

# Monitoring the evolution of antisemitic discourse on extremist social media using BERT

Raza Ul Mustafa, Nathalie Japkowicz

American University, 4400 Massachusetts Ave NW, Washington, DC 20016, USA

{rmustafa,japkowicz}@american.edu

**Abstract**—Racism and intolerance on social media contribute to a toxic online environment which may spill offline to foster hatred, and eventually lead to physical violence. That is the case with online antisemitism, the specific category of hatred considered in this study. Tracking antisemitic themes and their associated terminology over time in online discussions could help monitor the sentiments of their participants and their evolution, and possibly offer avenues for intervention that may prevent the escalation of hatred. Due to the large volume and constant evolution of online traffic, monitoring conversations manually is impractical. Instead, we propose an automated method that extracts antisemitic themes and terminology from extremist social media over time and captures their evolution. Since supervised learning would be too limited for such a task, we created an *unsupervised online machine learning* approach that uses large language models to assess the contextual similarity of posts. The method clusters similar posts together, dividing, and creating additional clusters over time when sub-themes emerge from existing ones or new themes appear. The antisemitic terminology used within each theme is extracted from the posts in each cluster. Our experiments show that our methodology outperforms existing baselines and demonstrates the kind of themes and sub-themes it discovers within antisemitic discourse along with their associated terminology. We believe that our approach will be useful for monitoring the evolution of all kinds of hatred beyond antisemitism on social platforms.

**Index Terms**—hate speech, concept formation, monitoring, antisemitic speech, large language model, NLP, social media, BERT, transfer learning

## I. INTRODUCTION

Social<sup>1</sup> media has played a crucial role in simplifying the human process of joining communities of like-minded individuals. People use these platforms to engage with others by way of expressing their opinions and commenting on those of others. While technology has had a positive impact on many people’s lives, it has also brought serious negative consequences onto society, including an acceleration of the spread of hatred.

In the past few years, a large number of studies have been devoted to automatic hate speech detection [1]–[4]. The more difficult task of understanding the nature of online discussions automatically has been considered, though only rarely. On those few occasions, the task was considered in a static fashion, ignoring the fact that online discussions evolve

quickly. Though these attempts constitute a good start, they are not sufficient since organizations that seek to promote social peace need to be informed of changes in discussion themes as they occur rather than on, say, a monthly basis, when the software is run on a new batch of posts. The purpose of our work is to explore the ability of machine learning (ML) and natural language processing (NLP) tools to extract a continuously evolving map of the semantic themes represented in social media posts, automatically. To provide continuity and avoid catastrophic forgetting, it is of utmost importance that past knowledge be preserved and only updated when necessary.

We develop a method to continuously monitor antisemitic themes from discussions taking place on extremist social media. Many antisemitic themes have emerged throughout the years, making antisemitism an unfortunately good testbed for our approach. Indeed, Jews have been victims of discrimination for centuries, sometimes accused of having too much power, controlling the world economy, or being disloyal. Discussions and conspiracy theories about the Holocaust abound. Other historical tropes include: “Jews killed Jesus” and “Jews are greedy”. These conspiracy theories evolve continuously developing new themes, such as linking Jews to the COVID-19 pandemic [5]. The purpose of our endeavor is to stay ahead of the “mood” in extremist social media communities where antisemitic posts are frequent, so as to be aware of emerging new themes or recurring old ones in the same or altered form. To be practical, given the exploratory and continuous nature of the task, the method we devised is unsupervised and works in a continual and, thus, stable fashion using state-of-the-art ML and NLP techniques such as Large Language Models (LLMs). Though antisemitism was used in this work as a case study, the methods we propose will apply to any other kinds of hatred, such as Islamophobia, anti-Black or anti-Asian racism, anti-LGBTQ+ discourse, etc.

Our proposed approach begins by considering posts collected in a first time-window and groups together semantically related themes (i.e., concepts, topics). It then proceeds with the next time-window, adding new posts to the previously discovered themes and discovering new themes in the data if the discourse they represent stands semantically apart from the themes already present in memory and sub-themes, if they share enough commonality with existing ones. The system then considers the posts collected in the next time-window and repeats the same steps over and over.

**Acknowledgements:** Research supported by American University’s Signature Research Initiative program. We also thank Matan Schwartz for his initial help with this project.

<sup>1</sup>Warning: This paper contains examples of racist and antisemitic statements that may be disturbing to the reader.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we discuss the philosophical basis for our work along with related studies from the fields of Computer Science, Psychology and Business. We then review ML and NLP techniques previously used for combating online hate speech and antisemitism in Section III. Section IV describes our methodology. We present and discuss our results in Section V and conclude our paper in Section VI.

## II. GENERAL BACKGROUND

In this section, we consider related work from four different disciplines: Philosophy, Computer Science, Psychology, Business.

*Philosophical Concept Theory:* Our work is based on Philosophical Concept Theory [6] used extensively in the fields of Psychology and Cognitive Science. In a nutshell, we take the view that concepts are representations of the mind and that complex concepts are composed of sub-concepts. Furthermore, we subscribe to the Prototype Theory rooted in Wittgenstein [7] and Rosch [8]’s thought where a concept is defined by its most central, or *prototypical*, instance and the association of a separate instance to that concept depends on its distance to the prototype. We illustrate these ideas with the following example. A common concept is that flowers are beautiful and fragrant. However, the reality is more complex: while most flowers fit the common concept, some flowers are odorless, and some are even pungent and cause allergies. Therefore, beauty and fragrance, while brought together in the common concept of a flower, can also be taken apart. That is the case for the concept of flowers that are beautiful but pungent (or odorless). Such flowers remain semantically close to the prototypical instance (a rose, for example) of beautiful and fragrant flowers because of their many shared features, but they must be represented by a different sub-concept since, while still beautiful, they are not fragrant. Similarly, flowers that cause allergies must be represented by yet a new sub-concept that intersects with the concepts of beautiful and fragrant flowers and beautiful but pungent (or odorless) ones. Our work equates clusters of posts to concepts and subconcepts and assesses the relations between them by means of their distance in LLM embedded space.

