

HELPING TO MAKE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS
A REALITY FOR EVERYONE IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

Antisemitism

Summary overview of the situation in
the European Union 2002–2012

November 2013



FRA

EUROPEAN UNION AGENCY FOR FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS



***Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers
to your questions about the European Union.***

Freephone number (*):
00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

More information on the European Union is available on the Internet (<http://europa.eu>).

FRA – European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights
Schwarzenbergplatz 11 – 1040 Vienna – Austria
Tel.: +43 158030-0 – Fax: +43 158030-699
Email: info@fra.europa.eu – fra.europa.eu

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2013

ISBN 978-92-9239-087-7
doi:10.2811/4899

© European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2013
Reproduction is authorised, except for commercial purposes, provided the source is acknowledged.

Antisemitism

Summary overview of the situation in
the European Union 2002–2012

November 2013

Contents

Introduction	5
Manifestations of antisemitism.....	5
Limited data collection on antisemitism	8
The legal framework.....	9
Data collection for this update	10
Data from international organisations	11
Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights	11
European Commission against Racism and Intolerance.....	12
National data on antisemitism.....	13
Austria.....	14
Belgium.....	18
Croatia.....	22
Cyprus	23
Czech Republic.....	24
Denmark.....	26
Finland	28
France	29
Germany.....	31
Greece.....	34
Hungary	35
Ireland.....	36
Italy	37
Latvia	38
Lithuania.....	39
The Netherlands.....	40
Poland.....	44
Spain	46
Slovakia	47
Sweden.....	48
United Kingdom.....	50
Concluding remarks – persisting gaps in data collection	54

Introduction

Antisemitism can be expressed in the form of verbal and physical attacks, threats, harassment, property damage, graffiti or other forms of text, including hate speech on the internet. The present report – the ninth update of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) overview of *Manifestations of antisemitism in the EU* – relates to manifestations of antisemitism as they are recorded by official and unofficial sources in the 28 European Union (EU) Member States.¹

This update compiles available data on antisemitic incidents collected by international, governmental and non-governmental sources, covering the period 1 January 2002–31 December 2012, where data are available. No data on manifestations of antisemitism were available for Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia and Romania at the time this update was compiled.

Manifestations of antisemitism

Antisemitism is a deeply rooted prejudice that has persisted over centuries and whose devastating effects continue to be felt to this day. Jewish people across the EU continue to face insults, discrimination, harassment and even physical violence which, despite concerted efforts by both the EU and its Member States, show no signs of fading into the past. A 2012 FRA survey on experiences and perceptions of hate crime, discrimination and antisemitism among Jewish persons in the EU² highlights some of these effects.

According to the survey findings, two thirds of the almost 6,000 survey respondents consider antisemitism to be a problem in the EU Member State where they live; three quarters believe that antisemitism has increased in that country over the past five years. Close to half of the respondents worry about being verbally insulted or harassed in a public place because they are Jewish, while another third worry about being physical attack in the country where they live for the same reason. Over half of the respondents heard or saw someone claim that the Holocaust was a myth or that it had been exaggerated. Three quarters of respondents consider antisemitism online a problem, with the same proportion believing antisemitism online has increased over the last five years.

¹ 'Official data' is understood here as those data collected by law enforcement agencies, criminal justice systems and relevant state ministries at the national level. 'Unofficial data' refers to data collected by non-governmental and civil society organisations.

² FRA (2013), *Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU Member States: experiences and perceptions of antisemitism*, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union (Publications Office).

FRA survey on experiences and perceptions of hate crime, discrimination and antisemitism among Jewish persons in the EU

The FRA survey on Jewish people's experiences and perceptions of antisemitism collected data from 5,847 self-identified Jewish respondents (aged 16 or over) in eight EU Member States – Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The survey was also carried out in Romania, but due to the low number of responses, the data were analysed separately from those of the other eight survey countries.

The survey was carried out online in September and October 2012 when all self-identifying Jewish respondents were free to complete the survey – therefore the respondents are a self-selected sample of Jewish people in the survey countries. The countries selected for the survey correspond to over 90 % of the estimated Jewish population in the European Union (EU) and the number of respondents obtained in each country corresponds roughly to differences in the estimated size of the Jewish population between Member States. The survey data collection was coordinated by Ipsos MORI and the Institute for Jewish Policy Research.

This FRA survey is the first in the EU to collect comparable data on Jewish people's experiences and perceptions of bias-motivated crime, discrimination and antisemitism. Specifically the survey asked respondents' opinions about trends in antisemitism, antisemitism as a problem in everyday life, personal experiences of antisemitic incidents, witnessing antisemitic incidents and worries about becoming a victim of an antisemitic attack (personal safety, safety of children, other family members and friends). The survey also provides data on the extent to which respondents consider antisemitic acts against the Jewish community, such as vandalism of Jewish sites or antisemitic messages in the media or on the internet, to be a problem in their countries.

The survey collected data on the effects of antisemitism in respondents' daily behaviour, their feelings of safety and any actions they may take due to a lack of it. The surveyed followed up on questions about personal experiences of specific forms of harassment, vandalism or physical violence with others about the details of such incidents, including their frequency, the number and characteristics of perpetrators, the reporting of the incident to any organisations or institutions and any other actions taken as a result of the incident. The survey collected data about personal experiences of discrimination against Jews on different grounds and in various areas of everyday life – for example at work, school or when using specific services. The survey followed up on questions on the extent of discrimination with other questions asking about the reporting of incidents and the reasons for non-reporting. The survey explored the level of rights awareness regarding antidiscrimination legislation, victim support organisations and knowledge of any legislation concerning trivialisation or denial of the Holocaust.

For more information, see: FRA (2013), Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU Member States: experiences and perceptions of antisemitism, Luxembourg, Publications Office

In historical terms, Anti-Jewish sentiment began to move away from more or less exclusively religious considerations during the course of the 19th century. The focus turned instead to assumed negative and pernicious biological traits thought to be shared by Jewish populations as a whole.

This process of ‘racialisation’ of Jewish populations came to be expressed in openly antisemitic political agendas across Europe from the late 19th century onwards. Next to deadly anti-Jewish pogroms carried out in the Russian Empire at the end of that century, the National Socialist, or Nazi, regime’s atrocities exemplified during World War II the worst excesses of antisemitism.

