

The type of content that violates our policies and is therefore NOT allowed on our platform:

1. We do not allow the following people (living or deceased) or groups to maintain a presence (e.g. have an account, Page, Group) on our platform:

1. Terrorist organizations and terrorists
2. Hate organizations and their leaders and prominent members
3. People notable for physically attacking people based on a protected characteristic
4. People who have committed or attempted mass murder
5. People who have committed multiple murder [sic]
6. Criminal organizations and their leaders and prominent members
7. Violent non-state actors

2. We do not allow any of the symbols of the above organizations or individuals to be shared on the platform unless it is to condemn or neutrally discuss.

3. We do not allow content that praises any of the above organizations or individuals or any acts committed by the above organizations or individuals, except Violent Non-State Actors.

4. We do not allow content that substantively supports any of the above organizations or individuals or any acts committed by the above organizations or individuals.

5. We do not allow content that praises, substantively supports, or represents events that are internally designated as violating or hate crimes.

6. We do not allow content that praises, substantively supports, or represents Hateful Ideologies.

7. We do not allow the following entities to maintain a Page, Group, Event, or IG Profile on our platform:

1. Militarized Social Movements (MSM)
 - a. Entities designated by DOI Policy as Militarized Social Movements can be found in KOIOS

The type of content that does not violate our policies and is therefore allowed on our platform.

1. Content that praises Violent Non-State Actors, unless it contains explicit reference to violence

2. Challenging historical events and facts (e.g. "The death toll of Stalin's purges has been grossly exaggerated")

3. Context related to any of the individuals or organization [sic] covered under this policy that is shared in the context of

1. Condemnation
2. News reporting
3. Academic debate and informative, educational discourse, including factual statements without praise, support, representation
4. Disapproval through humor (the onus needs to be on the user)

4. Depicting weaponry outside the context of terrorism, organized crime, or hate

5. Advocating:

1. Violence against nations, governments, organizations, or locations no smaller than a village (e.g. we should invade Libya).
2. Violence in a fictional setting (e.g. "kill all the Orcs in Mordor").
3. For capital or cruel and unusual punishment for crimes FB recognizes (e.g. "Hang Child Molesters")
4. For political, nationalist, or ideological movements that reject established or recognized political or governmental entities, so long as they do not meet any of the criteria for removal above.

6. Allow content that discusses whether mass murders / attempted mass murders or their perpetrators were justified, that fall into the following categories:

1. Discussions of laws, punishments, potential charges, legal outcomes, or potential legal defenses, even when such discussions take a favorable position towards the designated event or its perpetrator. **For Example:**

2. Allow: "A first degree murder charge isn't appropriate here, doesn't seem like the shooter premeditated the killings." [Discussion of charges]

3. Allow: "If the law says this isn't self-defense, then the law is wrong." [Discussions of Legal Defenses and Laws]

4. Allow: "I saw the tape - he's not guilty of murder! This was definitely self-defense!" [Discussions of Legal Defenses and Laws]

5. Allow: "They are innocent, they were protecting themselves." [Discussion of Legal Outcome and Defenses]

- 6. Allow: "The defendant shouldn't be blamed for what happened - he was in the wrong place at the wrong time" [Discussion of Laws, Punishments]
- 7. I'm not sure what all the fuss is about, he didn't do anything wrong - he just acted the way they teach you in self-defense classes." [Discussion of Laws, Defenses]
- 8. Allow: "It would be an injustice if she was found guilty, she's the real victim here" OR [Discussions of punishments, legal outcomes]
- 9. Remove: "He's a hero for defending himself!" [Contains praise beyond discussion of legal defenses.]
- 10. Remove: "Donate to the legal defense fund: [Link]" [Not discussion]

What are the definitions of Praise, Support and Representation as they apply to Dangerous Organizations and Individuals?

Praise

Rationale: Content that praises a designated entity, event, or ideology and seeks to make others think more positively of them. Where neutral speech discusses facts, history, political divisions, etc. Praise often engages in value-based statements and emotive argument.