*Lifelong Unsupervised Learning:* The method designed in this paper is inspired by a recent approach for lifelong anomaly detection presented in [9], [10]. The main purpose of that approach was to build an evolving representation and organization of memory to ensure that new concepts could be coherently added to the organized structure while older pieces of knowledge could be retrieved efficiently in a lifelong learning regimen. The stability of the method ensured that catastrophic forgetting was avoided. Anomaly detection was performed on a continual basis by checking whether the new data fell into one of the categories present in memory. If not, a decision was made as to whether the new data was anomalous or not. If it was deemed anomalous, an alert was issued and the data not saved. Otherwise, the new data was introduced into the memory structure as either a sub-concept

or a new concept altogether. Decisions were made based on distance in an autoencoder-based embedding space. The approach was tested and validated on tabular data representing fairly straightforward hierarchically organized categories of data. One of the challenges of the present study is to see to what extent the principles used in the earlier work can apply to text data and imprecise concepts that are not always hierarchically organized.

*Psychological Studies on Hate Speech:* To underline the importance of the task we address with our method, we review two related psychological studies on hate speech that seek to extract similar types of information as ours from their analysis, albeit manually. In the first study, closest to our proposed one, [11] extracted four semantic themes from a series of comments responding to a Youtube video that displayed a white British woman abusing black passengers on the Tube (subway). The four themes they organized the posts around are: 1) posts that explain the abuser’s behavior; 2) posts that counter the abuser’s behavior with aggressive and hateful language; 3) posts that categorize other posters into racist or non racist people; 4) posts that discuss what it means to be British. The authors’ analysis led them to conclude that online hate speech does not necessarily generate more hate speech, a potentially useful conclusion for this specific content and platform. In a second study, [12] analyzed the behavioral roles taken by online users responding to hate speech posts in Ethiopia. They identified five major roles—trolling, pace-making, peace-making, informing, and guarding—and used their conclusions to make recommendations on how to counter online hatred. Though like in our work, both studies support the need for a deeper semantic analysis of posts rather than their mere classification as hateful or not, it is important to note that both were conducted through human analysis of a relatively small and static number of posts. Our work, in contrast, seeks to perform the same type of analysis automatically and dynamically.

*Information Extraction from Customer Surveys:* Although the aim of our study is new in the context of automated hate speech analysis, the business community has understood the value of extracting information from product reviews for some time. As a matter of fact, it has already seized upon the power of AI to learn how to extract automatically the areas of satisfaction and concern about its products expressed by customers. This is shown in both academic research papers [13], [14] and commercial products available to businesses. It is important to note, however, that the domain explored by such business tools is much simpler than the hate speech domain. Indeed, human beings typically have many conflicting and hard-to-express resentments about other human beings, and these feelings may fluctuate as a result of national or international news items or personal experiences. On the other hand, feelings about purchased goods are rather straightforward and limited since they are non-conflictual and pertain to simple and finite properties such as the product’s price, functionality, or looks. In addition, the approaches considered in these works take a static rather than a dynamic view of

the problem. For these reasons, the techniques used by the business community, though relevant, are not sufficient, and new methods must be developed to handle the monitoring of complex themes that also evolve over time.

### III. BACKGROUND ON COMPUTER-BASED HATE SPEECH ANALYSIS

As previously mentioned, hate-speech detection has become an important area of study in NLP as reported by a number of surveys on the topic [1]–[4]. Recently, many of these studies have employed deep learning techniques [15]. In [16], the authors proposed a Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) based framework for the classification of racism & sexism, offensive speech, and cyberbullying using text and metadata. In [17], the LSTM (Long Short-Term Memory) architecture is used for the classification of abusive content on social media while [18] uses more advanced recurrent neural network techniques to classify sexism and misogyny. In another study, [19] compared multiple deep learning techniques to classify tweets into three categories: racism, sexism, or neither.

There have been a few studies devoted to the particular issue of online antisemitism. [20] used a transformer architecture (RoBERTa) to classify antisemitic content into four categories: political, economic, religious, or racial. In [5] the authors used Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) to find topics particularly related to the coronavirus and antisemitism in the Hungarian language. [21] describes a large study with several outcomes. In that work, the authors collected 7 million images and comments from 4chan and Gab to study the spread of antisemitic memes. They provide a framework to better understand antisemitic memes and content and their relation to political events. In one part of the study, they used Word2Vec to discover words closely associated with the term "Jew" and used network analysis tools such as community discovery in an attempt to uncover the themes represented by these terms. The themes they uncovered are: Jewish moral corruptness, Jews as geopolitical conspirators, ethnic Jewish identities, Kabbalistic and cryptic themes, and religious or theological topics. Following this study, [22] considers both antisemitism and Islamophobia. In that work, the authors constructed two lexicons: a lexicon of 48 Antisemitic terms and another of 135 Islamophobic terms. The lexicons were built using pre-existing knowledge graphs, pre-trained word embedding models, and manual annotations. Using their lexicons, they extracted posts from 4Chan and analyzed them using sentence embeddings by BERT and clustering using HDBSCAN. They subsequently analyzed the groupings qualitatively.

We summarize the previous work in Table I. Our proposed approach is summarized at the bottom of the table. As can be seen, our work is most similar to [5], [21] and [22]. The main difference between these three works and ours is that they consider a static situation whereas our approach is an online machine learning approach that provides self-adaptation mechanisms in a dynamic setting, making sure that the knowledge base induced in previous steps is not compromised by a new influx of information. Self-adaptation,




Fig. 1. Overview of the methodology.

dynamism, and stability aside, of the three methods closest to ours, [22] is the one that uses the closest methodology since [5] performs topic extraction using LDA, and [21] does so using Word2Vec. These two methodologies are less recent and typically obtain lower performance than the one used by both [22] and our work: transformers. In particular, both works use BERT, though while [22] rely on pre-trained language models, we fine-tuned our model to the particular type of data we analyze. Like in our study, [22] uses clustering on the language representations learned and, in particular, HDBSCAN. Rather than using an off-the-shelf static clustering approach, however, we design our own approach that works in a dynamic environment without causing catastrophic forgetting.

### IV. METHODOLOGY

Our antisemitic discourse monitoring approach takes as input continuously arriving batches of posts and organizes them into a knowledge base containing the antisemitic themes they convey in an unsupervised way. In more detail, we designed a repeating two step-method that takes the following actions for each batch of incoming posts: 1) it generates contextual embeddings from the posts using a fine-tuned BERT model; 2) it inputs these embeddings into our newly proposed divisive clustering approach which adaptively updates the last clustering to integrate the new batch of embeddings into the existing knowledge base using local or global updates. Decisions are made based on the distance in embedding space between the new posts and the existing cluster centers. The two main mechanisms used in the process are illustrated in Figure 1. Each step of the process will be described in more detail below.