After the war, a transformation occurred in the public expression of antisemitism. Open manifestations of antisemitism generally came to be seen and treated as socially unacceptable and punishable by law, and thereby, seemingly, were banished to society’s fringes. At that time arose what is known as ‘secondary antisemitism’. Drawing on older, openly antisemitic stereotypes, a typical claim of secondary antisemitism is, for example, that ‘Jews’ manipulate Germans or Austrians by exploiting their feelings of guilt about World War II. Characteristic of all forms of secondary antisemitism is that they relate to the Holocaust and that they allow speakers to avoid expressing obviously antisemitic sentiments.

The on-going political conflict between Israel and Palestine has played an important role in the development and expression of antisemitism in the contemporary period, leading some to speak of a ‘new antisemitism’, sometimes also referred to as anti-Zionism.

Antisemitism can be manifested in the denial and/or trivialisation of the Holocaust. Against this backdrop, FRA implemented a project on Holocaust and human rights education³ between 2006 and 2012. The project aimed at informing policy makers and funding institutes about the role visits to original sites and historical exhibitions can play in school education. The project served to develop practical guidance for school teachers and operators of commemoration sites, original sites and historical museums.

The findings of this project were presented in April 2013 at a conference on *Reflecting remembrance: teaching history for a common culture of remembrance*. The conference,⁴ organised by the European Commission and the European Association of History Educators (Euroclio), contributed to the EU for Citizens Programme and policy of lifelong learning.⁵ As a follow-up to the conference, the European Commission opened a funding stream providing financial assistance to projects in the field of Active European Memory.⁶

³ For more detailed information on the project, see:

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2006/holocaust-and-human-rights-education>.

⁴ 20th Euroclio Annual Professional Training and Development Conference, 7–13 April 2013, Erfurt, Germany. For more information, see: www.euroclio.eu.

⁵ For more information, see: http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/media/pr-250412_en.htm.

⁶ For more information on Action 4 – Active European Memory, see:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/funding/2012/call_action4_2012_en.php.

Under its 2013 Annual Work Programme, FRA is implementing a project on raising awareness of human rights education.⁷ This project will initially serve to develop and pilot a training module for European Commission officials on the Holocaust and human rights education, helping to ensure that FRA work in this field will lead to better implementation of teaching about the Holocaust and human rights under the EU Key Competences Framework.⁸

Limited data collection on antisemitism

Despite the negative effects of antisemitism on Jewish populations in particular and on society at large, evidence collected by FRA shows that few EU Member States operate official data collection mechanisms that record the incidence of antisemitism in detail.⁹ This lack of systematic data collection leads to gross underreporting of the nature and characteristics of antisemitic incidents that occur in the EU.

The lack of data also limits the ability of policy makers and other relevant stakeholders at national and international levels to take measures and implement courses of action to combat antisemitism effectively and decisively. The latter means that offenders are often able to carry out attacks with relative impunity, with Jewish populations continuing to face antisemitic violence, whether verbal or physical.

Where data exist, they are generally not comparable, not least because the different Member States use different definitions, methodologies and sources. Furthermore, while official systems of data collection are generally based on police records and/or criminal justice data, authorities do not always categorise incidents motivated by antisemitism under that heading.

Incidents motivated by antisemitism are often not recorded as such, primarily because the relevant provisions are often lacking in the criminal codes of EU Member States, which means that the category of ‘antisemitic incidents’ is not included on police reporting forms. In addition, front-line police officers often lack the training necessary to recognise incidents as being motivated by antisemitism. An additional limitation of official data collection is that victims or witnesses of antisemitic incidents often do not report them to the authorities, as the findings of the FRA survey confirm.

Jewish and other civil society organisations (CSOs) also collect data on antisemitism, which offers an important supplement to official data. They rarely collect them, however, in a systematic way. As a result, doubts remain as to the validity and reliability of these data, and, therefore, to their comparability.

⁷ For more information, see: http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/awp-2013_en.pdf.

⁸ For more information, see: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/ll-learning/keycomp_en.pdf.

⁹ FRA (2013), *Making hate crime visible in the European Union: acknowledging victims’ rights*. Luxembourg, Publications Office.

The current state of official and unofficial data collection is such that the present report can only provide a partial, albeit essential, overview of the situation of antisemitism in EU Member States. Due to gaps in data collection and to high levels of underreporting, the data presented here cannot and should not be taken at face value, nor should they be taken as an indication of the prevalence of antisemitism in any given EU Member State.

What this update does show, however, is that antisemitism remains an issue of serious concern for Jewish populations in particular and for society as a whole. The issue demands decisive and targeted policy responses. The effective implementation of these responses would not only afford Jewish communities better protection against antisemitism, but it would also ensure that EU Member States guarantee that the fundamental rights of people living in the EU are protected and safeguarded.

National and international authorities, as well as civil society, must exert renewed and sustained effort if data collection on the matter is to be improved. The ready and regular availability of robust and comparable data on the situation of antisemitism in the EU would enable policy makers and relevant stakeholders to better target interventions to combat antisemitism. This ninth update contributes to providing such data to all relevant stakeholders.

The legal framework

Legal instruments relevant to countering antisemitism are in place at the level of the United Nations, the Council of Europe and the EU.¹⁰

For the purposes of this update, a key legal instrument is Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, which sets out to define a common EU-wide criminal law approach in the field.

The Framework Decision on Racism and Xenophobia aims to ensure that the same behaviour constitutes an offence in all EU Member States and that effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal penalties, including the possibility of imprisonment, are provided for natural and legal persons who have committed or who are liable for offences motivated by racism or xenophobia, therefore also including antisemitism.

It requires EU Member States to take measures to punish public incitement to violence or hatred directed against a person or persons belonging to a group defined by reference to 'race', colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin and the commission of such acts by public dissemination or distribution of tracts, pictures or other material.

¹⁰ See: *Ibid.*; FRA, European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) and Council of Europe (2011), *Handbook on European non-discrimination law*, Luxembourg, Publications Office, available at: <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2011/handbook-european-non-discrimination-law>.