VIOLATING: Content that seeks to:

1. Speak **positively** about the designated entity
 - a. This signal deals with praise that would make others think more positively of the organizations, aside from the more specific categories listed below.
 - i. Example: "Hizbul Mujahideen is looking out for Kashmiris like me"
 - ii. Example: Referring to a designated individual as a "hero"
 - iii. Example: "The fighters in the Islamic State are really brave."
 - iv Example: "The Sinola Cartel are donating most of their profits to charity."
 - b. **IGNORE:** Stating that an entity or ideology is not a **threat, relevant, or worthy of attention** is not speaking positively about that entity (e.g. "White Supremacy is not a threat")
 - c. **IGNORE:** Statements that a DOI entity were wrongly sanctioned, designated, etc. or otherwise should not have been sanctioned, designated, etc.
2. Give a dangerous organization or individual's cause sense of achievement.
 - a. Where **achievement** is defined as claiming victory or meeting a goal of the organization
 - i. Example: "Look at all the great work Al Qaeda does for the local community."
 - ii. Example: "Hizbul Mujahideen is winning the war for a free and independent Kashmir."
 - iii. Example: "Stormfront is spreading the word about nat-soc far and wide."
3. Legitimize the cause of a Dangerous Entity
 - a. Where **legitimize** is defined as: making claims about the **legal, moral, or other justification** for criminal, hateful, or terrorist activity that an entity participates in. This claim of justification must be present.
 - i. Example: "Hitler did nothing wrong."

ii. Example: “The members of the Sinola cartel are right to step in and fill the power vacuum in Mexico.”

iii. Example: “The Islamic State’s actions in Syria are justified because of the United States’ unjust occupation of the Middle East.”

b. This does not include statements presented in the form of a fact about the entity’s motives, but rather **glorifies the entity through the use of approving adjectives, phrases, imagery, etc.**

i. *Compare* “The IRA were pushed towards violence by the brutal practices of the British government in Ireland.” (IGNORE) with “The IRA *were right to use violence* to combat the brutal practices of the British Government during the 20th century.” (DELETE).

ii. The latter makes a normative judgment about the designated entity, expressing that they are morally justified for engaging in violent behavior. While similar, the former makes a statement in the form of a fact about the reasons behind an entities action, without the use of normative language, and thus is an ignore.

c. **IGNORE:** Stating that an entity or ideology is or is not **a threat, relevant, or worthy of attention** is not legitimizing the cause (e.g. “White Supremacy is not a threat.”)

4. Align oneself with a cause

a. Where **alignment** is ideological, rather than literal - expressing a belief in the stated goals, methods, etc of an organization or individual.

i. Example: “I stand behind Tommy Robinson.”

ii. Example: “Egalité et Réconciliation is standing up for my people and values.”

iii. Example: “#iamRGC”

iv. Example: *Posting an image of Osama Bin Laden with no caption, or a nonsense caption*

v. Example: Claiming a relationship with a designated entity

Substantive Support

Rationale: Content that Substantively supports a dangerous entity provides a tangible financial, operational, or strategic advantage to the entity. Content that calls for others to take action or not act in service or support of the entity. This can take the form of attempted fundraising, recruiting, or spreading official propaganda on behalf of the entity.

VIOLATING content that seeks to:

1. Give material aid to a designated dangerous organizations entity

a. Where **material aid** is defined as a specific and tangible form of support that is not directly financial.

i. Example: “Free martial arts lessons for all members of [Insert Entity name]”

ii. Example: “I am sending first aid kits to ISIS fighters!”

iii. Example: “All members of Hitler Youth in town for tomorrow’s protest can stay at my apartment for free”

iv. Example: “Anyone coming to the Unite The Right rally can stay at my house”

2. Improve the financial status of subjects - funneling money towards or away

a. Where **Improving the Financial Status** is defined as providing direct (fundraising, donation-drive, etc.) or indirect (money laundering, accounting or banking services, etc.) financial support to an organization.

i. Example: “Donate to the Islamic State’s Kickstarter! [Link]”

ii. Example: “I’ll give the KKK a dollar for every like & share!”

iii. Example: “Free tax preparation services for Proud Boys”

3. Call to Action

a. Where a **Call to Action** is defined as directing the audience to take some action or stop an action in furtherance of the organization or cause

i. Example: “Contact us via Telegram”

ii. Example: “View our website for more information”

iii. Example: “All proud white men should support the Nazi party”

4. Recruiting on Behalf of a Designated Entity or Ideology

a. Where **Recruitment** is defined as encouraging, coordinating or arranging for an individual to become a member of a designated entity.

i. Example: “Join the fight for your homeland, join HuM”

ii. Example: “If you want to go to Syria and fight for the Caliphate, DM me”

iii. Example: “If you want to live the 14:88 life, reach out to me”

5. Channel information or resources, or distributing official communications on behalf of a designated entity

a. Example: Distributing official communications

i. **Note:** Posting an official communication of a DO entity with no caption or a nonsense caption falls under this section.

b. Example: Posting a video or audio produced by a hate figure, or a speech they performed.

c. Example: “Join the fight for your homeland, join HuM” (also an example of recruitment)

d. Example: Creating an “Unofficial” or “Fan” Page/Group/Account/etc. dedicated to the DOI entity.

e. Example: Directly quoting a DOI entity without caption that condemns or neutrally discusses

f. Example: Sharing a Recording of a DO

g. **IGNORE:** Dangerous Organizations materials shared as part of neutral news reporting

Representation

Rationale: Representation mostly exists in the realm of complex objects - where a group, page, event, etc presents itself as being the designated entity - or a member of the designated organization. When assessing simple objects, representation is only present when a user claims to be a designated individual, or a member of a dangerous organization.

