

# A Longitudinal Measurement Study of 4chan’s Politically Incorrect Forum and Its Effect on the Web

Gabriel Emile Hine<sup>†</sup>, Jeremiah Onaolapo<sup>‡</sup>, Emiliano De Cristofaro<sup>‡</sup>, Nicolas Kourtellis<sup>\*</sup>, Ilias Leontiadis<sup>\*</sup>, Riginos Samaras<sup>‡</sup>, Gianluca Stringhini<sup>‡</sup>, Jeremy Blackburn<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Roma Tre University   <sup>‡</sup>University College London   <sup>\*</sup>Telefonica Research   <sup>#</sup>CUT

## ABSTRACT

The discussion board site 4chan has been a part of the dark underbelly of the Internet since its inception, but recent events have brought it to the forefront of the world’s collective mind. In particular, /pol/, 4chan’s “Politically Incorrect” board has become a central figure in the outlandish 2016 US election campaign, often linked to the alt-right movement and the rhetoric of hate and racism. Nonetheless, 4chan remains relatively unstudied by the research community. In this paper, we start addressing this gap by analyzing /pol/ along several axes, using a dataset of over 8M posts collected over two and a half months. First, we perform a general characterization, showing that /pol/ users are well distributed around the world and that 4chan’s unique features encourage fresh discussions. Then, we analyze content posted on /pol/, finding YouTube links and hate speech to be predominant, that 95% of images are posted no more than 5 times, and that there are notable differences in the English language used in different parts of the world. Last but not least, we provide quantitative evidence of /pol/’s collective attacks on other social media platforms by analyzing the comments in YouTube videos linked on /pol/. We also present a quantitative case study of /pol/’s attempt to poison anti-trolling tools by altering the language of hate on social media, finding it to be less successful than reported by the popular press. Overall, our analysis not only provides the first measurement study of /pol/, but also insight on online harassment and hate speech trends in online social media.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In today’s digital society, the web plays a central role, as billions of people use it daily for accessing news and knowledge, work, entertainment, social interactions, finding romantic relationships, and so on. At the same time, it has also become an impactful source for new “culture” [17], coining new jargon and producing new celebrities as well as disruptive social phenomena. However, the web has also led to new socio-technical concerns, ranging from cyber-crime [7] to “net overload” [39] and privacy [32]. Among the most worrying threats, hate speech and abusive behavior have become increasingly prevalent [11, 27], as the Internet’s global communication capabilities, as well as the platforms built on top of them, often enable previously isolated, and possibly ostracized, members of fringe political groups and ideologies to gather, converse, organize, execute, and spread their agenda [37].

Over the past decade, 4chan.org has emerged as one of the most impactful generators of online culture. Created in 2003 by Christopher Poole (at the time only known as *moot*), and acquired by Hiroyuki Nishimura in 2015, 4chan is an imageboard site, built around a typical bulletin-board model. An “original poster” (OP)

creates a new thread by making a post, with one single image attached, to a board with a particular interest focus. Other users can reply, with or without images, and possibly add references to previous posts, quote text, etc. Some of 4chan’s most important aspects are anonymity (there is no identity associated with posts) and ephemerality (threads are periodically pruned) [10]. 4chan is generally considered a highly influential ecosystem, as not only has it given birth to significant chunks of Internet culture and memes<sup>1</sup>, but also provided a highly visible platform to movements like *Anonymous* and the *alt-right* ideology. Although it has also enabled to positive actions, such as catching animal abusers [4], 4chan is one of the darkest corners of the Internet, featuring a high rate of hate speech, porn, trolling, and even murder confessions [24]. Moreover, it often acts as a platform to coordinate distributed denial of service attacks [5] as well as aggressive actions on other sites [3].

Despite its influence and frequent media attention [8, 9, 23, 38], 4chan remains largely unstudied. To the best of our knowledge, there has been very little work providing a systematic analysis of its ecosystem. In this paper, we start addressing this gap by presenting a longitudinal study on one sub-community, namely, /pol/, i.e., 4chan’s “Politically Incorrect” board. To some extent, /pol/ is considered a containment board, allowing users to discuss generally distasteful content – even by 4chan standards – without disturbing the operations of other boards, with many of its posters subscribing to the “alt-right” movement and exhibiting characteristics of xenophobia, social conservatism, racism, and, generally speaking, hate.

**Roadmap.** This paper presents a multi-faceted, first-of-its-kind analysis of /pol/, using a dataset of 8M posts from over 216K conversation threads collected over a 2.5-month period (Section 4). First, we perform a general characterization of /pol/, focusing on posting behavior and on how 4chan unique features influence the way discussions proceed (Section 5). Next, we explore the types of content shared on /pol/, including third-party links, images, and focus on the use of hate speech, which we also analyze at a country level (Section 6). Finally, we show that /pol/’s hate-filled vitriol is not contained within /pol/, or even 4chan, as we measure its effects on conversations taking place on other platforms, such as Youtube, via a phenomenon called “raids” (Section 7). We also provide a quantitative analysis of /pol/’s attempt to circumvent anti-trolling machine learning technologies (e.g., used by Google) by altering the language of hate (e.g., substituting the *n-word* with “*googles*”).

**Contributions.** In summary, this paper makes several contributions. First, we provide a large scale analysis of /pol/’s posting behavior, showing the impact of 4chan’s unique features, that /pol/ users are surprisingly international, and that although posters remain anonymous, /pol/ is filled with many different voices. Next,

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author: jeremyb@tid.es

<sup>1</sup>For readers unfamiliar with memes, we suggest a review of the documentary available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dQw4w9WgXcQ>.



**Figure 1:** Examples of typical /pol/ threads. Thread (A) illustrates the derogatory use of “cuck” in response to a Bernie Sanders image, (B) a casual call for genocide with an image of a woman’s cleavage and a “humorous” response, (C) /pol/’s fears that a withdrawal of Hillary Clinton would guarantee Donald Trump’s loss, and (D) shows *Kek* the “god” of memes via which /pol/ believes they influence reality.

we show that /pol/ users post many links to YouTube videos, tend to favor “right wing” news sources, and post a staggering amount of unique images. Finally, we provide evidence that although one of /pol/’s publicized attempts to disrupt Twitter mostly failed, there are numerous instances of individual YouTube videos being “raided” and provide a first metric for measuring such activity.

## 2. 4CHAN

4chan.org is an imageboard site. A user, the “original poster” (OP), creates a new thread by posting a message with one image attached to a board with a particular topic. Other users can also post in the thread, with or without images, and add references to previous posts by replying to or quoting portions of a post.

**Boards.** As of October 2016, 4chan features 69 boards, split into 7 high level categories, e.g., Japanese Culture (9 boards) or Adult (i.e., porn, 13 boards). In this paper, we focus on /pol/, the “politically incorrect” board.<sup>2</sup> Figure 1 shows four typical /pol/ threads. Besides the content, the figure also illustrates the *reply* feature (“>>12345” is a reply to post “12345”), as well as other concepts discussed below. Aiming to create a baseline to compare /pol/ to, we also collect posts from two other boards: “sports” (/sp/) and “international” (/int/). The former focuses on sports and athletics, the latter on cultures, languages, etc. We choose these two since they are considered “safe for work” boards, and are, according to 4chan rules, more heavily moderated, but also because they display the country flag of the OP, which we discuss next.