The Framework Decision also requires EU Member States to take measures to punish any conduct publicly condoning, denying or grossly trivialising crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes (as defined in Articles 6, 7 and 8 of the Statute of the International Criminal Court) against a person or persons defined by reference to 'race', colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin, when the conduct is carried out in a manner likely to incite to violence or hatred against such a group or a member of such a group.

Under the terms of the Framework Decision, EU Member States are further required to take measures to punish condoning, denying or grossly trivialising crimes (as defined in Article 6 of the Charter of the International Military Tribunal appended to the London Agreement of 8 August 1945) against a person or persons defined by reference to 'race', colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin, when the conduct is carried out in public and in a manner likely to incite to violence or hatred against such a group or a member of such a group.

Instigating, aiding and abetting the commission of conduct described above are also punishable under the terms of the Framework Decision. For legal persons, penalties should include criminal or non-criminal fines and may also include other penalties, such as: exclusion from entitlement to public benefits or aid; temporary or permanent disqualification from the practice of commercial activities; placement under judicial supervision; or a judicial winding-up order, which allows for a company to be liquidated.

For other criminal offences, racist and xenophobic motivation is to be considered an aggravating circumstance, or, alternatively, courts may take the motivation into account in the determination of penalties.

Article 10 of the Framework Decision stipulates its review by the end of November 2013, thereby providing an opportunity to assess efforts made at the level of national legislation as to how EU Member States combat racism and xenophobia, including antisemitism.

Data collection for this update

FRA consulted a variety of data sources to obtain the most complete and accurate picture of the situation of antisemitism in the EU. This update covers all 28 EU Member States. To collect the data presented here, FRA:

- reviewed official sources of data on antisemitism available in the public domain, both at international and national levels. At the international level, this includes the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) at the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) at the Council of Europe. At the national level, data published by relevant governmental offices, equality bodies, police forces and criminal justice systems were consulted;

- lodged specific requests with governmental offices through its National Liaison Officers system¹¹ to ensure that the latest available official data on antisemitism would be considered in drafting this update;
- Consulted data on antisemitism published by civil society organisations and non-governmental organisations.

Data from international organisations

ODIHR compiles official data on antisemitism, which it publishes in its annual report on *Hate crimes in the OSCE region – incidents and responses*. ECRI includes considerations on antisemitism in the country reports that are part of its monitoring cycles.

Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights

ODIHR's annual report on hate crime covers all 28 EU Member States and includes 13 bias motivations, one of which is antisemitism. The data presented in the report stem from governmental sources (National Points of Contact on Hate Crimes, NPCs), NGOs and international governmental organisations. ODIHR requests that National Points of Contact fill out a questionnaire on the basis of ODIHR's definition of what constitutes a hate crime:

"[...] a criminal act motivated by bias towards a certain group. For a criminal act to qualify as a hate crime, it must meet two criteria: The act must be a crime under the criminal code of the legal jurisdiction in which it is committed. The crime must have been committed with a bias motivation. 'Bias motivation' means that the perpetrator chose the target of the crime on the basis of protected characteristics. A 'protected characteristic' is a fundamental or core characteristic that is shared by a group, such as 'race', religion, ethnicity, language or sexual orientation. The target of a hate crime may be a person, people or property associated with a group that shares a protected characteristic."¹²

ODIHR's latest annual report on hate crime covers the year 2011 and was published in November 2012.¹³ Fifteen EU Member States reported to ODIHR that they record crimes motivated by antisemitism: Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom. However, only four of these (Germany, Italy, Sweden and the United Kingdom) provided ODIHR with the specific data on antisemitic crime needed for that report (Table 1).

¹¹ For a list of National Liaison Officers, see: <http://fra.europa.eu/en/cooperation/eu-member-states/national-liaison-officers>.

¹² ODIHR (2012), *Hate crime*, available at: <http://tandis.odihr.pl/?p=ki-hc>.

¹³ ODIHR (2012), *Hate crimes in the OSCE region: incidents and responses – Annual report for 2011*, Warsaw, ODIHR/OSCE, available at: http://tandis.odihr.pl/hcr2011/pdf/Hate_Crime_Report_full_version.pdf.

Table 1: Antisemitic hate crimes in the OSCE region in 2011, official data submitted by EU Member States

Country code	Antisemitic hate crimes recorded	National point of contact on hate crime
DE	1,239	Federal Interior Ministry
IT	30	Ministry of the Interior, Office for Co-ordination and Planning of Police Forces
SE	194	National Council for Crime Prevention
UK	438 (England, Wales and Northern Ireland)	Ministry of Justice

Source: ODIHR, 2012, pp. 61–64, pp. 145–147

European Commission against Racism and Intolerance

ECRI includes considerations on antisemitism in its country monitoring work. This work proceeds by cycle to examine “the situation concerning manifestations of racism and intolerance in each of the Council of Europe member States”.¹⁴

These considerations include a broad overview of the situation of antisemitism in the country under examination, with ECRI also making recommendations on what it considers to be the main issues the country under examination needs to address. All 28 EU Member States have been covered in the last two monitoring cycles.

The main conclusions that can be drawn from ECRI’s monitoring work on antisemitism in the EU are as follows.

- Representatives of Jewish communities report that they are well-integrated in society.
- EU Member States actively implement programmes aimed at combating antisemitism, including education programmes and initiatives to support Jewish culture.
- EU Member States attempt to fight antisemitism through the courts.
- Antisemitic stereotyping continues to be a reality in EU Member States.
- Antisemitism is often openly expressed, including in the context of sporting events.
- Antisemitic incidents continue to occur in EU Member States, whether expressed in terms of verbal and physical violence; threats, insults directed at Jews going to synagogue; persistent harassment of rabbis; repeated attacks on Jews wearing religious symbols; hate speech; antisemitic bullying in schools; or through damage to or desecration of property, including arson.

¹⁴ ECRI (2012), *Country monitoring work*, available at: www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/ecri/activities/countrybycountry_en.asp.