VIOLATING: Content that makes an:

1. Explicit Statement of membership in a dangerous organization, or a statement that you are a dangerous individual.

- a. Ex. "I am a grand dragon of the KKK",
- b. Ex. "I joined Hizbul Mujihadeen to fight for the future of Kashmir"
- c. **Note:** This is distinct from **aligning oneself with a cause (Praise)** as here the user is claiming to be a part of the dangerous entity, rather than simply believing in the goals, mission, or tactics of the organization.

2. Creating a Page, Profile, Group, IG account, etc. that purports to be a dangerous DOI entity or maintained on behalf of a DOI entity

a. Unless it says "unofficial" or "fan account" or any other type of signifier. In other words, the onus is on the user to prove that it is not an official Page. Such "unofficial" or "fan" pages should be treated as Support (Channeling information on behalf of)

- i. Example: "Osama Bin Laden"
- ii. Example: "American Nazi Party"

3. Creating an event that purports to be made by, or on behalf of, a designated DOI entity

- a. Example: "Official Annual Meeting of the Nazi Party 2019"

B. What if a piece of content meets the definitions of more than one of Praise, Support and Representation?

If a piece of content seems to meet the criteria for more than one of Praise, Support and Representation, apply the following hierarchy:

- 1. If **Representation** is present, always label the content as Representation
- 2. If **Substantive Support** is present, and Representation is not, always mark Substantive Support.
- 3. If **Praise** is present and no other categories are present, then mark Praise

Examples:

- 1. A piece of content features a leader of a dangerous organization speaking about their mission and a caption that speaks positively about the content. Both Praise and Substantive Support are present, so mark Substantive Support.

2. A piece of content claims the author is a member of a dangerous organization and includes a telegram channel that potential recruits can join to volunteer. Substantive Support and Representation are present, so mark Representation.

If a piece of content meets multiple subcategories within one of Praise, Support or Representation, simply mark as the relevant category. Example:

1. A piece of content meets the definition for both “Speaking positively about the entity” and “Aligning oneself with an entities cause”, which are both subcategories of Praise. The content should be labeled as Praise.

C. What is the difference between “speaking positively about a designated entity” (Praise) and “channeling information on behalf of a designated entity” (Substantive Support)?

Consider content to be speaking positively about a designated entity when three conditions are met:

1. It does **not** meet the definition of “channeling information on behalf of a designated entity”

2. It does **not** meet the definition of any other subcategory of Praise (“Giving a designated entity a sense of achievement, Legitimizing the cause of a designated entity; or Aligning oneself with a designated entity’s cause”)

3. The content through a combination of words, images, videos and/or emojis expresses admiration, approval or other positive feeling about the designated entity or its goals.

D. What does the policy mean by “official communications” of a dangerous entity?

Any of the following:

1. There is a known watermark from a media wing or other designated entity in the image.

2. The content is posted by a known media arm of the dangerous entity.

3. The caption states that it is produced by or on behalf of a designated entity.

4. The content itself claims that it is made by or on behalf of a designated entity

5. The content features, or claims to feature, a leader, spokesperson, or a known or self-proclaimed member of a designated entity speaking about the organization or its cause

E. What is an “explicit statement of membership” as it pertains to Representation?

An explicit statement of membership is a clear statement by a user, group, page, etc. that they belong to a designated entity. This can come in the form of an actual statement (“I am a proud member of the Nazi Party”) or an image of a membership card, tattoo of the group’s logo, or other similar proof of membership. This is not the same as affiliation with a designated entity, and simple objects should only be marked as Representation when such an explicit signal of personal membership is present.

F. Is supporting the use of “concentration camps”, “gas chambers” and/or “send/burn people in/to the ovens” allowed?

1. No. References to supporting/advocating the use of “concentration camps”, “gas chambers” and “sending/burning people in/to the ovens” support Nazi extermination program, unless the poster clearly specifies that he/she is referring to something else (e.g. in the case of gas chambers legal capital punishment, military drills, etc.)