**Flags.** /pol/, /sp/, /int/ also include, along with each post, the flag of the country the user posted from, based on IP geo-location. This is meant to reduce the ability to “troll” users by, e.g., claiming to

<sup>2</sup><http://boards.4chan.org/pol/>

be from a country where some event is happening (even though geo-location can obviously be fooled using VPNs and proxies).

**Anonymity.** Users do not need an account to read/write posts. Anonymity is the default (and preferred) behavior, but users can enter a name along with their posts, even though they can change it with each post if they wish. “Tripcodes” (hashes of user-supplied passwords) can be used to “link” threads from the same user across time, thus providing a way to verify their pseudo-identity to other users. Tripcodes are generally considered “un-cool” Unless using Tor or similar tools, anonymity only really exists between users – in fact, *moot* (4chan’s creator) reported turning server logs and other records over to the FBI.<sup>3</sup>

On some boards, intra-thread trolling led 4chan to also introduce “poster IDs” within a thread (and only that thread), each poster is given a unique ID that appears along with their post, using a combination of cookies and IP tracking. This preserves anonymity, but mitigates low-effort sock puppeteering. To the best of our knowledge, /pol/ is currently the only board with poster IDs enabled.

**Bumping System.** Each board has a finite catalog, so threads are pruned after a relatively short period of time. Threads having the most recent post appear first, and creating a new thread results in the one with the least recent post getting removed. A post in a thread keeps it alive by bumping it up, however, to prevent a thread from never getting purged, 4chan implements *bump* and *image limits*. After a thread is bumped  $N$  times or has  $M$  images posted to it (with  $N$  and  $M$  being board-dependent), new posts to it will no longer bump it up. Originally, when a thread fell out of the catalog, it was permanently gone, however, an archive system for a subset of boards has recently been implemented: once a thread is purged, its final state is archived for some period of time – currently 7 days.

**Moderation.** 4chan’s moderation policy is generally lax, especially on /pol/.<sup>4</sup> “Janitors” – i.e., volunteers periodically recruited from the user base – are given limited tools allowing them to prune posts and threads, as well as recommend users to be banned by more “senior” 4chan employees. Generally speaking, although janitors are not well respected by 4chan users and are often mocked for their perceived love for the modicum of power they have, they do contribute to 4chan’s continuing operation, volunteering work on a site that, at the time of writing, is somewhat struggling to stay solvent [40].

## 3. RELATED WORK

While 4chan constantly attracts a lot of interest in the popular press [8, 9, 23, 38], to the best of our knowledge, there is very little work studying it from a quantitative perspective. Bernstein et al. [10] study the “random” board on 4chan (/b/), the first and most active board. Using a dataset of 5.5M posts from almost 500K threads collected over a two-week period, they focus on analyzing the anonymity and ephemerality characteristics of 4chan. They find that over 90% of posts are made by anonymous users, and, similar to our results, that the “bump” system affects threads’ evolution, finding the median lifetime of a /b/ thread to be only 3.9mins (and 9.1mins on average). Our work differs from [10] in several aspects. First, their study is focused on /b/ in a self-contained fashion, while we are more interested in how /pol/ affects the rest of the web (e.g., via raids). Second, their content analysis is primarily limited to a typology of thread types. Via manual labeling of a small sample, they determined that 7% of posts on /b/ are a “call for action,” which includes raiding behavior. In contrast, our analysis goes deeper,

<sup>3</sup><http://www.thesmokinggun.com/buster/fbi/turns-out-4chan-not-lawless-it-seems>  
<sup>4</sup>/pol/’s “rules” are available from <http://boards.4chan.org/pol/thread/40489590>

looking at post contents and raiding in a quantitative manner. Finally, using some of the features unique to /pol/, /int/, and /sp/, we are able to get a glimpse of 4chan’s demographics, which are only speculated about in [10].

Besides [10], there have been some qualitative studies and analyses of 4chan. Potts and Harrison studied reddit and 4chan’s attempts to track down the perpetrators of the 2013 Boston bombing. In general, they noted that the fast pace and overall chaotic environment resulted in information being lost. Further, they note that while the attitudes of 4chan users did not seem congruent with the severity of the topic, the mainstream media still took 4chan’s search seriously. As we show in Section 7, 4chan users retain their ability to garner media attention even though their actions might not be impactful.

Potapova et al. [30] study the influence of anonymity on the level of aggression and usage of obscene lexis by comparing various anonymous forums and social networks. Although they focused primarily on Russian-language platforms, they also include 2M words from 4chan, overall finding no correlation between anonymity and aggression. They point out that obscene language does not necessarily carry aggression. According to their results, 8.2% of messages contain obscene language although expressing positive emotions. In follow-up work [19, 31], authors use 4chan messages to evaluate automatic verbal aggression detection techniques.

Other work has looked at the analysis of social media, besides 4chan, that are characterized by (semi-)anonymity and/or ephemerality. Correa et al. [13] study the differences between content posted on anonymous and non-anonymous social media, showing that linguistic differences between Whisper posts (anonymous) and Twitter (non-anonymous) are significantly different, and they train automated classifiers to discriminate them with reasonable accuracy (73%). Peddinti et al. [29] analyze users’ anonymity choices during their activity on Quora, identifying categories of questions for which users are more likely to seek anonymity. They also perform an analysis of Twitter to study the prevalence and behavior of so-called “anonymous” and “identifiable” users, as classified by Amazon Mechanical Turk workers, and find a correlation between content sensitivity and a user’s choice to be anonymous. Roesner et al. [34] analyze why people use Snapchat, performing a survey of 127 adults, and find that privacy is not the major driver of adoption, but rather the “fun” of self-destructing messages. Hosseinmardi et al. [22] analyze user behavior on ask.fm by building an “interaction graph” between 30K profiles. They characterize users in terms of positive/negative behavior, positive/negative in-degree/out-degree, and analyze the relationships between these factors.

Another line of work focuses on studying and detecting hate speech. Djuric et al. [15] propose a word embedding based detection tool for hate speech in online user comments, and test it on Yahoo Finance comments. Then, Nobata et al. [27] also perform hate speech detection on Yahoo Finance and News data, using a supervised classification methodology. Related to these, Cheng et al. [12] characterize anti-social behavior in comments sections of a few popular websites and predicting accounts on those sites that will exhibit anti-social behavior.

While we certainly see some similar behavior from /pol/ users, the present work is focused more on understanding the platform and organization of semi-organized campaigns of anti-social behavior, rather than identifying particular users exhibiting the behavior.

Gerstenfeld, Grant, and Chiang [18] perform a study of 157 extremist websites from around the world. Using independent raters, each site is rated on several variables (e.g., whether the content contains racist symbols, or whether there were links to other sites).