- Jewish people wearing visible symbols of their religion are the most likely targets of antisemitic incidents.
- Denial and trivialisation of the Holocaust are becoming more common, with glorification of the Nazi past also in evidence.
- The expression of antisemitism on the internet is on the rise, as demonstrated by the open expression of antisemitism in online forums.
- Links are sometimes made between policies taken by the State of Israel and members of Jewish communities at the local level.
- Antisemitic incidents intensify in periods when conflict in the Middle East flares up, with the nature and tone of news coverage of the conflict a contributing factor.
- Antisemitic demonstrations are sometimes organised by far-right groups to coincide with events in the Jewish calendar or with the anniversary of historical events of significance to Jewish communities, especially as regards World War II.
- Antisemitic material continues to be published in some EU Member States, with few or no consequences for those who do so.
- Some political parties in EU Member States are openly antisemitic.
- The main perpetrators of antisemitic incidents are neo-Nazis, sympathisers of the far right and far left, Muslim fundamentalists and the younger generation, including school children. There are also incidents of public antisemitic discourse on university campuses.
- Discussions surrounding property restitution laws have spurred antisemitic sentiments because the general population does not understand why such laws are needed.
- There are forums for dialogue bringing together members of Jewish and Muslim communities and local government representatives to promote mutual understanding and to take joint action to combat intolerance.

National data on antisemitism

This section on national data on antisemitic incidents takes each country in turn, given that the national level data are not comparable. The country sections begin by presenting official data on antisemitism, followed by unofficial data and finishing with *one* example of antisemitic incidents recorded in the Member State of concern, so as to illustrate the reality behind the figures that are presented. Where possible, these examples are drawn from official sources or from NGOs that record antisemitic incidents. Where available, the country sections provide data on the types of incidents that are recorded and on the characteristics of victims and perpetrators of antisemitic incidents.

Austria

Official data

The main source of official data on antisemitic incidents in Austria is the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution and Counter-terrorism (*Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz und Terrorismusbekämpfung*, BVT). The Office collects data submitted to it on a quarterly basis by the regional offices for the protection of the constitution and counter-terrorism (*Landesämter für Verfassungsschutz und Terrorismusbekämpfung*, LVG). These data are published annually in a report on the protection of the constitution (*Verfassungsschutzbericht*), which covers right-wing extremism, left-wing extremism, animal rights activism, terrorism, espionage and weapons proliferation.¹⁵ Data on antisemitism (Table 2) are subsumed under the category of right-wing extremism. Official statistics show that the number of antisemitic offences recorded in Austria increased to 27 in 2012 from 16 in 2011.

Table 2: Recorded antisemitic offences committed by right-wing extremists, Austria, 2002–2012

Year	Recorded antisemitic offences
2002	20
2003	9
2004	17
2005	8
2006	8
2007	15
2008	23
2009	12
2010	27
2011	16
2012	27

Sources: 2002–2010: Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution and Counter-terrorism; 2011–2012: Federal Chancellery

The legal and constitutional service of the Federal Chancellery (*Bundeskanzleramt Verfassungsdienst*) communicated data to the FRA on the nature of these recorded offences, covering the period 2009–2012 (Table 3). These data show that recorded antisemitic offences generally consist of verbal expressions or damage to property and tend not to target individual persons or organisations.

¹⁵ These reports are available at: www.bmi.gv.at/cms/bmi_verfassungsschutz.

Table 3: Nature of recorded antisemitic offences, Austria, 2009–2012

Year	Verbal expressions (incl. on the internet) or damage to property	Against a person or an organisation	Total
2009	9	3	12
2010	24	3	27
2011	15	1	16
2012	26	1	27

Source: Federal Chancellery

Although not all the activities of right-wing extremists and of neo-Nazi sympathisers are antisemitic in nature, the decrease to 920 in 2012 from 1,040 in 2010 in the number of cases brought to the courts in relation to these activities is still noteworthy (Table 4).

Table 4: Cases brought to the courts in Austria, right-wing extremism, 2008–2012

Legal provision	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Prohibition Statute (<i>Verbotsgesetz</i>)	360	396	522	436	466
Criminal law on incitement to hatred (<i>Verhetzung – §283 Strafgesetzbuch</i>)	73	33	79	84	83
Other criminal offences (<i>Sonstige StGB-Delikte</i>)	304	253	380	368	323
Insignia Law (<i>Abzeichengesetz</i>)	21	40	20	26	31
Nazi ideology (<i>Art. III Abs. 1 Ziff. 4 EGVG</i>)	77	69	39	49	17
Total	835	791	1,040	963	920

Source: Austrian Ministry of the Interior

The legal and constitutional service of the Federal Chancellery also provided FRA with data on the clearance rates of cases relating to incitement to hatred and the Prohibition Statute (Table 5). These data show increases in cases relating to the Prohibition Statute, which relates to the banning of Nazism in Austria, with convictions rising steadily between 2008 and 2012.

Table 5: Cases relating to incitement to hatred and the Prohibition Statute: clearance rates, Austria, 2008–2012

Year	Offence	Cases brought to the courts (Anzeigen)	Charges/ indictments (Anklagen/ Strafanträge)	Convictions (Verurteilungen)	Acquittals (Freisprüche)
2008	Incitement to hatred	73	14	3	3
	Prohibition Statute	360	25	32	5
2009	Incitement to hatred	33	13	5	4
	Prohibition Statute	396	46	36	7
2010	Incitement to hatred	79	7	9	1
	Prohibition Statute	522	73	43	6
2011	Incitement to hatred	84	10	6	1
	Prohibition Statute	436	78	45	7
2012	Incitement to hatred	83	14	6	2
	Prohibition Statute	466	65	51	9

Source: Federal Chancellery

Unofficial data

In its annual reports on racism in Austria, Civil Courage and Anti-racism Work (*Zivilcourage und Anti-Rassismus-Arbeit*, ZARA) publishes data on the number of racist graffiti reported to it in the preceding year.¹⁶ Forty-four such reports were made to ZARA in 2012, 51 % of which consisted of swastikas or antisemitic graffiti (Table 6).

¹⁶ These reports are available here: www.zara.or.at/index.php/beratung/rassismus-report.

