http://truthandgrace.com/Hindu.htm>; hyperlink to Hinduphobia
(2007), at: <http://www.hafsite.org/>.

Anti-Abortion Sites

The Creator’s Rights Party: <http://www.tcrp.us/>;
The Army of God: <http://www.armyofgod.com/>;
Final Conflict: <http://dspace.dial.pipex.com/finalconflict/a14-6.html>.

Examples of YouTube Videos

Nazi Hate Society—Hail Blood and Honour:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sSGXQmfHzsU>; Nazi skrewdriver- blood and
honour of White Nationalists, Fighters for the White Race and “to crush the
Zionist Scum”: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y0UuqFaoMiM&NR=1>;
Nazi Hate Society and Razors Edge—Teenage Rebellion:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lzE5Z3SZ1Jg>; Racist anti-Black Hate
Society—Burning Cross: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HI4b2zYA9vE>;

Nazi Svastika flies again! http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fu3XvQv_IXE;
Nazi Stahlgewitter—Auftrag Deutsches Reich:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IU4mRANRsdw&feature=related>; SS-
Sturmführer: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dBhFgnADkpY&NR=1>;
Fuck niggers and kikes white power, 14/88:
[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dw20MnHFCwI&feature=Playlist&p=1AFE
D9C2D71B446B&index=14](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dw20MnHFCwI&feature=Playlist&p=1AFE D9C2D71B446B&index=14).

References

- Andrews, A.S. 1999. "When is a Threat 'Truly' a Threat Lacking First Amendment Protection? A Proposed True Threats Test to Safeguard Free Speech Rights in the Age of the Internet." *The UCLA Online Institute for Cyberspace Law and Policy* (May 1999).
<http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/iclp/aandrews2.htm>.
- Black, H.L. 1960. "The Bill of Rights." *NY University Law Review* 35: 879.
- Bollinger, L.C. 1986. *The Tolerant Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bunton, K. 1998. "Social Responsibility in Covering Community: A Narrative Case Study." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 13 (4): 232-246.
- Chau, M., and J. Xu. 2007. "Mining Communities and Their Relationships in Blogs: A Study of Online Hate Groups." *International Journal Of Human-Computer Studies* 65: 57-70.
- Christians, C., and K. Nordenstreng. 2004. "Social Responsibility Worldwide." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 19 (1): 3-28.
- Cohen-Almagor, R. 1994. *The Boundaries of Liberty and Tolerance*. Gainesville, FL: The University Press of Florida.
- Cohen-Almagor, R. 2005. *Speech, Media, and Ethics*. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Cohen-Almagor, R. 2006. *The Scope of Tolerance: Studies on the Costs of Free Expression and Freedom of the Press*. London: Routledge, 256-258.
- Cohen-Almagor, R. 2009. "Holocaust Denial is a Form of Hate Speech." *Amsterdam Law Forum* 2 (1): 33-42.
- Cohen-Almagor, R. 2010a. "Countering Hate on the Internet—A Rejoinder." *Amsterdam Law Forum* 2 (2): 125-132.
- Cohen-Almagor, R. 2010b. "Responsibility of and Trust in ISPs." *Knowledge, Technology and Policy* 23 (3): 381-396.