	/pol/	/sp/	/int/	Total
<b>Threads</b>	216,783	14,402	24,873	256,058
<b>Posts</b>	8,284,823	1,189,736	1,418,566	10,893,125

**Table 1:** Number of threads and posts crawled for each board.

While they focus on more “organized” sites than /pol/, their findings are nonetheless applicable. In general, they find that despite the inherently decentralized and nationalist nature of extremist groups, sites tended to link quite liberally to other international groups. One particularly cogent example is that the Aryan Nations website link to Radio Islam and Hamas sites. As we will see in Section 5, /pol/ users are also quite international. They additionally find that just under 50% of the sites examined contain multimedia material, however, 62% of Skinhead sites has multimedia content. The explanation provided for this was that Skinheads tend to be younger than members of other white supremacist groups, and thus more web savvy. We suspect that the demographics of /pol/ trend much younger than more traditional sites, and this, coupled with 4chan being an image board, is a likely explanation for the massive amount of images posted (Section 6).

## 4. DATASETS

On June 30, 2016, we started crawling 4chan using its JSON API.<sup>5</sup> We retrieve /pol/’s thread catalog every 5 minutes and compare the threads that are currently live to those in the previously obtained catalog, then, for each thread that has been purged, we retrieve a full copy from 4chan’s archive, which allows us to obtain the full/final contents of a thread.

For each post in a thread, the API returns, among other things, the post’s number, its author (e.g., “Anonymous”), timestamp, and contents of the post (escaped HTML). Although our crawler does not save images, the API also includes image metadata, e.g., the name the image is uploaded with, dimensions (width and height), file size, and an MD5 hash of the image.

On August 6, 2016 we also started crawling /sp/, 4chan’s sports boards, and on August 10, 2016 /int/, the international board. Table 1 provides a high level overview of our datasets. We note that for about 6% of the threads, the crawler gets a 404 error: from a manual inspection, it seems that this is due to “janitors” (i.e., moderators) removing threads for violating rules.

Our crawler is still running, however, analysis presented in this paper only considers data crawled until September 12, 2016, *except* for the raids analysis presented in Section 7, where we considered threads and YouTube comments up to Sept. 25, as well as 60,040,275 tweets from Sept. 18 to Oct. 5, 2016 – see Section 7 for details. Note that *our datasets will be made available to other researchers upon request.*

**Ethical considerations.** Although we only collected publicly available data, we have thoroughly considered the ethical implications of our work and obtained approval by the designated ethics officer at UCL. 4chan posts are typically anonymous, however, analysis of the activity generated by links on 4chan to other services could be potentially used to de-anonymize users. To this end, we have followed ethical guidelines by Rivers et al. [33] and enforced a few mechanisms to protect user privacy: data is encrypted at rest and no attempt is made to de-anonymize users. We are also aware that content posted on /pol/ is often highly offensive, especially to minorities, women, etc., however, we do not censor content in order to provide a comprehensive analysis of /pol/, but we warn the reader

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/4chan/4chan-API>




Figure 2: Average number of new threads created per hour of the week.



Figure 3: Heat map of the number of new /pol/ threads created per country, normalized by Internet-using population.

that the remainder of this paper features language that is likely to be upsetting or uncomfortable.

## 5. GENERAL CHARACTERIZATION

### 5.1 Posting Activity in /pol/

To begin understanding the behavior of /pol/ users, our first step is a high-level examination of posting activity. In Figure 2, we plot the average number of new threads created per hour of the week, showing that /pol/ users create one order of magnitude more threads than /int/ and /sp/ users at nearly all hours of the day. Then, Figure 3 reports the number of new threads created per country, normalized by the country’s Internet-using population.<sup>6</sup>

Although the US dominates in total thread creation (visible by the timing of the diurnal patterns from Figure 2), the top 5 countries in terms of threads per capita are New Zealand, Canada, Ireland, Finland, and Australia. 4chan is primarily an English-speaking board, and indeed nearly every post on /pol/ is in English, but we still find that many other countries – e.g., France, Germany, Spain, Portugal, and several Eastern European countries – are represented. This suggests that, although /pol/ is considered an “ideological backwater,” it is surprisingly diverse in terms of international participation.

Next, in Figure 4, we plot the distribution of the number of posts per thread on /pol/, /int/, and /sp/, reporting both the cumulative distribution function (CDF) and the complementary CDF (CCDF). All three boards are skewed to the right, exhibiting quite different means (38.4, 57.1, and 82.9 for /pol/, /int/, and /sp/, respectively) and medians (7.0, 12.0, 12.0) – i.e., there are a few threads with a

<sup>6</sup>Obtained from <http://www.internetlivestats.com/internet-users/>.




Figure 4: Distributions of the number of posts per thread on /pol/, /int/, and /sp/. We plot both the CDF and CCDF to show both typical threads as well as threads that reach the bump limit. Note that the bump limit for /pol/ and /int/ is 300 at the time of this writing, while for /sp/ it is 500.

significantly higher number of posts. One likely explanation for the average length of /sp/ threads being larger is that users on /sp/ make “game threads” where they discuss a professional sports game live, while it is being played. The effects of the bump limit (see Section 2) are evident on all three boards. The bump limit is designed to ensure that fresh content is always available, and Figure 4 shows this is the case, as extremely popular threads are eventually purged.


As mentioned, moderation on 4chan is generally considered to be lax, so we set to investigate how much content actually violates the rules of the board. In Figure 5, we plot the CDF of the maximum number of replies per thread observed via the /pol/ catalog, but for which we later receive a 404 error when retrieving the archived version – i.e., threads that have most likely been deleted by a janitor or moved to another board. Surprisingly, there are many “popular” threads that are deleted, as the median number of posts in a deleted /pol/ thread is around 20, as opposed to 7 for the threads that are successfully archived. For /int/, the median number of posts in a deleted thread (5) is appreciably lower than in archived threads (12). This difference is likely due to: (i) /int/ moving much slower than /pol/, so there is enough time to delete threads before they become overly popular, and/or (ii) /pol/’s relatively lax moderation policy, which allows borderline threads to generate many replies for a while before they end up “officially” violating the rules of the board.

### 5.2 Tripcodes, Poster IDs, and Replies


Next, we aim to shed light on 4chan’s user base. This task is not trivial, since, due to the site’s anonymous and ephemeral nature, it is hard to build a unified network of user interactions. However, we leverage 4chan’s pseudo-identifying attributes – i.e., the use of tripcodes and poster IDs – to provide an overview of both micro-level interactions and individual poster behavior over time.

Overall, we find 188,849 posts with a tripcode attached across /pol/ (128,839 posts), /sp/ (42,431), and /int/ (17,578) – out of the 10.89M total posts (cf. Table 1). Note that unique tripcodes do not necessarily correspond to unique users, since users can use any number of tripcodes they desire. Figure 6 plots the CDF of posts per unique tripcode, for each of the three boards we study, showing that the median and mean are 6.50 and 36.08, respectively. We observe that 25% of tripcodes (over 30% on /int/) are only used once, and that, although /pol/ has many more posts overall, /sp/ has more active “tripcode users” – about 17% of tripcodes on /sp/ are associated to at least 100 posts, compared to about 7% on /pol/.