G. What indicators do we use to identify a member of a terrorist org?

1. Please check if the person has any of the following:
 - a. Onsite terrorism violations, OR
 - b. The person is on the DTO list, OR
 - c. Documented in tasks based on our evidence in accepted resources list, OR
 - d. Is under current legal proceedings for terrorist activities
 - e. Is the leader or founder of a designated terrorist organization

H. Is saying you are a member of a terrorist organization or hate organization considered representation?

1. Yes. If someone says “I am a member of ISIS” or “I belong to the KKK”, “I’m a member of Cartel del Gollo” this should be considered representation.

I. Is claiming a relationship or association with a dangerous organization or dangerous figure a violation?

1. Yes. Claiming a relationship with a dangerous organization or figure, e.g. saying they are a “friend/brother/sister/comrade” is considered praise. Wishing them a happy birthday is also a way of claiming a relationship and should be considered praise. Please note, the examples are illustrative and not meant to be exhaustive.

J. What do emojis mean when used in content about dangerous organizations?

1. The most common reading for emojis for praise/support and condemnation are included below

[MISSING]

K. If an ISIS flag is in another language other than Arabic, should we treat it as an ISIS flag?

1. Yes, if the translation is exactly the same as the Arabic text we can find on any ISIS logo.

L. Who are considered Mass Murderers, Attempted Mass Murderers, and Multiple Murderers?

1. **Mass Murderer:** 3+ casualties (deaths or injuries), not including perpetrator, during a single incident with no time between murders.

2. **Attempted Mass Murderer:**

a. Perpetrator(s) uses a weapon or vehicle to attempt mass harm in a public space or against or than 1 person OR

b. Perpetrator attempts to use a weapon in a public space or against more than 1 person, not including the perpetrator, and has any of the following indicators of mass harm intent during the incident(s):

- i. Wears tactical attire or paraphernalia, such as a helmet, mask body armor, multiple gun holsters, or high capacity magazines;
- ii. Uses an automatic or semi-automatic firearm;
- iii. Has more than one weapon on their person;
- iv. Has authored a manifesto or similar declaration of motive related to the attack (please consider whether or not this qualifies for Terrorism designation)

3. Multiple Murderer: 2+ killings not including the perpetrator, over multiple incidents or locations

4. Non-exhaustive list of examples we consider mass murderers/multiple murderers/attempted mass murderers: Ted Bundy (American serial killer from the 1970s), Mutsuo Toi (Japanese mass murderer from the 1930s) and Charles Sobhraj (global serial killer active between 1960's-1990's). If there are multiple historical examples from specific markets that fit into the definition of mass murderer/attempted mass murderer/multiple murderer, please treat them as such and remove all praise, support, and representation of them. If unsure flag to the Market team or Organic Content Policy. Only recent events must be flagged and designated by Organic Content Policy.

M. What is the definition of casualties?

- 1. Confirmed deaths or severely injured (e.g. we have context that the person has experienced life-threatening event or may not live) *Note: context that a person was shot is sufficient to infer severe injury. There is no need to infer the seriousness of gunshot wounds).*

N. Do we consider individuals convicted of terrorism as terrorists under our policy?

No, we designate individuals/organizations only if they meet our internal criteria for designation, irrespective of a conviction or charge under local law.

O. Is identifying oneself or expressing aspiration/intention to become a member of a recognized category of dangerous organization and/or individual a violation? E.g. 'Aspiring school shooter,' 'mass murderer,' 'future terrorist,' 'cartel leader'

- 1. Yes, this is always violating unless there's clear context to raise awareness or other context such as a non-violating fictional setting like video games or movie characters, etc.

P. Is praise or support of an action that would qualify as a terror event, hate crime, or other violating events violating? E.g. 'I love school shootings,' 'More lynchings are needed in this country,' 'I support bombing government buildings'

- 1. Yes, this is always violating.

Q. What is considered a designated Hateful Ideology?

1. Below is the list of designated Hateful Ideologies that are violating under the Dangerous Organizations policy. We will remove content that explicitly praises, supports, or represents these ideologies. Content that condemns or discusses (without praising or supporting) these ideologies is allowed.

a. White Supremacy:

- i. Remove: "White supremacist and proud."
- ii. Remove: "White supremacy is the right thing."
- iii. Allow: I am against all forms of white supremacy."

iv. “Many people believe that white supremacy is not hateful.”

b. White Separatism:

- i. Remove: “Asians are taking all of our jobs. This is why white separatism is the only way we can survive.”
- ii. Remove: “What’s the answer to this immigration problem? White separatism.”

c. Nazism:

- i. Remove: “Aryan master race — Nazism had it right all along!”

d. White Nationalism:

- i. Remove: “I am white. I am a nationalist. I am a proud white nationalist.”
- ii. Remove: “Yes, I am a white nationalist. No, I am not a racist.”