#### A. Dataset and Pre-Processing

1) *Data Collection and Labeling:* This work is part of a larger project entitled unmasking antisemitism that our organization has undertaken to control anti-Jewish hatred. Under this project, a data team collected and labeled the data set using third-party software Pyrra<sup>2</sup>. A baseline was set for data selection under which currently known antisemitic seed words from the American Jewish Committee (AJC) and other sources were used (e.g., cabal, new world order). During labeling, the data team carefully examined word selection in posts as well as other pieces of information such as i) does

<sup>2</sup><https://www.pyrratech.com/>

TABLE I  
COMPARISON TO TRADITIONAL WORK AND TECHNIQUES USED IN HATE SPEECH DETECTION.

Ref	Unsupervised	Online	Term Extraction	Topic Extraction	ML Tools	Hate Type
[16]	×	×	×	×	RNNs	racism & sexism, offensive speech, and cyberbullying
[17]	×	×	×	×	LSTMs	abusive content
[18]	×	×	×	×	LSTMs, CNNs	sexism and misogyny
[19]	×	×	×	×	LSTMs, CNNs, GloVe	racism, sexism, or neither
[20]	×	×	×	×	RoBERTa	antisemitism
[5]	✓	×	×	✓	LDA	coronavirus related antisemitism
[21]	✓	×	✓	✓	Word2Vec, network analysis	antisemitism
[22]	✓	×	✓	✓	BERT, HDBSCAN	antisemitism and islamophobia
This work	✓	✓	✓	✓	BERT, novel algorithm	antisemitism




Fig. 2. BERT layers to extract contextual embedding.

the post demonstrate an applied understanding of particular antisemitic tropes? ii) does the post express themes of control over media, politics, academia, economy, or culture at large? and so on. It then classified the data into different pre-defined historic tropes or generated variations on them when the post was found to be antisemitic. The labels generated by the data team are used in this work to evaluate our approach and the baselines we will be comparing it to.<sup>3</sup>

2) *Data Pre-Processing*: The initial step of our approach, not shown in Figure 1, involves preparing the dataset using different techniques. We first normalize the text documents by converting uppercase to lowercase and replacing references. Next, we remove links from the text. However, we replace the links with the titles of the posts they lead to. Finally, we remove all special characters, white spaces, and line breaks using regular expressions. The cleaned-up texts are then fed into BERT for tokenization into small units (words or word parts) and contextual embeddings are generated to facilitate the discovery of underlying concepts in the text. The details of the contextual embedding method used here are described in the next section.

### B. Contextual Embedding

To convert our extremist cleaned-up dataset into embeddings, we use embedding techniques derived from large language models to extract a structural representation that captures semantic relationships and contextual meanings. This ap-

proach facilitates the categorization of information to uncover hidden patterns [20]. Since BERT doesn't possess vocabulary specific to our domain, we first added Out of Vocabulary (OOV) tokens and fine-tuned the BERT uncased model as in [23]. During concept extraction, we consider different types of combinations to extract contextual embedding from the BERT (see Figure 2). To this end, we first explored the summation of the last four layers, followed by the concatenation of the last four layers. We also considered the pooled layer, which provides 768-dimensional sentence-level embeddings. In our case, the last hidden layer, after taking the mean of tokens level embedding, produces the best results and was therefore the embedding technique we retained. These variations allowed us to evaluate the impact of different feature representations, contributing to a deeper understanding of the model's capabilities and suitability for our specific NLP task.

### C. Antisemitic Themes discovery

We now describe the approach we designed to extract concepts from extremist posts. To simulate a streaming situation, we divide the dataset into batches of vectors  $\vec{v}$  (each containing instances of posts embeddings) and feed each batch into algorithm 1. Algorithm 1 uses distances in the embedding space along with several thresholds to capture the antisemitic themes expressed in our extremist dataset. Several parameters need to be set prior to running the algorithm:  $k$ ,  $lo$ ,  $hi$ , and thresholds  $\lambda$  and  $\delta$ .  $k$  represents the number of initial concepts considered in the first batch of data  $\vec{v}_1$ . In our work, we set  $k = 2$ , assuming that the posts in  $\vec{v}_1$  align along two main themes.  $lo$  and  $hi$  represent the lower and higher percentile marks used in our computations to consider whether a post is within the vicinity of a concept or not. We set them to  $lo = 40$  and  $hi = 60$ , here.  $\lambda$  is the multiplier used (combined with  $lo$  and  $hi$ ) to calculate the percentile distribution ranges that will help determine whether instances from a given batch are outliers with respect to the concept considered. Finally,  $\delta$ , determines the minimum number of outlying instances required to justify the need for an additional concept in memory (i.e., an increase in  $k$ ). In our work, we choose a  $\lambda$  value of 0.25, and  $\delta$  is set to 15% of the batch size.

A crucial aspect of the algorithm is its stability. Indeed, given its continual learning nature, it is imperative that when new information comes in, previous knowledge is preserved to

<sup>3</sup>The coding statement used by the data team is available upon request.

the greatest extent possible. To implement this requirement, we only allow for two kinds of updates: a local update and a global one, each with the following allowances and limitations. The local adjustment phase may be drastic, but it can involve only one concept. The global adjustment phase is much lighter but it may affect all the concepts in memory. The two adjustments are shown in Figure 3 where the top figure illustrates a local adjustment while the bottom one illustrates a global one. The leftmost pictures show the “before” situation with black dots on the top figure and green ones on the bottom representing data that has arrived in a new batch, but has not yet been processed. The rightmost pictures show the “after” situation, i.e., the result of the processing in each case. What is important to note in the top figure is that while the original C0 concept gets split into two new concepts C0 and C2, concept C1 is not affected by this change. That is an instance of a local adjustment. In the bottom figure, an example of a global adjustment, no new concept is created, but both C1 and C2 are slightly modified (their center and/or spread change from the picture on the left to that on the right) to accommodate the new data. C0 could have accommodated new data as well, but in our particular illustration, no new data affected it.