Arguably, the closest we can get to estimating how unique users are engaged in 4chan threads is via poster IDs. Unfortunately, these are not available from the JSON API once a thread is archived, and we decided to use them only a few weeks into our data collection. However, the HTML version of archived threads *does* include




**Figure 5:** CDF of the number of replies for non-archived threads (i.e., likely removed by janitors).



**Figure 6:** CDF of the number of posts per unique tripcode.



**Figure 7:** CCDF of the number of unique posters per thread.



**Figure 8:** Distribution of the average number of replies received per country, per board.

/pol/		/int/		/sp/	
Country	Avg. Replies	Country	Avg. Replies	Country	Avg. Replies
China	1.57	Thailand	1.13	Slovenia	0.91
Pakistan	1.42	Algeria	1.12	Japan	0.84
Japan	1.35	Jordan	1.04	Bulgaria	0.81
Egypt	1.33	S. Korea	1.02	Sweden	0.75
Tri. & Tob.	1.28	Ukraine	1.00	Israel	0.74
Israel	1.27	Viet Nam	0.97	Argentina	0.72
S. Korea	1.20	Tunisia	0.97	India	0.72
Turkey	1.18	Israel	0.97	Greece	0.72
UAE	1.20	Hong Kong	0.92	Puerto Rico	0.70
Bangladesh	1.15	Macedonia	0.91	Australia	0.68


**Table 2:** The top 10 countries (with at least 1,000 posts) in terms of direct replies received per post for each board in our dataset.

poster IDs, so we started collecting HTML on August 17, 2016, obtaining it for the last 72,725 (33%) threads in our dataset.

Figure 7 plots the CCDF of the number of unique users per /pol/ thread, broken up into threads that reached the bump limit and those that did not. The median and mean number of unique posters in threads that reached the bump limit was 134.0 and 139.6, respectively. For typical threads (those that did not reach the bump limit), the median and mean is much lower – i.e., 5.0 and 14.76 unique posters per thread. This shows that, even though 4chan is anonymous, the most popular threads have “many voices.”

Also, recall that in 4chan, replying to a particular post entails users referencing another post number  $N$  by adding » $N$  in their post, and the standard UIs then treat it as a reply. This is different from simply posting in a thread (which might also be considered a “reply” to the OP). Here, users are *directly* replying to a specific post (not necessarily the post the OP started the thread with), although one can reply to the same post multiple times and to multiple posts at the same time.

We look at this reply functionality in 4chan to assess how engaged users are with each other. First, we find that 50-60% of posts never receive a direct reply across all three boards (/int/: 49%, /pol/: 57%, /sp/: 60%). Taking the posts with no replies into account,



**Figure 9:** Distribution of different categories of URLs posted in /pol/, together with the Alexa ranking of their domain.

we see that on average /pol/ (0.83) and /int/ (0.80) have many more replies per post than /sp/ (0.64), however, the standard deviation on /pol/ is much higher (/pol/: 2.55, /int/: 1.29, /sp/: 1.25).

Next, in Figure 8, we plot the CDF of the average number of replies per poster per board, aggregated by the country of the poster, i.e., the distribution of mean replies per country. The top-10 countries (with at least 1,000 posts) per average number of replies – see Table 2 lets us zoom on the tail end of this “replies-per-post” per country distribution. On average, while /pol/ posts are likely to receive more replies than /sp/ and /int/ posts, the distribution is heavily skewed towards certain countries.

Although deeper analysis of these differences is beyond the scope of this paper, we highlight that, for some of the countries, the “rare flag” meme may be responsible for receiving more replies, i.e., users will respond to a post by an uncommonly seen flag. For other countries, e.g., Turkey or Israel, it might be the case that these are either of particular interest to /pol/, or are quite adept at trolling /pol/ into replies (we note that our dataset covers the 2016 Turkish coup attempt and /pol/ has a love/hate relationship with Israel).

Finally, we note that unlike many other social media platforms, there is no other interaction system applied to posts on 4chan besides replies (e.g., no liking, upvoting, starring, etc.). Thus, the only way for a user to receive validation from (or really any sort of direct interaction with) other users is to entice them to reply, which might encourage users to craft as inflammatory or controversial posts as possible.

## 6. CONTENT ANALYSIS

In this section, we present an exploratory analysis of the content posted on /pol/. First, we analyze the types of media (links and images) shared on the board, then, we study the use of hate words, and show how /pol/ users can be clustered into meaningful geopolitical regions by means of the language of their posts.




Figure 10: CCDF of the number of posts exact duplicate images appeared in on /pol/.




Figure 12: Distribution of file sizes for unique images posted to /pol/.




Figure 11: Percentage of posts on /pol/ that the top 15 most popular hate words appear in.




Figure 13: The most popular image on /pol/ during our collection period, perhaps the least rare Pepe.

## 6.1 Links

As expected, we find that /pol/ users often post links to external content, e.g., to share and comment on news and events. (As we discuss later in Section 7, they also do so to identify and coordinate targets for hate attacks on other platforms.) To study the nature of the URLs posted on /pol/, we use McAfee SiteAdvisor,<sup>7</sup> which, given a URL, returns its category – e.g., “Entertainment” or “Social Networking.” We also measure the popularity of the linked websites, using Alexa ranking.<sup>8</sup> Figure 9 plots the distribution of categories of URLs posted in /pol/, showing that “Streaming Media” and “Media Sharing” are the most common, with YouTube playing a key role. Interestingly, for some categories, URLs mostly belong to very popular domains, while others, e.g., “General News,” include a large number of less popular sites.

The most linked website on /pol/ is YouTube, with over an order of magnitude more URLs posted than the next two sites, Wikipedia and Twitter. Next is Archive.is, a site that lets users take on demand “snapshots” of a website, which is often used in /pol/ to record content – e.g., tweets, blog posts, or news stories users feel might get deleted. 5th and 6th most popular domains are, respectively, Wikileaks and pastebin, followed by DonaldJTrump.com. Next, news sites start appearing, including the DailyMail and Breitbart, which are right-wing leaning news outlets. Furthermore, it is interesting to observe that some of the most popular news sites on a global level, e.g., CNN, BBC, and The Guardian, appear well outside the top-10 most common domains. On a board like /pol/, which is meant to focus on politics and current events, this underlines the polarization of opinions expressed by its users.

<sup>7</sup><https://www.siteadvisor.com/>


<sup>8</sup><http://www.alexa.com/>

## 6.2 Images

4chan was designed as an imageboard site, where users share images along with a message. Therefore, although some content will naturally be “reposted” (in fact, memes are almost by definition going to be posted numerous times [16]), we expect /pol/ to generate large amounts of original content. In Figure 12, we plot the CDF of sizes for unique images uploaded to /pol/: the median and mean size of unique images uploaded is 103.9 KB and 321.3 KB, respectively. Then, we count the number of unique images posted on /pol/ during our observation time, finding 1,003,785 unique images (almost 800GB) out of a total 2,210,972 images (45%). We also plot the CCDF of the number of posts in which each unique image appears, using the image hash (obtained from the JSON API) as a unique identifier – see Figure 10. Although the plot is only a *lower* bound on image reuse (it only captures *exact* reposts), we notice that the majority (about 70%) of the images are only posted once, and nearly 95% no more than 5 times. That said, there is a very long tail, i.e., a few select images become what we might deem “successful memes.” This is line with 4chan’s reputation for creating memes, and a meme is such only if it is seen many times.