Table 6: Unofficial data on antisemitic incidents, Austria, 2003–2012

Year	ZARA: Swastikas or antisemitic graffiti
2003	18
2004	17
2005	10
2006	9
2007	60
2008	33
2009	86
2010	78
2011	33
2012	22

Sources: ZARA, *Racism reports 2003–2012*

Example of antisemitic incidents in Austria in 2012

In its *Racism Report 2012: Case report on racist incidents and structures in Austria*, ZARA reports the following antisemitic incident:

“In August, new ‘Stones of Remembrance’ are placed in a street in Vienna. They commemorate the Jews killed during National-Socialism. Shortly thereafter Ms P. reports to ZARA that the stones had already been spat on, the very morning of the first day after they had been set in place. ZARA documents this anti-Semitic incident and forwards the report to the Forum against Anti-Semitism.”¹⁷

¹⁷ ZARA, Zivilcourage und Anti-Rassismus-Arbeit (2012), *Racism report 2012: case report on racist incidents and structures in Austria*, p. 18, available at: www.zara.or.at/wp/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/ZARA_RR12_english.pdf.

Belgium

Official data

The Federal Police record and publish data on Holocaust denial and revisionism, which are reproduced in Table 7.¹⁸ After decreasing to two cases from 11 between 2010 and 2009, the number of cases increased again to seven from two between 2011 and 2012.

Table 7: Cases of Holocaust denial and revisionism recorded by the Belgian Federal Police, 2006–2012

Year	Holocaust denial or trivialisation	Approving of or justifying the Holocaust	Not specified	Total
2006		1		1
2007	2	2		4
2008	3	5	1	9
2009	4	7		11
2010	1	1		2
2011	0	2		2
2012	1	6		7

Source: Federal Police

The national equality body in Belgium (Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism, CEOOR) is competent to receive and handle complaints from members of the public pertaining to discrimination on all grounds. In 2012, it was competent to deal with 88 cases relating to antisemitism that were lodged with it, compared with 62 in 2011 and 57 in 2010 (Table 8).¹⁹

¹⁸ Federal Police (2013), *Statistiques policières de criminalité, Belgique 2000-2012*, available in French at: www.polfed-fedpol.be/crim/crim_statistieken/2012_trim4/pdf/nationaal/rapport_2012_trim4_nat_belgique_fr.pdf; available in Dutch at: www.polfed-fedpol.be/crim/crim_statistieken/2012_trim4/pdf/nationaal/rapport_2012_trim4_nat_belgie_nl.pdf.

¹⁹ Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism (2013), *Annual report on discrimination (Discrimination/Diversité: rapport annuel 2012)*, available in French at: http://diversite.be/diversiteit/files/File//publications/rapport_annuel/2013/Disc_Div/CGKR_JV_discr_FR.pdf; available in Dutch at: http://diversite.be/diversiteit/files/File//publications/rapport_annuel/2013/Disc_Div/CGKR_JV_discr_NL.pdf.

Table 8: Complaints of antisemitism received by the Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism for which it was competent, Belgium, 2002–2012

Year	Complaints of antisemitism
2002	30
2003	30
2004	69
2005	58
2006	64
2007	67
2008	66
2009	108
2010	57
2011	62
2012	88

Source: Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism, Annual report on discrimination

The most common complaints CEOOR receives in relation to antisemitic incidents concern the internet, followed by verbal aggression, with a large increase in complaints relating to Holocaust denial, as Table 9 shows.

Table 9: Complaints of antisemitism received by CEOOR for which it was competent, Belgium, by category, 2004–2012

Year	Verbal aggression	Letters, articles	Media	Internet	Violence	Vandalism	Holocaust denial	Other
2004	23	14	5	10	9	3	3	2
2005	18	9	2	11	6	6	6	0
2006	14	16	1	21	3	3	3	3
2007	17	8	3	25	0	9	1	4
2008	16	3	0	26	5	7	8	1
2009	24	1	1	35	10	18	11	8
2010	8	3	2	31	7	5	1	0
2011	9	6	0	32	6	2	4	3
2012	15	5	5	28	4	11	13	7

Source: Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism, Annual report on discrimination

Unofficial data

Antisemitisme.be is the main NGO that records data on antisemitism in Belgium. It registers acts of antisemitism through a dedicated telephone and fax hotline and email address, and through regular contact with CEOOR. Antisemitisme.be is run by volunteers and works in close association with the Executive Office of Community Surveillance (*Bureau exécutif de surveillance communautaire*) and the Coordination Committee of the Jewish Municipalities of Antwerp (*Coördinatie*

Komit  van de Joodse Gemeenten van Antwerpen), with the support of the Israelite Central Consistory of Belgium (*Consistoire central Isra lite de Belgique*).

Data published annually by Antisemitisme.be²⁰ show that it received reports of 80 incidents in 2012 against 65 in 2011. This suggests that the number of incidents is gradually climbing back to the 2009 peak of 109 incidents (Table 10).

Table 10: Antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be, Belgium, 2002–2012

Year	Reported antisemitic incidents
2002	62
2003	28
2004	46
2005	60
2006	66
2007	69
2008	73
2009	109
2010	52
2011	65
2012	80

Source: Antisemitisme.be, Annual report on antisemitism in Belgium

The largest numbers of incidents of antisemitism in 2012 were reported in Brussels (30) and Antwerp (10), as was the case in 2011, when 19 incidents were reported in Brussels and 14 in Antwerp.

There is a great degree of variance in the types of antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be. Ideological antisemitism – often translated into the expression of anti-Israel sentiments – and antisemitic incidents on the internet account for the largest proportions of reported incidents (Table 11).

Table 11: Types of antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be, Belgium, 2009–2012

Year	Violence	Threats	Desecration/ Property damage	Ideological	Internet
2009 (n = 109)	11	13	22	29	34
2010 (n = 52)	7	3	5	12	25
2011 (n = 65)	7	5	3	23	27
2012 (n = 80)	5	6	13	26	30

Source: Antisemitisme.be, Annual report on antisemitism in Belgium

Although no statistical data are provided on the perpetrators of antisemitic incidents, Antisemitisme.be reports that the five violent acts reported to it

²⁰ These reports are available in French at: www.antisemitisme.be/fr/category/analyses/ and in Dutch at: www.antisemitisme.be/nl/category/analyses-nl/.

in 2012 were most frequently carried out by what it describes as persons of ‘Arab-Muslim origin’. Antisemitisme.be does not provide details on how the origins of perpetrators are ascertained. For this reason, these data must be interpreted with care and caution.

