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PREO organisational types and operational extents

Type

- Alternative media: 60
- Movement: 5
- Party: 1

Extent

- National: 28
- Sub-national: 6
- Transnational: 32
PREOs’ ideational ‘vision of society’

- Accelerationism: 51
- Authoritarian: 2
- Civilisationist: 2
- Neo-nazi: 2
- Sovereign citizens: 6
- Territorial revisionism: 2
- White nationalist / supremacist: 1
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PREOs’ ideational ‘gender’ and ‘opponent’ traits

Gender

- Anti-feminist: 9
- Anti-gender: 1
- Anti-LGBTQ: 1
- Male supremacy: 1
- Misogynist: 4
- Other: 9

Opponent

- Anti-EU: 28
- Anti-globalist: 11
- Anti-immigrant: 5
- Anti-Leftist: 8
- Anti-Muslim: 32
- Anti-Roma: 24
- Antisemitism: 4
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PREOs’ ideational ‘religious/cult’ and ‘conspiracy theory’ traits

Religious/Cult

Conspiracy belief

- Christianist
- Neo-Odinist
- Neo-völkisch

- Great Replacement
- Holocaust denial
- Jewish conspiracy
- Other
- Revisionism
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Ideational trait impressions

- overwhelmingly movement actors – but that category contains diversity
- neo-Nazi organisations predominate because many laws are framed to counter post-war Nazism
- distinction between action-oriented (leftists) and ideologically-oriented (Jews, Muslims, immigrants) opponents
- gendered traits and religious/cult traits (esp. neo-völkisch and Christianist) rooted in traditional, even atavistic views of family, sexuality, and society
- conspiracy beliefs: longstanding antisemitic variants and recent great replacement
PREO digital presence
PREOs on digital platforms

![Graph showing the number of proscribed groups on different platforms]

- **Platform:** VK, Facebook, Gab, YouTube, Twitter, Instagram, Telegram
- **Activity:** Active, Inactive

The graph illustrates the number of accounts with matching names across various digital platforms for proscribed groups.
Digital activity impressions

- moderation of PREOs is largely effective, leading to very low representation on both mainstream and alt-tech platforms
- absence of organisational profiles does not, however, mean lack of a digital footprint
- lack of digital presence does not necessarily mean a lack of offline organisational activity
Content proscription
## Modes of content proscription in the EU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context dependent judicial interpretation</td>
<td>Typically, no symbols are explicitly proscribed; charges may be brought for various forms of incitement, for which the use of symbols and content may be evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascist regime proscription</td>
<td>Symbols directly associated with the National Socialist or Fascist regimes are proscribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalitarian proscription</td>
<td>Symbols directly associated with the totalitarian regimes (often specifying the National Socialist and Communist regimes) are proscribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREO symbol proscription</td>
<td>Symbols associated with proscribed organisations are specified and concurrently proscribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrete symbol proscription</td>
<td>Proscription of symbols and content are applied, irrespective of their connection to existing, lawful organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No content proscription</td>
<td>Symbols are not proscribed, even within the scope of context dependent judicial interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thematic groupings of banned symbols: Supremacist symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imported American symbols</th>
<th>Anti-gay symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KKK symbols</td>
<td>Crossed-out rainbow flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White fist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'No paedophilia' symbol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Connotative dimensions of VRWE (violent right-wing extremist) symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly cryptic</th>
<th>Strong VRWE linkage</th>
<th>Weak VRWE linkage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EX: ’14 words’</td>
<td>EX: ’100%’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordadler symbols</td>
<td></td>
<td>runic symbols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly cryptic</td>
<td>EX: ’White Power’</td>
<td>EX: Celtic crosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS Reichsadler</td>
<td></td>
<td>meander patterns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREO Project findings

- Further evidence of far-right transnationalism
- Variation in standards of proscription, including states with no proscriptive instruments
- Proscription and content moderation: not panaceas, but a means to disrupt extremism
- BUT! Extremist have many means to beat the ban (‘Trotz Verbot – nicht tot’) 
- Hard to use historical cases to address current and emergent problems—ongoing monitoring is needed