Indeed, the most popular image on /pol/ appears 838 times in our dataset, depicting what we might consider the least rare “Pepe” – see Figure 13. Note that the Pepe the Frog meme was recently declared a hate symbol by the Anti-Defamation League [6], but of the 10 Pepe images appearing in the top 25 most popular images on /pol/, none seem to have an obvious link to hate. While Figure 13 is clearly the most common of Peopes, we have included a collection of somewhat rarer Peopes in Appendix 10.

In Figure 14, we measure the distribution of the difference in time between when an image is re-posted to each board in our



**Figure 14:** CDF of the delay between an image originally appearing on 4chan and it being reposted on /pol/, /sp/, /int/.


dataset and the time it is originally posted to 4chan. We observe a 41.3 days median “delay” for reposted images on /pol/, with about one quarter of re-posted images appearing on 4chan within the previous week.

Overall, even with a conservative estimation, we find that /pol/ users posted over 1M unique images in 2.5 months, the majority of which were either original content or sourced from outside /pol/. This suggests that the constant production of new content is likely one of the reasons /pol/ is thought to be at the heart of the growing hate movement on the Internet [35].

### 6.3 Hate speech

/pol/ is generally considered a “hateful” ecosystem, however, *quantifying* hate is a non-trivial task. One possible approach is to perform sentiment analysis [28] over the posts in order to identify positive vs negative attitude, but this is difficult since the majority of /pol/ posts (about 84%) is either neutral or negative. As a consequence, to identify hateful posts, we use the *hatebase* dictionary, a crowdsourced list of more than 1,000 terms from around the world that indicate hate when referring to a third person [1]. We also use the NLTK framework [2] to identify these words in various forms (e.g., “retard” vs “retarded”). Our dictionary-based approach identifies posts that *contain* hateful terms, but there might be cases where the context might not exactly be “hateful” (e.g., ironic usage). Moreover, *hatebase* is a crowdsourced database, and is not perfect. To this end, we manually examine the list and remove a few of the words that are clearly ambiguous or extremely context-sensitive (e.g., “india” is a variant of “indio,” used in Mexico to refer to someone of Afro-Mexican origin, so can often confused with the country India). Nevertheless, given the nature of /pol/, the vast majority of posts likely use these terms in a hateful manner.

Despite these caveats, we can use this approach to provide an idea of how prevalent hate speech is on /pol/. We find that 12% of /pol/ posts contain hateful terms, which is significantly higher than in /sp/ (6.3%) and /int/ (7.3%). In comparison, analyzing a random sample of tweets reveals that it contains only 2.18% of hateful tweets. In Figure 11, we also report the percentage of /pol/ posts in which the top 15 most “popular” hate words from the hatebase dictionary appear. “Nigger” is the most popular hate word, used in more than 2% of posts, while “faggot” and “retard” appear in over 1% of posts as well. To get an idea of the hate magnitude, consider that “nigger” appears in 265K posts, i.e., in about 120 posts an hour. After the top 3 hate words, there is a sharp drop in usage, although we see a variety of slurs. These include “goy,” which is a derogatory word used by Jewish people to refer to non-Jewish people. In our experience, however, we note that “goy” is used in an *inverted* fashion on /pol/, i.e., posters call other posters “goys” to imply that



**Figure 15:** Heat map showing the percentage of posts with hate speech per country. [Best viewed in color.]

they are submitting to Jewish “manipulation” and “trickery.”

### 6.4 Country Analysis


Next, we explored how hate speech differs by country. We observe clear differences in the use of hate speech, ranging from around 4.15% (e.g., in Indonesia, Arab countries, etc.) to around 30% of posts (e.g., China, Bahamas, Cyprus), while the majority of the 239 countries in our dataset feature hate speech in 8%–12% of their posts.

Figure 15 plots a heat map of the percentage of posts that contain hate speech per country with at least 1,000 posts on /pol/. Countries are placed into seven equally populated bins and colored from blue to red depending on the percentage of their posts contain a hate word from the hatebase dictionary.

Note that some of the most “hateful” countries (e.g., Bahamas and Zimbabwe) might be over represented due to use of proxies in those countries. Zimbabwe is of particular interest to /pol/ users because of its history as the unrecognized state of Rhodesia.

To understand whether the country flag has any meaning, we run a term frequency-inverse document frequency (TF-IDF) analysis to identify that topics that are used per country. We remove all countries that have less than 1,000 posts, as this eliminates the most obvious potential proxy locations. After removing stop words and performing stemming, we build TF-IDF vectors for each of the remaining 98 countries, representing the frequencies with which different words are used, but down-weighted by the general frequency of each word across all countries. When examining the TF-IDF vectors, although we cannot definitely exclude the presence of proxied users, we see that the majority of posts from countries seem to match geographically, e.g., posters from the US talk about Trump and the elections more than posters from South America, users in the UK talk about Brexit, those from Greece about the economic and immigration crisis, and people from Turkey about the attempted coup in July 2016.

**Clustering.** To further reinforce this conclusion, we perform some basic text classification to evaluate whether or not different parts of the world are talking about “similar” things. We apply spectral clustering over the vectors using the Eigengap heuristic [26] to automatically identify the number of target clusters. In Figure 16, we present a world map colored according to the 8 clusters generated. Indeed, we see the formation of geo-political “blocks.” For example, most of Western Europe is clustered together, and so are USA and Canada, while the Balkans are in a cluster with Russia. One possible limitation stemming from our spectral clustering is its sensitivity to the total number of countries we are attempting to cluster. Indeed, we find that, by filtering out fewer countries



**Figure 16:** World map colored by content analysis based clustering. [Best viewed in color.]

based on number of posts, the clusters *do* change. For instance, if we do not filter any countries out, France is clustered with former French colonies and territories, Spain with South America, and a few of the Nordic countries flip between the Western Europe and the North American clusters. However, the overall picture remains consistent: the flags associated with /pol/ posts are meaningful in terms of the topics those posts talk about.

## 7. RAIDS TOWARDS OTHER SERVICES


As discussed in Section 6, /pol/ is often used to post links to other sites: some are posted as commentary to the discussion, but others often serve to call /pol/ users on certain coordinated actions, including attempts to skew post-debate polls [14] as well as “raids” [3]. Broadly speaking, a raid is an attempt to disrupt another site, not from a network perspective (as in a DDoS attack), but from a content point of view, aiming to disrupt the *community* operating on that service. Raids on /pol/ are semi-organized: we observe a number of calls for action consisting of a link to a target – e.g., a Youtube video or a Twitter hashtag – and the text “you know what to do”, prompting other 4chan users to start harassing the target. We also observe that the thread itself often becomes an aggregation point with screenshots of the target’s reaction, sharing of sock puppet accounts used to harass, etc. Unlike 4chan’s earliest days, raids are now strictly prohibited, and special mention is made on /pol/’s rules as well, however, we have found evidence they still occur.