We now describe Algorithm 1 line by line. It begins on line 1 where the batch number  $b$  is set to 1. On line 2, a model is built by clustering the data in  $v_1$  using the k-means algorithm (we chose an initial value of  $k = 2$ ). Next, on lines 3-4, we store the initial centroid values in  $cc$  and initialize the semantic similarity structure,  $ss$ , that associates the two concepts most closely related to one another. Specifically,  $ss$  is a list of  $[r, l]$ 's, where  $r$  refers to the root concept that already existed in memory, and  $l$ , the concept derived from  $r$  during local updating.  $l$  has some degree of similarity with  $r$  though the majority of the data in  $l$  represents a new concept. On line 4, we have  $r_1 = r_2 = 0$  since these are the initial concepts with no root from which they derived. During our continual learning process, new concepts are created or old ones modified based on percentile distributions and numbers of outlying instances, as illustrated in Figure 3. On line 5, we increment the batch number and on line 6, we assign the next batch of posts to  $curr$ . Line 7 is the while loop that drives the continual consideration of new batches of posts. Inside the loop, line 8 calculates the size of the batch and assigns it to  $s$ . Line 9 is another loop that considers each of the concepts currently present in memory, in turn. The purpose of that loop is to implement the local updates of the type shown on the top of Figure 3. In more detail, lines 10-22 are repeated for each concept in memory with respect to the current batch,  $curr$ . The purpose of the loop is to estimate whether the data in the batch fits the current concept well or whether it would be beneficial to split it. This question is repeated for each of the current concepts in memory and in every case, if the answer is yes,  $k$  gets incremented. The decision of whether to increment  $k$  or not for a given concept is done by first, determining the lower and upper percentiles of the distance distribution to find out whether a particular post belongs to concept  $c$  and falls within the outlier category, and second, seeing whether the number

of instances from the batch to be considered outliers by these percentiles exceeds a specific threshold. In more detail, on line 10, a vector is calculated that stores the distance of each instance in the batch to the concept's centroid. Lines 11-12 calculate the lower and upper distance values representing the  $lo^{th}$  (40) and  $hi^{th}$  (60)'s percentiles. These correspond to the limits within which a post is considered the purview of concept  $c$ . These values are used on lines 13-14, along with threshold  $\lambda$  (.25) to determine the lower and upper percentile distribution ranges used to establish whether an instance in the batch is an outlier or not. On line 15,  $out$  is assigned all the instances from the current batch that are the purview of concept  $c$  and yet deviate too much from its centroid (either from the lower or from the upper end). On line 16, the number of instances in  $out$  is pitted against threshold  $\delta$ . If that number exceeds  $\delta$  (15%), k-means is run with  $k=2$  on all instances of concept  $c$  ( $\bar{c}$ ) and all instances contained in  $out$  on line 17 to split the concept and its outliers appropriately (see top of Figure 3). On lines 18-20, the centroids  $cc$  are updated, the number of concepts present in memory,  $k$ , is incremented, and the cluster pair is added to the semantic similarity list,  $ss$ . For example, in the top situation of Figure 3, C2 is created and was derived from C0 (which itself was shifted), so we add  $[C0, C2]$  to  $ss$ . Line 21 ends the “if statement” that causes a local update to occur, while line 22 terminates the inner loop that considers each concept in memory one after the other. Lines 23-24 implement the second type of adjustment, the global adjustment, that takes place in our algorithm. This consists of simply running k-means on the union of all batches of data seen so far with the updated value of  $k$ . Since  $k$  fits the data perfectly thanks to our carefully crafted local adjustment approach and since k-means has theoretical guarantees of stability [24], line 23 will have the minimum effect of adjusting the centroids as shown at the bottom of Figure 3, thus adjusting the knowledge in a stable manner, as required. Lines 25-26 increment the batch number and assign the next batch to  $curr$  prior to looping back to line 7. The algorithm terminates if no new batch is present. It is important to note that this process is a continual learning process. However, though our approach has focused on the stability of the memory-building process, it has left out a number of features necessary in lifelong learning. To ensure our system's long-term viability, we will outfit it, in the future, with lifelong learning features such as those proposed in [10] including knowledge distillation and experience replay.

## V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We now discuss both the quantitative and qualitative ways in which we tested our trope discovery approach. We recall that our approach is dynamic and creates clusterings over time. Unfortunately, there are no clear baselines for comparing the performance of our approach over others in that fashion. Therefore, we consider the final clustering output by our approach and compare it quantitatively to those of state-of-the-art static clustering methods, along with qualitative considerations. The section starts with a quantitative analysis, followed by a qualitative one. Using specific information from




Fig. 3. Local and Global Updates.

the qualitative analysis, we then return to the quantitative analysis focusing on particular regions of the clustering.

### A. Quantitative Analysis

We compared the final clustering obtained by our method to the following five state-of-the-art clustering approaches.

**Affinity Propagation:** Affinity Propagation groups data points together relying on a message-passing process between points that assesses their similarity to the different groupings. The algorithm doesn't require pre-defining the number of clusters [25].

**Birch:** Birch begins by producing a brief summary tree structure that preserves the maximum amount of information in the dataset. In the next step, this summary is classified into different numbers of clusters. Birch can be used with or without specifying the desired number of clusters,  $k$ . We ran it without specifying,  $k$  and obtained over 300 clusters. We then searched for the  $k$  that optimized the results and settled on  $k = 9$ .

**Spectral Clustering:** Spectral Clustering is derived from spectral graph theory. It involves analyzing the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of a similarity matrix derived from the data. The number of desired clusters,  $k$ , must be fixed prior to running the algorithm. We considered different combinations of parameters, but none of the combinations clearly differentiated between the antisemitic themes. For comparison purposes, we settled on  $k = 9$ .

**Gaussian Mixture:** In Gaussian Mixture (GM), each cluster is represented as a Gaussian distribution, and data points are assigned to clusters based on their likelihood of belonging to each component. GM requires a pre-defined number of clusters,  $k$ . Here again, after evaluating different combinations to look at the distributions of clusters, we use  $k = 9$  to compare the results to our method.

**Mean Shift:** Mean Shift is a centroid-based algorithm that updates the centroid with each new point. Mean Shift works in high-dimensional spaces and uses the mean as the centroid [26]. It does not require a predefined number of clusters.