NOTE: We allow praise, support, and representation for other types of nationalism and separatism.

R. Are individuals known to have been directly involved with a global dangerous organization (e.g. ISIS), even if not known to have directly participated in fighting, considered to be terrorists/dangerous individuals?

Yes, our definition includes individuals who were not necessarily directly involved in fighting/directly inflicting violence. For instance, those who traveled to Syria as “ISIS brides” to serve the cause of the dangerous organization, are considered to be terrorist individuals.

S. What kind of public debate and “neutral discussion” about returning foreign fighters, for instance who traveled from Europe, is allowed and not considered as PSR?

- * Debating the citizenship of fighters
- * Debating the return/re-admission of a foreign fighter so they can be prosecuted in their original country;
- * Debating the age of fighters;
- * Debating the potential grooming/propaganda directed at young people, which led to the radicalization of foreign fighters, without directing praise at the individual

T. DO we allow third-party facilitation of direct engagement/conversations with any designated orgs/individuals through hashtags, polls, or other channels on our platforms?

No, this would be considered a show of support and representation by providing a platform for engagement to the subject. If the intent of the third-party facilitation is to condemn the represented designated org/individual, then it would not be violating.

U. Political Commentary and Hate Speech: How do I know if a photo is being shared as political commentary?

Look to see the tell tale signs:

1. has the photo been edited in photo editing software to insert a hate symbol?
2. is the subject a public figure?
3. is there a national flag also depicted?
4. Check out the examples below which clearly indicate political commentary:

[Images of George W. Bush and Angela Merkel depicted as Nazis]

V. What is a Militarized Social Movement (MSM)?

There are two types of MSMs, Militias and Groups Supporting Violent Acts Amid Protests (GSVAAP)

1. A militia is defined as a non-state actor that is militarized (group that uses firearms as part of its training, communication, and presence; and operating or acting as if to take the place or supplement regular military or law enforcement forces) AND at least one of the following signals:

- a. Coordinating (statements of intent, calls to action, representing, supporting or advocacy) for violence or civil war
- b. Distributes information about the tactical use of weapons for combat
- c. Coordinates militarized tactical coordination in a present or future armed civil conflict or civil war

2. A Group Supporting Violent Acts Amid Protests (GSVAAP) is defined as a non-state actor that meets at least one of the signals below:

- a. Coordinating (statement of intent, calls to action, representing, supporting or advocacy) OR depicting, admitting to, or promoting:
 - i. Acts of street violence against civilians or law enforcement OR
 - ii. Arson, looting, or other destruction of private or public property; OR
- b. Threatens to violently disrupt an election process, OR
- c. Calls to action, statements of intent or advocating to bring weapons to a location when the stated intent is to intimidate people amid a protest.

W. What are examples of “praise” for Violent Non-State Actors that we would remove because they contain explicit reference to violence?

We allow “praise” of Violent Non-State Actors, unless the content contains explicit references to violence, violent acts or events. The following examples would be removed per policy:

1. “The FSA killed 1 from Assad’s forces. It’s a great day for all of us.”
2. “Arakan Army soldiers bombed enemy territory killing many and was victorious in protecting us.”
3. “They did a great deed by attacking these troops. I praise them for their actions and raise the FSA flag.”

K. How are quotations from designated entities treated?

1. REMOVE – If a designated entity is quoted with no context it should be treated as substantive support.

2. REMOVE – If a designated entity is attributed to a quote even if we know or do not know the quote was from them or not it should be treated as substantive support

3. ALLOW – If the quotation is posted by a Page representing a legitimate news agency/media outlet

4. ALLOW – If the quote disavows the violence or promotion of hatred that got the entity labeled as a dangerous entity in the first place.

5. EXAMPLES:

a. “As long as I’m alive, there will be no rest for the enemies of Islam, I will continue my mission against them.” – Osama Bin Laden – REMOVE

b. “Those who want to live, let them fight, and those who do not want to fight in this world of eternal struggle do not deserve to live.” – Adolf Hitler – REMOVE

Y. If someone is quoting a designated entity but not using quotation marks, should we consider it a quotation?

Yes, if you have context that a designated entity is being quoted, we should treat it as a quotation. For example, in Arabic a colon is sometimes used as a quotation mark. Another example would be where the text is attributed to the leader/member of a dangerous entity:

1. You must believe before everything else that the revolution must come, that there is no other choice – Abdullah Ocalan

2. Adolf Hitler: It is not truth that matters, but victory.