In this section, we study how raids work on /pol/. We start with a case study of a very broad-target raid, attempting to mess with anti-trolling tools by substituting racially charged words with company names, e.g., “googles.” Next, we find large scale-evidence of raids and describe an algorithm to detect raids taking place.


### 7.1 Case Study: “Operation Google”

On September 22, 2016, a thread on /pol/ called for the execution of so-called “Operation Google,” in response to Google announcing the introduction of anti-trolling machine learning based technology [20] and similar initiatives on Twitter [21]. It was proposed to poison these by using, e.g., “Google” instead of “nigger” and “Skype” for “kike,” calling other users to disrupt social media sites like Twitter, and also recommending using certain hashtags, e.g., #worthlessgoogs and #googlehangout. By examining the impact of Operation Google on both /pol/ and Twitter, we aim to gain useful insight into just how efficient and effective the /pol/ community is in acting in a coordinated manner.

In Figure 17, we plot the normalized usage of the specific replacements called for in the Operation Google post. The effects within /pol/ are quite evident: on Sep 22 we see the word “google” appearing at over 5 times its normal rate, while “Skype” appears at almost double its normal rate. To some extent, this illustrates how quickly /pol/ can execute on a raid, but also how short of an atten-



**Figure 17:** The effects of Operation Google within /pol/.




**Figure 18:** The effects of “Operation Google” on Twitter.

tion span its users have: by Sep 26 the burst in usage of Google and Skype had died down. While we still see elevated usages of “Google” and “Skype,” there is no discernible change in the usage of “nigger” or “kike,” but these replacement words do seem to have become part of /pol/’s vernacular.


Next, we investigate the effects of Operation Google *outside* of /pol/, counting how many tweets in our 60M tweet dataset (see Section 4) contain the hashtags #worthlessgoogs, #googlehangout, #googlerlots, #googlesgonnagoog, and #dumbgoogles. (Recall that our dataset consists of a 1% sample of all public tweets from Sep 18 to Oct 5, 2016.) As expected, the first instances of those hashtags, specifically, #googlerlots and #dumbgoogles, appear on Sep 22. On Sep 23, we also see #worthlessgoogs and, on later days, the rest of the hashtags. Overall, Sep 23 features the highest hashtag activity during our observation period. While this does indicate an attempt to instigate censorship evasion on Twitter, the percentage of tweets containing these hashtags shows that Operation Google’s impact was much more prevalent on /pol/ itself than on Twitter. For example, on Sep. 23, #dumbgoogles appears in only 5 out of 3M tweets (0.00016%) in our dataset for that day, despite it being the most “popular” hashtag (among the ones involved in Operation Google) on the most “active” day. Incidentally, this is somewhat at odds with the level of media coverage around Operation Google [25].

### 7.2 Spreading Hate on Third-Party Services


As we will discuss in Section 3, we still have limited insight on how trolls operate, and in particular how forces outside the control of targeted services organize and coordinate their actions. To this end, we set out to investigate the connection between /pol/ threads and YouTube comments. We focus on YouTube since 1) it accounts for the majority of media links posted on /pol/, and 2) it is experiencing an increase in hateful comments, prompting Google to an-




**Figure 20:** Distribution of the distance (in normalized thread lifetime) of the highest peak of activity in YouTube comments and the /pol/ thread they appear in.  $t = 0$  denotes the time when video was first mentioned, and  $t = 1$  the last related post in the thread.



**Figure 21:** Hateful YouTube comments vs synchronization lag between /pol/ threads and corresponding YouTube comments. Each point is a /pol/ thread. The hateful comments count refers to just those within the thread lifetime ([0,+1])



**Figure 22:** CDF of synchronization lag between /pol/ threads and YouTube comments, distinguishing between threads with YouTube videos containing more hate comments in the [0,+1] period or [-1,0].



**Figure 19:** Two tweets featuring Operation Google hashtags in combination with other racist memes.

nounce the (not uncontroversial) YouTube Heroes program [41].

We examine the comments from 19,568 YouTube videos linked to by 10,809 /pol/ threads to look for raiding behavior at scale. Note that finding evidence of raids on YouTube (or any other service) is not an easy task, considering that explicit calls for raids are an offense that can get users banned.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, rather than looking for a particular trigger on /pol/, we look for elevated activity in comments to YouTube videos linked in /pol/. In a nutshell, we expect raids to be exhibited by synchronized activity between a YouTube link appearing on /pol/ and the amount of comments it receives on YouTube. We also expect the rate of hateful comments to increase after a link is posted on /pol/.

**Activity Modeling.** To model synchronized activities, we use

<sup>9</sup>Recall that, since there are no accounts on 4chan, bans are based on session/cookies or IP addresses/ranges, with the latter causing VPN/proxies to often be banned.

signal processing techniques. First, we introduce some notation: Let  $x$  be a /pol/ thread, and  $y$  the set of comments to a YouTube video linked from  $x$ . We denote with  $\{t_x^i | i = 1, \dots, N_x\}$  and  $\{t_y^j | j = 1, \dots, N_y\}$ , respectively, the set of timestamps of posts in  $x$  and  $y$ . Since the lifetime of /pol/ threads is quite dynamic, we shift and normalize the time axis for both  $\{t_x^i\}$  and  $\{t_y^j\}$ , so that  $t = 0$  corresponds to when the video was first linked and  $t = 1$  to the last post in the /pol/ thread:

$$t \leftarrow \frac{t - t_{yt}}{t_{last} - t_{yt}}$$

In other words, we normalize to the duration of the /pol/ thread’s lifetime. We consider only /pol/ posts that occur after the YouTube mention, while, for computational complexity reasons, we consider only YouTube posts that occurred within the (normalized)  $[-10, +10]$  period, which accounts for 35% of our YouTube comments dataset.

From the list of the YouTube comment timestamps, we compute the corresponding Probability Density Function (PDF) using the Kernel Density Estimator method [36], and estimate the position of the absolute maximum of the distribution. In Figure 20, we plot the distribution of the distance between the highest peak in YouTube commenting activity and the /pol/ post linking to the video. We observe that 14% of the YouTube videos experience a peak in activity during the period they are discussed on /pol/. In many cases, /pol/ seems to have a strong influence on YouTube activity, suggesting that the YouTube link posted on /pol/ might have a triggering behavior, even though this analysis does not necessarily provide evidence of a raid taking place.

However, if a raid *is* taking place, then the comments on both /pol/ and YouTube are likely to be “synchronized.” Consider, for instance, the extreme case where some users that see the YouTube link on a /pol/ thread comment on both YouTube and the /pol/ thread simultaneously: the two set of timestamps would be perfectly synchronized. In practice, we measure the synchronization, in terms of delay between activities, using *cross-correlation* to estimate the lag between two signals. In practice, cross-correlation slides one signal with respect to the other and calculates the dot product (*i.e.*, the *matching*) between the two signals for each possible lag. The estimated lag is the one that maximizes the matching between the signals. We represent the sequences as signals  $(x(t))$  and  $y(t)$ , using Dirac Delta distributions  $\delta(\cdot)$ . Specifically, we

expand  $x(t)$  and  $y(t)$  into trains of Dirac Delta distributions:

$$x(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_x} \delta(t - t_x^i); \quad y(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_y} \delta(t - t_y^j)$$

and we calculate  $c(t)$ , the continuous time cross-correlation between the two series<sup>10</sup> as:

$$c(t) = y(t) \otimes x(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x(t+\tau)y(\tau)d\tau = \sum_{i=1}^{N_x} \sum_{j=1}^{N_y} \delta(t - (t_y^j - t_x^i))$$

where  $\otimes$  denotes the cross-correlation operator. The resulting cross-correlation is also a Dirac Delta train, representing the set of all possible inter-arrival times between elements from the two sets.