---

### Algorithm 1: Antisemitic concepts extraction

Input:  $\vec{v} = [\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2, \dots, \vec{v}_n]$ ; Parameters:  $k, \delta, \lambda, lo, hi$

---

```

1  $b \leftarrow 1$ ; /* initial batch number*/
2  $m \leftarrow kmeans(\vec{v}_b, k)$ ; /* build initial model*/
3  $cc \leftarrow m(k)$ ; /* cc contains centroids  $c_1, \dots, c_k$ */
4  $ss \leftarrow [(r_1, l_1), \dots, (r_k, l_k)]$ ; /* initialize semantic similarity structure*/
5  $b \leftarrow b + 1$ ; /* increment batch number*/
6  $cu\vec{r}r \leftarrow \vec{v}_b$ ; /* Consider next batch*/
7 while  $cu\vec{r}r \neq Empty$  do
8    $s \leftarrow len(cu\vec{r}r)$ ; /* numb. of instances in  $cu\vec{r}r$ */
9   foreach  $concept\ c = 1\ to\ k$  in memory, m do
10     $\hat{d}^c \leftarrow [\hat{d}_1^c, \hat{d}_2^c, \dots, \hat{d}_s^c]$ ; /* pred. dist. to  $c$ */
11     $l \leftarrow percentile(\hat{d}^c, lo)$ ; /*  $lo^{th}$  perc. in  $\hat{d}^c$ */
12     $u \leftarrow percentile(\hat{d}^c, hi)$ ; /*  $hi^{th}$  perc. in  $\hat{d}^c$ */
13     $lower \leftarrow l - \lambda * (u - l)$ ; /* lower percentile*/
14     $upper \leftarrow u + \lambda * (u - l)$ ; /* upper percentile*/
15     $\vec{out} \leftarrow (l < cu\vec{r}r < lower) + (u > cu\vec{r}r > upper)$ ; /* set of outliers*/
16    if  $len(\vec{out}) > \delta$  then
17       $kmeans([\vec{c}, \vec{out}], 2)$ ; /* local adjustment*/
18       $update\ cc$ ; /* add new centroid to  $cc$ */
19       $k += 1$ ; /* increment numb. of  $k$ */
20       $ss \leftarrow (r_c, l_c)$ ; /* root and child concept*/
21    end
22  end
23   $m \leftarrow kmeans([\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_b], k)$ ; /* global adjustment*/
24   $cc \leftarrow m(k)$ ; /* update all centroids*/
25   $b \leftarrow b + 1$ ; /* increment batch number*/
26   $cu\vec{r}r \leftarrow \vec{v}_b$ ; /* Consider next batch*/
27 end

```

---

The results of our comparison are shown in Table II. In this discussion, we focus on columns 1-4 of the table. The last two columns will be discussed in Section V-C. We use three well-known metrics devised for unsupervised learning: the **Davies-Bouldin Index (DBI)**, the **Silhouette Coefficient (SC)**, and the **Calinski-Harabasz Index (CHI)**. The first metric, DBI, computes the average similarity between each cluster and its most similar one. In contrast to the next metrics,

a clear separation is indicated by a lower score. The second metric, SC, measures the similarity of each point within a cluster to its similarity to the nearest cluster. It then averages all the results. It returns a value between -1 and 1, where 1 represents an ideal clustering. The third metric, CHI, also determines the quality of clustering by measuring the ratio of between- to within-cluster dispersion, however, it does so at a more abstract level than SC. Here again, the higher the value of CHI, the clearer the separation of the data points; however, there is no upper bound. Table II also shows the number of clusters discovered by each clustering method on its own when possible (underlined), or assigned to it. Figure 4 in the appendix gives a visual illustration of each approach’s results by displaying their T-SNE projections.

Putting aside the dynamic element of our approach not present in any of the methods we compared it to, these results suggest that our approach is the only one able to estimate a reasonable number of clusters while also performing near the top. Indeed, none of the methods that discover  $k$  on their own did a reasonable job: Affinity discovered 31 clusters, Birch, over 300, and MeanShift, only two. In all these cases, the results are not very practical and disqualify Affinity and MeanShift. Birch, on the other hand, remains in the game since it allows the user to provide a predefined number of clusters. Our approach settled on 9 clusters which we use going forward. Once provided with the number of clusters ( $k = 9$ ), Birch, Gaussian, and our method perform reasonably well according to two of the metrics considered (SC and CHI) with Birch leading the pack, whereas Spectral does well on DBI and poorly on the other two metrics. A look at the T-SNE plot for Spectral reveals that the algorithm learns one very large cluster and eight very small ones, therefore, not capturing the essence of the dataset. This observation along with Spectral’s very low scores on SC and CHI disqualify it from further consideration. We, thus, conclude that Birch, Gaussian, and our method are competitive for this domain with Birch possibly learning slightly better clusters as seen by its slightly better results on SC and CHI (Gaussian does poorly on CHI, a little worse than Birch and our method on SC though a little better than both methods on DBI). Nonetheless, we recall that our method has two advantages over Birch (and Gaussian): 1) it is a continual and stable self-adjusting algorithm; 2) it does not require a pre-defined number of clusters.

## B. Qualitative Analysis

We now present a qualitative analysis of the results obtained by our method and reported in Tables III and IV. The tables show samples of prototypical terminology and posts per extracted concept. The results of Table III were obtained using aspects<sup>4</sup> of the term extraction methodology described in [23] on each of the concepts extracted by our method. Due to space limitations, Table IV can be found in the Appendix. We conducted a qualitative analysis of

<sup>4</sup> [23] focuses on coded terminology. This work doesn’t so we disabled the filtering of non-coded terminology. We also return unigrams in addition to bi- and tri- grams.