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. 1948. *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*, December 9, 1948, art.3(c), 78 U.N.T.S. 277. <http://www.hrweb.org/legal/genocide.html>.
- Deibert, R., J. Palfrey, R. Rohozinski, and J. Zittrain, eds. 2008. *Access Denied: The Practice and Policy of Global Internet Filtering*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Delgado, R., and J. Stefancic. 2004. *Understanding Words That Wound*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 125.
- Emerson, T.I. 1970. *The System of Freedom of Expression*. NY: Random House.
- European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. 1950. *European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*. Opened for Signature by the Council of Europe on November 4, 1950; entered into Force on September 3, 1953. <http://www.religlaw.org/interdocs/docs/eurconvprothr1953.htm>.
- Fiss, O. 2000. "Freedom of Speech and Political Violence." In *Liberal Democracy and the Limits of Tolerance*, ed. R. Cohen-Almagor. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 70-78.
- Floridi, L., and J.W. Sanders. 2005. "Internet Ethics: The Constructionist Values of *Homo Poieticus*." In *The Impact of the Internet on Our Moral Lives*, ed. Robert J. Cavalier. Albany: State University of New York Press, 195-196.
- Gates, H.L., Jr., et al. 1995. *Speaking of Race, Speaking of Sex: Hate Speech, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties*. New York: New York University Press.
- Glaser, J., J. Dixit, and D.P. Green. 2002. "Studying Hate Crime with the Internet: What Makes Racists Advocate Racial Violence?" *Journal of Social Issues* 58 (1): 188.
- Gruen, M. 2004. "White Ethnonationalist and Political Islamist Methods of Fund-raising and Propaganda on the Internet." In *The Changing Face of Terrorism*, ed. Rohan Gunaratna. Singapore: Marshall Cavendish, 132.
- Hoffman, D.S. 1996. *The Web of Hate: Extremists Exploit the Internet*. New York: Anti-Defamation League, 9.
- ICCPR. 1966. *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, art. 20-2, 999 UNTS 171. Opened for signature December 16, 1966, Article 20 (2). <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm>.

- ICERD. 1969. *International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination*, 660 U.N.T.S. 195, art. 4(a), entered into force on January 4, 1969. <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/cerd.htm>.
- Kaliski, B.S., ed. 2001. *Encyclopedia of Business and Finance*. New York: Macmillan.
- Kessler, J. 1999. *Poisoning the Web: Hatred Online*. New York: Anti-Defamation League, 4.
- Koppel, T. 1998. "Hate Web Sites and the Issue of Free Speech." *ABC News Nightline*, January 13, 1998. <http://www.stormfront.org/dblack/nightline011398.htm>.
- Levmore, S., and M.C. Nussbaum, eds. 2011. *The Offensive Internet: Speech, Privacy, and Reputation*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marshall, M.L. 1994. "Ensuring Social Responsibility." *Thrust for Educational Leadership* 23 (4): 42-43.
- Matsuda, M.J., et al. 1993. *Words That Wound: Critical Race Theory, Assaultive Speech, and the First Amendment*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- McCullagh, D. 2002. "Google Excluding Controversial Sites." *CNET News*, October 23, 2002.
- Meiklejohn, A. 1965. *Political Freedom*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Newman, S.L. 2010. "Should Hate Speech Be Allowed On The Internet? A Reply to Raphael Cohen-Almagor." *Amsterdam Law Forum* 2 (2): 119-123.
- Novak, M. 1996. *Business as a Calling: Work and the Examined Life*. New York: Free Press.
- Purvis, A. 2007. "Germany's Battle Against Scientology." *Time*, December 17, 2007. <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1695514,00.html>.
- Resnick, D. 2006. "Tolerance and the Internet." In *Tolerance in the Twenty-first Century: Prospects and Challenges*, ed. Gerson Moreno-Riano. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 218.
- Roversi, A. 2008. *Hate on the Net*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 94.
- Smolla, R.A. 1993. *Free Speech in an Open Society*. London: Vintage.
- Stevens, T., and P.R. Neumann. 2009. *Countering Online Radicalisation: A Strategy for Action*. London: The International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Political Violence and the Community Security Trust, 18.
- Taylor, A. 2006. "Helping Kids Deal with Online Hate." *School Libraries in Canada* 25 (4): 14-16.

- Thornburgh, D., and H.S. Lin, eds. 2002. *Youth, Pornography, and the Internet*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 380.
- Trevino, L.K., and K.A. Nelson. 1999. *Managing Business Ethics: Straight Talk about How To Do It Right*. New York: John Wiley.
- Tsesis, A. 2002a. "Prohibiting Incitement on the Internet." *Virginia Journal of Law and Technology* 7 (2): 5.
- Tsesis, A. 2002b. *Destructive Messages: How Hate Speech Paves the Way For Harmful Social Movements*. NY: New York University Press.
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights. 1948. Universal Declaration of Human Rights. <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>.
- Werts, D. 2000. "How the Web Spawns Hate and Violence." *Newsday*, October 23, 2000, B27.
- Wintour, P. 2008. "Web Providers To Be Named and Shamed Over Offensive Content." *The Guardian*, November 15, 2008.