If  $y(t)$  is the version of  $x(t)$  shifted by  $\Delta T$  (or at least contains a shifted version of  $x(t)$ ), with each sample delayed with a slightly different time lag,  $c(t)$  will be characterized by a high concentration of pulses around  $\Delta T$ . As in the peak activity detection, we can estimate the more likely lag by computing the associated PDF function  $\hat{c}(t)$  by means of the Kernel Density Estimator method [36], and then compute the global maximum:

$$\hat{c}(t) = c(t) \otimes k(t); \quad \hat{\Delta T} = \arg \max_t \hat{c}(t)$$

where  $k(t)$  is the kernel smoothing function (typically a zero-mean Gaussian function).<sup>11</sup>

If a raid is taking place, we expect the estimated lag  $\Delta T$  to be close to zero, and we can validate this by looking at the content of the YouTube comments. Figure 21 plots the relationship between the number of *hateful* comments on YouTube that occur within the /pol/ thread lifetime (i.e., containing at least one word from the hatebase dictionary) and the synchronization lag between the /pol/ thread and the YouTube comments. The trend is quite clear: as the rate of hateful comments on YouTube increases, the synchronization lag between /pol/ and YouTube comments decreases. This result shows that almost all YouTube videos affected by (detected) hateful comments during the /pol/ thread lifetime are actually related to this. We also plot, in Figure 22, the CDF of the synchronization lag between /pol/ threads and comments on the corresponding YouTube videos. We distinguish between comments with more hate words *during* the life of the thread from those with more *before* the thread. In other words, we compare threads where /pol/ appears to have a negative impact vs. those where they do not. From the plot, we observe that the YouTube comments with more hate speech during the /pol/ thread’s lifetime are significantly more synchronized with the /pol/ thread itself. Although omitted due to space, we verified that this phenomenon is independent of the overall rate of comments on YouTube videos: the ratio of hate to non-hate words also increased as synchronization lag decreased.

## 8. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

This paper presented the first large-scale study of /pol/, 4chan’s politically incorrect board. We provided a general characterization, which compared activity on /pol/ to two other boards on 4chan, /sp/ (“sports”) and /int/ (“international”). First, we showed that each of the boards exhibits different behaviors with respect to thread creation and posts. In particular, we looked at the impact of 4chan’s “bump limit” on discourse, finding that it results in “fresh” content on a consistent basis. We also used the “flag” feature present on the

<sup>10</sup>Since timestamp resolution is 1s, this is equivalent to a discrete-time cross-correlation with 1s binning, but the closed form solution lets us compute it much more efficiently.

<sup>11</sup> $\hat{c}(t)$  is also the cross-correlation between the PDF functions related to  $x(t)$  and  $y(t)$ .

three boards and found that, while Americans dominate the conversation in terms of absolute numbers, many other countries (both native English speaking and not) are well represented in terms of posts per capita. We also showed differences in the “maturity” of threads with respect to moderators’ actions across the boards.

Next, we examined the content posted to /pol/, finding that the majority of links posted to the board are by far to YouTube. We also saw that /pol/ contains many more links to tabloid and right-wing leaning news outlets than main-stream sites. By looking at metadata associated with posted images, we learned that most content on 4chan is quite unique: 70% of the 1M unique images in our dataset were posted only once and 95% less than 5 times. In fact, /pol/’s ability to find and/or produce original content is likely one of the reasons it is thought to be at the center of hate on the web.

Finally, we studied the raiding behavior, via a quantitative case study of “Operation Google” and by looking for evidence of /pol/’s hateful impact on YouTube comments. We found that, although the impact of Operation Google on /pol/ itself was substantial, there was little evidence that it has spread to Twitter, whereas, we did find *quantitative evidence* of raiding activity on YouTube. While the nature of raids themselves is relatively unstudied, we used signal processing techniques to discover that peaks of commenting activity on YouTube tend to occur within the lifetime of the thread they were posted to on /pol/. Next, we used cross-correlation to estimate the synchronization lag between /pol/ threads and comments on linked YouTube videos. Here, we found that as the synchronization lag approaches zero, there is an increase in the rate of comments with hate words on the linked YouTube comments. This evidence suggests that, while not necessarily explicitly called for (and in fact, against /pol/’s rules), /pol/ users *are* performing raids in an attempt to disrupt the community of YouTube users.

**Limitations & Future Work.** Overall, our analysis not only provides the first measurement study of /pol/, but also insight on the continued growth of hate and extremism trends in online social media, and highlights a few interesting problems for future research. Naturally, our work is not without limitations, and a few caveats should be considered when looking at our findings. First, although the Hatebase dataset is an invaluable resource for our analysis, it is merely a dictionary while the usage of these words is often context-dependent. We leave it to future work to investigate how to distinguish context (e.g., by recognizing sarcasm or trolling). Second, our flag and country analysis may have been influenced by the use of VPNs/proxies: although this does not affect the validity of our results, it calls for a more in-depth analysis of language and posting behavior. Finally, while we showed quantitative evidence that raids are taking place, we make no claims about our ability to *classify* them as there are many layers of subtlety in how raiding behavior might be exhibited, and our findings really serve as a springboard for future work, rather than a readily available classifier.

**Acknowledgments.** We wish to thank Andri Ioannou and Despoina Chatzakou for their feedback. This research is supported by the European Union’s H2020-MSCA-RISE grant “EN-CASE” (Grant Agreement No. 691025) and by the EPSRC under grant EP/N008448/1. Jeremiah Onalapo was supported by the Petroleum Technology Development Fund (PTDF), Nigeria.

## 9. REFERENCES

- [1] Hatebase database. <https://www.hatebase.org/>.
- [2] Natural Language Toolkit. <http://www.nltk.org/>.
- [3] F. Alfonso. 4chan celebrates Independence Day by spamming popular Tumblr tags. <http://www.dailydot.com/news/4chan-tumblr-independence-day/>, 2014.