these tables as follows. The majority of posts in C1 is about Jews controlling the world. Indeed, we frequently observe the term *New world order* which, according to the AJC Translate Hate Glossary (AJC) conveys, in its antisemitic use, the belief that Jews have created a power structure that they fully control at the economic, media and political levels. Some frequent unigrams appearing in C1 are *evil*, *need*, *state*, *zionist*, *globalists*, *economic* while bigrams and trigrams include *new world order*, *world economic forum*, *deep state*, *banking cabal*, *state cabal*. As discussed in AJC, the term “cabal” refers to a powerful group of (Jewish) individuals whose goal is to establish control while “globalists”, which also introduces the idea of dual loyalty, can refer to a Jewish elite bent on destroying the western world order. Based on the terms extracted for C1 (Table III) and on the typical posts belonging to this category (Table IV), we concluded that while the concept presents a mixture of control types, the dominant one was economic, and we thus label it **C1: accusation of economic control**. In C2, our approach grouped posts referring to the meme *Shut it down; The goyim know* into a single concept, which we labeled **C2: The goyim know**. This meme portrays, in a satirical way, Jews panicking because their “secret plot to control the world” has been discovered (AJC). Our algorithm’s ss-structure shows that C2 was derived from C1 along with C3 and C4 described next. In C3, we observe the terms *cultural*, *marxism*, *frankfurt*, *school* as well as *frankfurt school*, *white reproduction*, *political correctness*, etc. According to a report by the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), these expressions refer to an antisemitic conspiracy theory that suggests that Cultural Marxism rooted in the Frankfurt School, a group of self-interested Jews, is responsible for progressive causes such as LGPTQ+, identity politics, and political correctness which are meant to destroy American values.<sup>5</sup> We labeled that concept **C3: accusation of cultural control**. C4 is mostly centered around wars and historical events. The themes revolve around history including USSR, Russia, Ukraine, Britain, WWII and the current war between Russia and Ukraine. Holocaust denial is also present. We labeled this concept **C4: accusation of political control**. Two seemingly unrelated expressions appear in C4 including *Mel Gibson* and *Moon Landing*. Our Web investigation revealed that Mel Gibson, upon receiving probation for DUI in 2006, remarked to the policeman arresting him that “the Jews are responsible for all the wars in the world.”<sup>6</sup> This comment (about wars) is what must have landed him into C4. Moon landing refers to the conspiracy theory that claims that the 1969 moon landing never happened (the footage was, supposedly, fake).<sup>7</sup> Moon landing landed in C4 most probably because of its role in the Cold War. Though the conspiracy theories revolving around it are not antisemitic in nature, it

<sup>5</sup><https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2003/cultural-marxism-catching>

<sup>6</sup><https://shorturl.at/dqyDH>

<sup>7</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moon\\_landing\\_conspiracy\\_theories](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moon_landing_conspiracy_theories)

TABLE II  
COMPARISON OF OUR APPROACH WITH FIVE BASELINES.

Approach	Davies-Bouldin	Silhouette Coefficient	Calinski-Harabasz	Clusters	C2 Coverage	C7 Coverage
Affinity	0.85	0.34	407.22	31	30.50 & 23.72%	100%
Birch	0.86	0.35	384.60	9 and 300+	67.79% and 5%	100% and 5%
Spectral	0.64	-0.01	67.76	9	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Gaussian	0.81	0.30	283.65	9	33.89%	100%
MeanShift	0.76	0.45	394.10	2	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Our approach	0.86	0.33	340.38	9	75.50%	100%

TABLE III  
TRENDING TERMS PRESENT IN THE EXTRACTED CONCEPTS

Concepts	Unigrams	Bigrams/Trigrams
C1: Control (Economic)	world, new, order, evil, need, state, zionist, globalists, economic, forum	new world order, world economic forum, deep state, banking cabal, state cabal
C2: Control (Economic & Political)	goyim, know, shut, jew, oy, well, kike, cope, oey, kek	goyim know, know shut, many kike, low birthrates, cunning plan, know fire
C3: Control (Cultural)	jewish, cultural, war, marxism, frankfurt, school, political, group, white, lobby	frankfurt school, political correctness, central bank, white reproduction, holy war, correct coalition
C4: Control (Political)	jewish, war, military, nation, money, control, Ukraine, russia, communist	mel gibson, zionist partners, zionist agent, ethnic foods, interest group, jewish community, moon landing, deception mentality, communist coup, color revolution
C5: Religion	zionist, type, Jesus, reptilian, blood, time, know, f**k, people	blood type, zionist reptilians, jews bible, real jew, fearsome warrior, rabbinical jew
C6: Control (Western World)	government, shabbos, biden, occupational, enslavement, american, goy, fake	zog/zionist, shabbos goy, ashkenazi jewish, enslavement agenda, mind control, terrorist cabinet, kosher sandwich
C7: Dystopia	slaughtering, zionist, partner, rock, agent, stone, time, information, domain	online domain, zionist reptilian, zionist partners, black stone, latin brown, black rocks
C8: ZOG	Jewish, communist, zionist, zog, capitalist, like	ZOG, scott greer, elephant room, capitalist subhuman, machine Georgia, bloodline conglomeration, diana spencer, gay jewish
C9: Jewish Mafia	Jewish, rothschild, world, f**k, people, need, soros	jacob rothschild, khazarian mafia, klaus schwab, mafia minion, george soros, trillionaire jacob

is worth noting that many proponents of these theories also support antisemitic ones and that some cross-overs sometimes take place.<sup>8</sup> In C5, we observe religious themes represented by terms such as *Jesus*, *Jews bible*, *Jews commit*, *deicide*, *rabbinical tradition*. These terms and the text they center around them fit in with the historical antisemitic trope *Jews Killed Jesus Christ*. They are mixed with other terms such as *reptilian*, *Zionist reptilians* which refer to the reptilian conspiracy theory that suggests that reptilian aliens take the form of politicians in order to control the world.<sup>9</sup> This, of course, gets back to the trope claiming that Jews control the world and is clearly antisemitic.<sup>10</sup> We labeled this concept **C5: rejection of Christianity** as we felt that despite the spread of this concept, that was the most representative theme. Next, in C6, the theme seems to revolve around the *Zionist Occupation Government* conspiracy theory that claims, once again, that Jews control the government of Western States.<sup>11</sup> This concept, which we labeled **C6: accusation of control of the Western States** is shown to be derived from C4 from the algorithm’s ss-structure. Finally, C7 directly advocates for the slaughter of “Zionists” using language rife in conspiratorial

metaphors about, once again, reptilians, but other dystopian types of themes such as *online domains*, *time*, *information*. We labeled this concept **C7: Dystopian Antisemitism**. C8, which we labeled **C8:Zionist Occupation Government (ZOG)** is derived from C6 (itself derived from C4). Finally, C9, labeled **C9: Jewish Mafia** lists names of Jewish millionaires or purported Jewish millionaires (e.g., Klaus Schwab) and is directly related to C8.