Example of antisemitic incidents in Belgium in 2012

Antisemitisme.be reports that an antisemitic blog titled *The true nature of Judaism* is hosted on blogspot.be. Next to Holocaust denial, the content of this blog allegedly also includes conspiracy theories and incitement to hatred. The stated aim of the blog is to inform its users, among others, about “the dark side of Judaism.” The Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism lodged a complaint with the host of the blog.²¹

²¹ Antisemitisme.be (2012), *Blog antisémite héberge sur blogspot.be*, available in French at: www.antisemitisme.be/fr/incidents-fr/blog-antisemite-heberge-sur-blogspot-be and in Dutch at: www.antisemitisme.be/nl/incidents-nl/antisemitische-blog-die-zich-op-blogspot-be-bevindt.

Croatia

Official data

The Ministry of Interior told FRA that it had recorded one criminal act motivated by antisemitism in Croatia in 2012.

Unofficial data

No unofficial data were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of antisemitic incidents in Croatia in 2012

The criminal act mentioned above concerns antisemitic statements posted on a Facebook page.

Cyprus

Official data

The Office for Combating Discrimination, part of the Police Headquarters in Cyprus, reported to FRA that no antisemitic incidents were recorded in the police registry of racial offences/incidents in 2012.

Unofficial data

No unofficial data were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of antisemitic incidents in Cyprus in 2012

No examples of antisemitic incidents were found in Cyprus in 2012.

Czech Republic

Official data

Every year, the Ministry of the Interior publishes a report on the issue of extremism in the Czech Republic, as part of the government's strategy on combating extremism.²² These reports also provide data on the number of recorded criminal offences motivated by antisemitism (Table 12). These data show that the number of such offences decreased to nine recorded offences in 2012 from their 2009 peak of 48 recorded offences.

Table 12: Recorded criminal offences motivated by antisemitism, Czech Republic, 2005–2012

Year	Recorded criminal offences
2005	23
2006	14
2007	18
2008	27
2009	48
2010	28
2011	18
2012	9

Source: Czech Republic, Ministry of the Interior, Annual report on the issue of extremism in the Czech Republic

Unofficial data

The Jewish Community of Prague (*Židovská obec v Praze*) reports annually on antisemitic incidents in the Czech Republic.²³ The 2012 report shows that antisemitic incidents take place predominantly on the internet, with a more than three-fold increase in such incidents recorded between 2011 and 2012, as outlined in Table 13.

²² The reports are available at: www.mvcr.cz/mvcren/article/documents-on-the-fight-against-extremism.aspx.

²³ Jewish Community of Prague (2012), *Výroční zpráva o projevech antisemitismu v České republice za rok 2012*, available in Czech at: www.kehilaprag.cz/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&qid=408&Itemid=276&language=cs.

Table 13: Numbers and types of antisemitic incidents recorded, Czech Republic, 2004–2012

Year	Attacks: physical	Attacks: property	Threats	Harassment	Media/ Web	Total
2004	5	9	3	27	13	57
2005	1	13	0	12	24	50
2006	1	5	2	10	16	34
2007	0	4	0	10	12	26
2008	1	2	2	15	28	48
2009	0	6	1	4	16	27
2010	0	5	3	8	31	47
2011	1	5	4	7	26	43
2012	0	6	0	10	82	98

Sources: 2004–2010: Fórum proti Antisemitismu, Zpráva o stavu antisemitismu v. ČR za rok 2010, available at: www.fzo.cz/projekty-fzo/forum-proti-antisemitismu;
2011–2012: Jewish Community of Prague

Example of antisemitic incidents in the Czech Republic in 2012

The Jewish Community in Prague reports on a number of antisemitic incidents in its *Annual report on anti-Semitism symptoms in the Czech Republic 2012*.²⁴ The report lists damages caused to synagogues (Pilsen, Prague), to a Jewish cemetery (Tabor region) and damage to a car advertising a kosher restaurant, as well as numerous harassing emails and antisemitic content on websites and other publications.

²⁴ Jewish Community in Prague (2013), *Annual report on anti-semitism symptoms in the Czech Republic 2012*, pp. 40–46, available at: http://kehilaprag.cz/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&qid=176&limit=10&limit_start=0&order=date&dir=ASC&Itemid=276&lang=en.

Denmark

Official data

The Danish Security and Intelligence Service (*Politiets Efterretningstjeneste*, PET) reports five cases of extremist crimes targeting Jews in 2011.²⁵

The Ministry of Justice also provided FRA with data on cases relating to Section 266b of the Criminal Code on racially discriminating statements submitted to the Director of Public Prosecutions in 2012. The Director of Public Prosecutions decided to withdraw the charges in two cases concerning alleged antisemitic statements. The first case concerned an antisemitic remark made by one person to another at an airport. The second case concerned statements aimed at the State of Israel during lectures on the conflict between Israel and Palestine.

In addition, in 2012, the Regional Public Prosecutor decided to discontinue investigations in two cases concerning statements of a possible antisemitic nature. In both cases the Regional Public Prosecutor found that the statements were not made with the intent to threaten, insult or degrade anyone.

Unofficial data

Unofficial data on antisemitism are collected by two NGOs in Denmark: the Mosaic Religious Community (*Det Mosaiske Trossamfund*, MT) and the Documentation and Advisory Centre on Racial Discrimination (DACoRD; *Dokumentations- og rådgivningscentret om racediskrimination*). No data for either 2010 or 2011 were available when this report was compiled (Table 15), whereas 40 incidents were recorded by MT in 2012.

²⁵ Danish Security and Intelligence Service (2013), *Kriminelle forhold i 2011 med mulig ekstremistisk baggrund*, available in Danish at: www.pet.dk/~media/Forebyggende%20sikkerhed/RACI-rapporter/RACIRapport2011pdf.ashx.