- [4] F. I. Alfonso. After 4chan manhunt, cat-kicker slapped with animal cruelty charges. <http://www.dailydot.com/news/walter-easley-cat-kicker-animal-cruelty/>, 2016.
- [5] N. Anderson. 4chan tries to change life OUTSIDE the basement via DDoS attacks. <http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2010/09/4chan-tries-to-change-life-outside-the-basement-via-ddos-attacks/>, 2010.
- [6] Anti-Defamation League. Pepe the Frog. <http://www.adl.org/combatting-hate/hate-on-display/c/pepe-the-frog.html>, 2016.
- [7] J. E. Barnes. Europol Warns of Cybercrime Surge. <http://on.wsj.com/2cAWwhB>, 2016.
- [8] J. Bartlett. 4chan: the role of anonymity in the meme-generating cesspool of the web. <http://www.wired.co.uk/article/4chan-happy-birthday>, 2016.
- [9] BBC News. Stolen celebrity images prompt policy change at 4Chan. <http://bbc.in/2cKde3a>, 2016.
- [10] M. S. Bernstein, A. Monroy-Hernández, D. Harry, P. André, K. Panovich, and G. Vargas. 4chan and /b/: An Analysis of Anonymity and Ephemerality in a Large Online Community. In *ICWSM*, 2011.
- [11] J. Blackburn and H. Kwak. STFU NOOB! Predicting Crowdsourced Decisions on Toxic Behavior in Online Games. In *WWW*, 2014.
- [12] J. Cheng, C. Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, and J. Leskovec. Antisocial behavior in online discussion communities. In *ICWSM*, 2015.
- [13] D. Correa, L. A. Silva, M. Mondal, F. Benevenuto, and K. P. Gummadi. The Many Shades of Anonymity: Characterizing Anonymous Social Media Content. In *ICWSM*, 2015.
- [14] A. Couts and A. Powell. 4chan and Reddit bombarded debate polls to declare Trump the winner. <http://www.dailydot.com/layer8/trump-clinton-debate-online-polls-4chan-the-donald/>, 2016.
- [15] N. Djuric, J. Zhou, R. Morris, M. Grbovic, V. Radosavljevic, and N. Bhamidipati. Hate speech detection with comment embeddings. In *WWW*, 2015.
- [16] E. Ferrara, M. JafariAsbagh, O. Varol, V. Qazvinian, F. Menczer, and A. Flammini. Clustering memes in social media. In *ASONAM*, Aug 2013.
- [17] F. Furedi. How The Internet and Social Media Are Changing Culture. The Aspen Institute. <http://www.aspeninstitute.cz/en/article/4-2014-how-the-internet-and-social-media-are-changing-culture/>, 2014.
- [18] P. B. Gerstenfeld, D. R. Grant, and C.-P. Chiang. Hate online: A content analysis of extremist internet sites. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 3(1), 2003.
- [19] D. Gordeev. Automatic verbal aggression detection for Russian and American imageboards, 2016.
- [20] A. Greenberg. Inside Google’s Internet Justice League and Its AI-Powered War on Trolls. <https://www.wired.com/2016/09/inside-googles-internet-justice-league-ai-powered-war-trolls/>, 2016.
- [21] A. Horowitz Satlin. Anti-Semitic Trolls Threaten To Take Twitter Down With Them. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/twitter-bullying-anti-semitism\\_us\\_580876d1e4b0b994d4c47e94](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/twitter-bullying-anti-semitism_us_580876d1e4b0b994d4c47e94), 2016.
- [22] H. Hosseinmardi, A. Ghasemianlangroodi, R. Han, Q. Lv, and S. Mishra. Analyzing Negative User Behavior in a Semi-anonymous Social Network. In *ASONAM*, 2014.
- [23] M. Ingram. Here’s Why You Shouldn’t Trust Those Online Polls That Say Trump Won. <http://for.tn/2dk74pG>, 2016.
- [24] A. Johnson and P. Hesel. 4chan Murder Suspect David Kalac Surrenders to Police. <http://nbcnews.to/2dHNcuO>, 2016.
- [25] C. McGoogan. Internet trolls replace racist slurs with codewords to avoid censorship. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/2016/10/03/internet-trolls-replace-racist-slurs-with-online-codewords-to-av/>, 2016.
- [26] A. Y. Ng, M. I. Jordan, Y. Weiss, et al. On spectral clustering: Analysis and an algorithm. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2, 2002.
- [27] C. Nobata, J. Tetreault, A. Thomas, Y. Mehdad, and Y. Chang. Abusive Language Detection in Online User Content. In *WWW*, 2016.
- [28] B. Pang and L. Lee. Opinion mining and sentiment analysis. *Foundations and trends in information retrieval*, 2, 2008.
- [29] S. T. Peddinti, A. Korolova, E. Bursztein, and G. Sampemane. Cloak and Swagger: Understanding data sensitivity through the lens of user anonymity. In *S&P*, 2014.
- [30] R. Potapova and D. Gordeev. Determination of the Internet Anonymity Influence on the Level of Aggression and Usage of Obscene Lexis, 2015.
- [31] R. Potapova and D. Gordeev. Detecting state of aggression in sentences using CNN. *CoRR*, abs/1604.06650, 2016.
- [32] L. Rainie. The state of privacy in post-Snowden America. <http://pewrsr.ch/2d216bm>, 2016.
- [33] C. M. Rivers and B. L. Lewis. Ethical research standards in a world of big data. *F1000Research*, 2014.
- [34] F. Roesner, B. T. Gill, and T. Kohno. Sex, Lies, or Kittens? Investigating the use of Snapchat’s self-destructing messages. In *Financial Cryptography and Data Security*. 2014.
- [35] J. Siegel. Dylann Roof, 4chan, and the New Online Racism, 2015. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/06/29/dylann-roof-4chan-and-the-new-online-racism.html>.
- [36] B. W. Silverman. *Density estimation for statistics and data analysis*, volume 26. CRC press, 1986.
- [37] J. Stein. How Trolls Are Ruining the Internet. <http://ti.me/2bzZa9y>, 2016.
- [38] The Week. The rise of the alt-right. <http://theweek.com/articles/651929/rise-altright>, 2016.
- [39] J. Wakefield. Net overload sparks digital detox for millions of Britons. <http://bbc.in/2ayPMU8>, 2016.
- [40] N. Wolf. Future of 4chan uncertain as controversial site faces financial woes. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/oct/04/4chan-website-financial-trouble-martin-shkreli>, 2016.
- [41] YouTube. Growing our Trusted Flagger program into YouTube Heroes. <https://youtube.googleblog.com/2016/09/growing-our-trusted-flagger-program.html>, 2016.

## 10. RARE PEPES

In this Section we display some of our rare Pepe collection.



**Figure 23:** A somewhat rare, modern Pepe, which much like the Bayeux Tapestry records the historic rise of /pol/.



**Figure 24:** An extremely common Pepe commissioned by CNN to commemorate Pepe's recognition as a hate symbol.



**Figure 25:** A (French?) Pepe wearing a beret, smoking a cigarette, and playing an accordion.



**Figure 26:** An (unfortunately) ultra rare Pepe eating a delicious Publix Deli Sub Sandwich.



Figure 27: An ironic Pepe depiction of Hillary Clinton.




Figure 29: What we believe to be a Pepe re-interpretation of Goya's "Saturn Devouring His Son."



Figure 28: A Pepe Julian Assange dangling a USB full of Democratic National Convention secrets.



Figure 30: A very comfy Pepe.



**Figure 31:** A mischievous witch Pepe.



**Figure 32:** The now “iconic” Trump Pepe.