### C. Quantitative Analysis (cont’d)

Having described the concepts derived by our approach, we can now get back to the last two columns of Table II that present the coverage by each approach of concepts C2 and C7 representing 15.90% and 5% of the entire data set, respectively. C2 and C7 were chosen for a detailed analysis because they are the most compact and unambiguous concepts in the entire set of posts. We discuss their treatment by each of the clustering methods discussed in Section V-A. Using our own approach described in Algorithm 1, coverage of concepts C2 and C7 are 75.5% and 100%, respectively. We note that for C7, three other methods obtain 100% coverage: Affinity, Birch, and Gaussian. Of these, Affinity is the only one that determines  $k$ , the number of clusters, on its own. The other two methods: Spectral and MeanShift receive the results “Not Applicable” because, as seen in Figure 4, MeanShift learns only two concepts and, therefore, does not discriminate enough to learn small concepts and, in the case of Spectral, even though small concepts are learned, our analysis revealed that C7 was merged

<sup>8</sup>E.g., <https://www.memri.org/tv/french-author-guyenot-moon-landing-foax-proves-america-is-empire-of-lies>

<sup>9</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reptilian\\_conspiracy\\_theory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reptilian_conspiracy_theory)

<sup>10</sup><https://shorturl.at/cfvEQ>

<sup>11</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zionist\\_Occupation\\_Government\\_conspiracy\\_theory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zionist_Occupation_Government_conspiracy_theory)



with C4, with no clear separation between them. C2 is more difficult to cover as seen in Table II. Affinity splits C2 into two clusters covering 30.50% and 23.72%, respectively, of C2 or 54.22% when considered together. When Birch is run with  $k = 9$ , it does pretty well, covering 67.69% of C2. That is less than the 75.5% obtained by our method, but it is close. Gaussian, on the other hand, only covers 33.89% of C2. Once again, Spectral received the "Not Applicable" mention because C2 was distributed into more than one concept. Conversely, C2 was one of many amalgamated concepts in MeanShift. This analysis confirms that Birch works quite well on this domain, but that, based on this detailed analysis as well as the previously mentioned strength of our approach, it is preferable given our practical goals.

## VI. CONCLUSION


This work proposes a completely unsupervised machine learning method for monitoring the evolution of antisemitic discourse in a continual manner. As new posts arrive, they are presented to the system in a mini-batch fashion. Concepts representing new themes discussed in the posts are formed and added to the existing knowledge base while existing concepts are updated in accordance with the new information contained in the posts. Our quantitative and qualitative analyses reveal that our approach accurately describes the themes discussed in the posts, thus providing a useful monitoring tool for social media content. Our future work will add lifelong learning features to ensure that our method is robust enough to sustain long periods of online use. Our future work will also involve working in tandem with social scientists to assess how useful our tool is in answering their research questions. This will allow us to refine our method to make it more focused on its users' needs. In addition, we will add information visualization features to make the approach more user-friendly. Finally, we will apply our work to other kinds of hatred in social media.

## REFERENCES


- [1] A. Schmidt and M. Wiegand, "A survey on hate speech detection using natural language processing," in *SocialNLP@EACL*, 2017.
- [2] P. Fortuna and S. Nunes, "A survey on automatic detection of hate speech in text," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 51, pp. 1 – 30, 2018.
- [3] F. Poletto, V. Basile, M. Sanguinetti, C. Bosco, and V. Patti, "Resources and benchmark corpora for hate speech detection: a systematic review," *Language Resources and Evaluation*, vol. 55, pp. 477 – 523, 2020.
- [4] M. S. Jahan and M. Oussalah, "A systematic review of hate speech automatic detection using natural language processing," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 546, p. 126232, 2021.
- [5] I. Barna and A. Knap, "An exploration of coronavirus-related online antisemitism in hungary using quantitative topic model and qualitative discourse analysis," *Intersections. East European Journal of Society and Politics*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 80–100, 2021.
- [6] C. Allen, U. Nodelman, and E. N. Zalta, "Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy: a dynamic reference work," *2003 Joint Conference on Digital Libraries, 2003. Proceedings.*, pp. 383–, 2003.
- [7] L. Wittgenstein, "Philosophical investigations = philosophische untersuchungen," in *PHILOSOPHICAL INVESTIGATIONS*, 1958.
- [8] E. Rosch, "Principles of categorization," in *Cognitive Science*, 1978.

- [9] R. Corizzo, M. I. Baron, and N. Japkowicz, "Cpdga: Change point driven growing auto-encoder for lifelong anomaly detection," *Knowl. Based Syst.*, vol. 247, p. 108756, 2022.
- [10] K. Faber, R. Corizzo, B. Sniezynski, and N. Japkowicz, "Vlad: Task-agnostic vae-based lifelong anomaly detection," *Neural networks : the official journal of the International Neural Network Society*, vol. 165, pp. 248–273, 2023.
- [11] S. Rohlifing and S. J. Sonnenberg, "'who is really british anyway?': A thematic analysis of responses to online hate materials," *Journal of psychosocial research*, vol. 10, p. 2, 2016.
- [12] T. Megersa and A. M. Gezie, "Social media users' online behavior with regard to the circulation of hate speech," *Frontiers in Communication*, 2023.
- [13] S. Ramaswamy and N. DeClerck, "Customer perception analysis using deep learning and nlp," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 140, pp. 170–178, 2018.
- [14] A. Aldunate, S. Maldonado, C. Vairetti, and G. Armelini, "Understanding customer satisfaction via deep learning and natural language processing," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 209, p. 118309, 2022.
- [15] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [16] A. M. Founta, D. Chatzakou, N. Kourtellis, J. Blackburn, A. Vakali, and I. Leontiadis, "A unified deep learning architecture for abuse detection," in *Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on web science*, pp. 105–114, 2019.
- [17] J. Serra, I. Leontiadis, D. Spathis, G. Stringhini, J. Blackburn, and A. Vakali, "Class-based prediction errors to detect hate speech with out-of-vocabulary words," in *Proceedings of the first workshop on abusive language online*, pp. 36–40, 2017.
- [18] P. Parikh, H. Abburi, N. Chhaya, M. Gupta, and V. Varma, "Categorizing sexism and misogyny through neural approaches," *ACM Transactions on the Web (TWEB)*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 1–31, 2021.
- [19] P. Badjatiya, S. Gupta, M. Gupta, and V. Varma, "Deep learning for hate speech detection in tweets," in *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on World Wide Web companion*, pp. 759–760, 2017.
- [20] M. Chandra, D. Pailla, H. Bhatia, A. Sanchawala, M. Gupta, M. Shrivastava, and P. Kumaraguru, "'subverting the jewtocracy': Online antisemitism detection using multimodal deep learning," in *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Web Science Conference 2021*, pp. 148–157, 2021.
- [21] S. Zannettou, J. Finkelstein, B. Bradlyn, and J. Blackburn, "A quantitative approach to understanding online antisemitism," in *Proceedings of the International AAAI conference on Web and Social Media*, vol. 14, pp. 786–797, 2020.
- [22] M. Ali and S. Zannettou, "Analyzing antisemitism and islamophobia using a lexicon-based approach," in *Workshop Proceedings of the 16th International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.36190>, 2022.
- [23] D. Kikkiseti, R. Ul-Mustafa, W. Melillo, R. Corizzo, Z. Boukouvalas, J. Gill, and N. Japkowicz, "Using llms to discover emerging coded antisemitic hate-speech in extremist social media," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2401.10841, 2024.
- [24] S. Ben-David, D. Pál, and H. U. Simon, "Stability of k -means clustering," in *Annual Conference Computational Learning Theory*, 2007.
- [25] D. Dueck and B. J. Frey, "Non-metric affinity propagation for unsupervised image categorization," in *2007 IEEE 11th international conference on computer vision*, pp. 1–8, IEEE, 2007.
- [26] K. G. Derpanis, "Mean shift clustering," *Lecture Notes*, vol. 32, pp. 1–4, 2005.