Table 14: Antisemitic incidents recorded by the Mosaic Religious Community and the Documentation and Advisory Centre on Racial Discrimination, Denmark, 2003–2012

Year	The Mosaic Religious Community	Documentation and Advisory Centre on Racial Discrimination
2003	29	1
2004	37	6
2005	37	3
2006	40	4
2007	10	1
2008	4	3
2009	22	21
2010	n/a	n/a
2011	n/a	n/a
2012	40	n/a

Sources: Mosaic Religious Community (2012), *Oversigt over anmeldte antisemitiske hændelser til Mosaik Troessamfund 2012*, available at: www.mosaiske.dk/sites/default/files/1365683126/AKVAH%20Report%202012.pdf and Documentation and Advisory Centre on Racial Discrimination

Example of antisemitic incidents in Denmark in 2012

The security service of the Jewish community in Denmark lists the 40 antisemitic incidents that were reported to the Mosaic Religious Community in 2012.²⁶ Among these, a Jewish youth football club was jeered on several occasions in April 2012, with antisemitic slogans used.

²⁶ Det Mosaiske Trossamfund (2012), *Oversigt over anmeldte antisemitiske hændelser til Mosaik Troessamfund 2012*, available at: www.mosaiske.dk/sites/default/files/1365683126/AKVAH%20Report%202012.pdf.

Finland

Official data

Every year, the Police College of Finland (*Poliisiammattikorkeakoulu*) publishes a report on suspected hate crimes reported to the police.²⁷ The data for this publication are based on keyword searches of police reports to help identify hate crimes. Since 2008, the report has covered religiously motivated hate crimes, including antisemitic crimes (Table 15).

Table 15: Antisemitic crimes reported to the police, Finland, 2008–2011

Year	Antisemitic crimes reported to the police
2008	1
2009	10
2010	4
2011	6

Source: Police College of Finland

Of the few antisemitic crimes reported, the most common include defamation, verbal threats and damage to property.

Unofficial data

No unofficial data were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of antisemitic incidents in Finland in 2012

The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism reports that an unidentified person walked by a Jewish community centre in Helsinki, screaming “Heil Hitler!” and making the Nazi salute.²⁸

²⁷ Finland, Poliisiammattikorkeakoulu (2012), *Poliisin tietoon tullut viharikollisuus Suomessa 2011*, available at: [www.poliisiammattikorkeakoulu.fi/poliisi/poliisioppilaitos/home.nsf/files/99989817AF566D6EC2257AD00037641B/\\$file/Raportteia104_web.pdf](http://www.poliisiammattikorkeakoulu.fi/poliisi/poliisioppilaitos/home.nsf/files/99989817AF566D6EC2257AD00037641B/$file/Raportteia104_web.pdf).

²⁸ Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2012), *Nazi salute in front of the Jewish Community Center*, available at: <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/76407/nazi-salute-front-jewish-community-center>.

France

Official data

The national human rights institution for France, the National Consultative Commission on Human Rights (*Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme*, CNCDH), compiles annually a detailed report on the fight against racism, antisemitism and xenophobia.²⁹

This report covers antisemitic acts and threats (Table 16). Antisemitic actions are defined as homicides, attacks and attempted attacks, arson, degradations, violence and assault and battery. Antisemitic threats are defined as covering speech acts, threatening gestures and insults, graffiti (*inscriptions*), pamphlets and emails.

The number of antisemitic acts and threats recorded in France almost doubled to 614 in 2012 from 389 in 2011, due principally to the reaction to the shooting deaths of four persons at a Jewish school in Toulouse in March 2012. The International League against Racism and Anti-Semitism (LICRA), in the CNCDH's annual report, says that: "The assassinations perpetrated by Mohamed Merah revealed the point to which [...] antisemitic hatred can lead. Far from causing an electro-shock in society these murders were, on the contrary, followed by a number of incidents targeting members of the Jewish community, stemming mainly from youths for whom the assassin became a hero."³⁰

Table 16: Antisemitic actions and threats recorded, France, 2002–2012

Year	Antisemitic actions and threats
2002	936
2003	601
2004	974
2005	508
2006	571
2007	402
2008	459
2009	815
2010	466
2011	389
2012	614

Source: National Consultative Commission on Human Rights

In 2012, 177 antisemitic violent actions were recorded in France, of which 55.3 %, or 98 cases, occurred in the Île-de-France region. The CNCDH notes that

²⁹ These reports are available at: www.cncdh.fr/fr/dossiers-thematiques/racisme.

³⁰ National Consultative Commission on Human Rights (2013), *Contribution de la ligue internationale contre le racisme et l'antisémitisme* (LICRA), p. 391, available at: www.cncdh.fr/sites/default/files/cncdh_racisme_2012_basse_def.pdf.

in 10 of the 177 cases, violent actions related to neo-Nazi ideology and were mainly expressed in terms of swastikas.

Of the 177 violent actions recorded, 40 % were for degradations, 55 % for violence and assault and battery, 3 % were for homicides, and 1 % for arson. A total of 50 persons were arrested, 28 of whom were minors.

In France in 2012, 437 antisemitic threats were recorded, with 42.5 % of these, or 186 cases, occurring in the Île-de-France region. About one in five of all threats were made in March 2012, the month when Mohamed Merah shot dead four Jewish persons at a Jewish school in Toulouse.

Half of the recorded threats consisted of verbal insults, with a further 39 % consisting of graffiti, and another 11 % of tracts, letters or posters. Of all the threats, 14.4 % were related to neo-Nazi ideology.

A total of 64 persons were arrested in relation to all 437 threats, 17 of whom were minors.

Unofficial data

The Service for the Protection of the Jewish Community (*Service de Protection de la Communauté Juive*, SPCJ) records complaints of antisemitism and cooperates with the Ministry of the Interior in an effort to paint a more accurate picture of the state of antisemitism in France. In its annual report on antisemitism, the Service for the Protection of the Jewish Community replicates the data from the National Consultative Commission on Human Rights presented above. In addition, it provides detailed descriptions of antisemitic incidents.³¹

Example of antisemitic incidents in France in 2012

France was witness to the most brutal antisemitic incident in the EU in 2012, when Mohamed Merah shot dead four persons and seriously injured another at a Jewish school in Toulouse in March 2012.

³¹ For more information on the Service for the Protection of the Jewish Community, see: <http://antisemitisme.org/>.

Germany

Official data

In Germany, official data on antisemitism are collected by the criminal police notification service – politically motivated crimes (*Kriminalpolizeilicher Meldedienst – Politisch motivierte Kriminalität*, KPMD PMK). These data are published in an annual report on the protection of the constitution.³²

Data are collected on the number of politically motivated antisemitic crimes (Table 17) and on the number of politically motivated antisemitic acts of violence (Table 18) perpetrated by right-wing extremists, left-wing extremists, foreigners and others. The category of ‘foreigners’ subsumes antisemitic incidents stemming from the ‘Muslim environment’, even when the perpetrators themselves are German citizens.