## VII. APPENDIX




(a) Affinity Propagation




(b) Birch




(c) Birch (with K)




(d) Spectral



(e) Gaussian



(f) MeanShift



(g) Our Approach

Fig. 4. T-SNE projections of the clustering obtained by our approach and baseline clustering methods

TABLE IV  
 EXAMPLES FROM OUR DATA SET OF POSTS FOUND ON EXTREME SOCIAL PLATFORMS ALONG WITH THE CONCEPT THEY BELONG TO AND THE  
 TERMINOLOGY THEY USE AS EXTRACTED BY THE APPROACH IN [23]

Posts	Concepts
these poor souls were murdered by the <b>cabal world economic forum</b> evil mad scientists elites. they should all be in front of a patriot firing squad	C1
the illegal us corp of american government must be eradicated closed permanently all the <b>cabal ,illuminate, world economic forum</b> , world health organization, united nation, north atlantic treaty organization, <b>new world order</b> and its sub cults all must be arrested and fully prosecuted world wide door to door	C1
the <b>goyim know</b> about isis.	C2
<b>shut it down, the goyim know</b>	C2
advertising should be banned. it has been used as a social manipulation tool for decades. just watch mad men. it started with the <b>frankfurt school</b> . the birth of <b>cultural marxism</b> . how the <b>frankfurt school</b> changed america	C3
we are in a war with <b>frankfurt school cultural marxism</b> . harris is an apostle of that woke cult. please stop conflating liberalism with left wing marxism when we need to divide them starting with the difficult task of convincing boomer liberals they have been fooled since teenage hood.	C3
you also need to provide all <b>zionist agents</b> embedded in the media organizations, zionist codenames, zionist handlers, zionist caves they report to, zionist time travellers giving them information, space time information about zionists, <b>zionist "partner/s"</b> , zionist alliances, zionist sponsored businesses, zionist media organizations, <b>zionist agents</b> embedded in the national security apparatuses, <b>zionist agents'</b> names censoring news and content, etc., etc. ...	C4
the united states government is controlled by <b>interest groups</b> that are only seeking to enlarge their own power. the us government does not represent the will of the citizenry, and condemning it is not a condemnation on the principles of freedom, democracy, etc.the usa is being set up to fail.the rootless <b>cosmopolitan elite</b> have been constructing elaborate safehouses for decades in preparation for this...	C4
did jesus come to his own? yes but his own did not receive him? that is correct. so jews killed jesus? yes. so jesus was jewish? no, jews are not the jews of the bible so how did jews commit decide if they are not the jews from the bible? hurr durr	C5
he was but the definition of jew changed entirely after the fulfilment of the prophecy those who calls themselves jews now are not the real jews they are the <b>rabbinical tradition</b> that rejected christ	C5
meet the new shabbos, same as the old shabbos stop eating the <b>kosher sandwich goy zionist occupied government</b> .	C6
<b>zog, zionist occupied government</b> . secretary of state=zog. attorney general=zog. senate majority leader=zog. head of dhs=zog 98 percent of americans are non jews.	C6
are the jews of belgium, providing the zionist codenames, zionist agent names, names of the <b>zionist reptilians</b> , names of the zionist "partner/s", zionist caves, space time information about zionist, etc need full disclosure from the zionists, <b>zionist reptilians</b> , zionist agents, zionist "partner/s", and reptilian "partner/s", etc. afterwards, i will slaughter them all, including their women, and their children. i will spare no one.but then again, i prefer genocides, mass erasures, etc., rather than patches.	C7
i also need the names of all zionist partner/s, all zionist agents, zionist caves, zionist time travel agents, zionist time portal technology, zionist advanced technology, and <b>zionist reptilian</b> "partner/s".and all <b>zionist reptilians</b> embedded in albania, and zionist reptilian "partner/s" embedded in albania.all can be published in the <b>online domain</b> , on the internet, available for all to dissect such information.afterwards, i will slaughter them all. including zionist women, and zionist children, zionist "partner/s", and those that interfere on behalf of zionists.	C7
you can post about the gae all you want and not get banned on any platform, like <b>scott greer</b> for example. start tweeting about the <b>zionist occupied government</b> and expect to be censored and banned. lesson there.	C8
you got a <b>gay jewish</b> communist takeover that is as communist as the chinese, without putting communist in the name.enjoy being spied, subverted, and psyoped.	C8
<b>klaus schwab</b> is a <b>rothschild</b> on his mother side. he answers to the trillionaire, <b>jacob rothschild</b> and his <b>khazarian mafia minions</b>	C9
radical soros backed group boosts warnock campaign funding ahead of run off billionaire radical <b>george soros</b> has worked his entire life to control the democrat party and destroy the united states. he has a deep seated hatred of the west and promotes its collapse, pouring millions of dollars into campaigns and causes that further his radical agenda.	C9