The data show that there has been a decline in the number of politically motivated antisemitic crimes and acts of violence recorded in Germany since 2009. The overwhelming majority of these are committed by right-wing extremists.

Concerning antisemitic crimes recorded in 2011, 692 consisted of incitement against people (*Volksverhetzung*) compared with 696 in 2010. Another 267 cases relate to antisemitic propaganda crimes in 2011, compared with 264 in 2010. A similar pattern emerges when considering antisemitic acts of violence, with a decline in recorded acts observed since 2008.

Table 17: Number of politically motivated crimes with an antisemitic motive by category of perpetrator recorded, Germany, 2002–2011

Year	Right-wing	Left-wing	Foreigner*	Other	Total
2002	1,594	6	89	82	1,771
2003	1,226	6	53	59	1,344
2004	1,346	4	46	53	1,449
2005	1,682	7	33	26	1,748
2006	1,662	4	89	54	1,809
2007	1,561	1	59	36	1,657
2008	1,496	5	41	17	1,559
2009	1,520	4	101	65	1,690
2010	1,192	1	53	22	1,268
2011	1,188	6	24	21	1,239

Note: *This category includes Germans who are Muslims.

Source: Criminal police notification service – politically motivated crimes

³² These reports are available at: www.verfassungsschutz.de/de/oeffentlichkeitsarbeit/publikationen/verfassungsschutzberichte.

Table 18: Number of politically motivated acts of violence with an antisemitic motive by category of perpetrator recorded, Germany, 2002–2011

	Right-wing	Left-wing	Foreigner*	Other	Total
2002	30	1	7	1	39
2003	38	0	7	1	46
2004	40	1	3	1	45
2005	50	1	3	2	56
2006	44	0	7	0	51
2007	61	0	3	0	64
2008	44	2	1	0	47
2009	31	0	9	1	41
2010	31	0	6	0	37
2011	26	1	2	0	29

Note: *This category includes Germans who are Muslims.

Source: Criminal police notification service – politically motivated crimes

Unofficial data

The Amadeu Antonio Foundation in Germany has been collecting data on antisemitic incidents from the German media and from projects and initiatives concerned with antisemitism since 2002. These data are presented as a chronology of events, which is updated on a continual basis.³³ The foundation notes that this chronology is not exhaustive and therefore gives individuals the possibility to report and reference other antisemitic incidents of which they may be aware.

As Table 19 shows, there is a great degree of fluctuation in the number of antisemitic incidents recorded by the Amadeu Antonio Foundation. While 33 incidents were recorded in 2012, 42 were recorded in 2011.

³³ Antonio Amadeu Foundation, *Chronik antisemitischer Vorfälle*, available in German at: www.amadeu-antonio-stiftung.de/die-stiftung-aktiv/themen/gegen-as/antisemitismus-heute/chronik-antisemitischer-vorfaelle-1.

Table 19: Recorded antisemitic incidents, Germany, 2002–2012

Year	Recorded antisemitic incidents
2002	49
2003	81
2004	36
2005	60
2006	113
2007	80
2008	83
2009	56
2010	71
2011	42
2012	33

Source: Amadeu Antonio Foundation

Example of antisemitic incidents in Germany in 2012

The Jewish cemetery in Delmenhorst (Niedersachsen) was desecrated in the night of 16 and 17 June 2012, the Antonio Amadeu Foundation reports. A total of 18 gravestones were damaged or desecrated, including with graffiti of swastikas.³⁴

³⁴ Antonio Amadeu Foundation (2013), *Jüdischer Friedhof geschändet*, available at: www.amadeu-antonio-stiftung.de/die-stiftung-aktiv/themen/gegen-as/antisemitismus-heute/chronik-antisemitischer-vorfaelle-1/chronik-antisemitischer-vorfaelle-2012.

Greece

Official data

Few prosecutions are initiated per year in Greece for crimes covered by Law 927/1979, which refers to acts or activities aiming at racial discrimination, according to data provided by local District Attorneys' Offices to the Ministry of Justice, Transparency and Human Rights, which was communicated to the FRA. Nevertheless, five cases pertaining to antisemitism were recorded in 2010, three in 2011 and one in 2012.

Taken together, these nine cases concern arson, damage to property and aggravated damages against synagogues, Holocaust memorials or Jewish cemeteries. The damages include those caused by fire, as well as antisemitic graffiti.

Unofficial data

A report published on the website of the Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism,³⁵ lists three incidents of antisemitic vandalism in Greece in 2012.

Example of antisemitic incidents in Greece in 2012

In 2012, an unknown perpetrator set fire to a motorcycle shop in Thessaloniki and sprayed graffiti on the shop windows, consisting of swastikas and the term 'Jews'.

³⁵ Navoth, M. (2013), *Antisemitism report in Greece 2012-2013*, available at: http://antisemitism.org.il/webfm_send/62.

Hungary

Official data

No official data on antisemitism were available for Hungary at the time this report was compiled.

Unofficial data

The NGO Athena Institute monitors extremist activity in Hungary. It has been recording incidents of hate crime since 2009, including the antisemitic incidents reflected in Table 20. It uses a variety of sources, including press accounts and reports published by the government and NGOs.³⁶ In addition, the newly formed Action and Protection Foundation published its first report on antisemitic incidents in May 2013, which mainly reproduces data collected and presented by the Athena Institute.

Table 20: Number of recorded antisemitic incidents, Hungary, 2009–2012

Year	Athena Institute
2009	9
2010	8
2011	10
2012	12

Source: Athena Institute

An anonymous report “prepared by a group of volunteer experts who closely followed the events in 2012” – referred to by The Economist³⁷ as the Anti-Semitism Research Group and available for download on the website of the World Jewish Congress – records 111 antisemitic incidents in Hungary.³⁸

Example of antisemitic incidents in Hungary in 2012

In November 2012, Marton Gyongyosi, a member of parliament for the Jobbik party, called on the government to create a list of all the Jewish Members of Parliament because he said they posed a threat to national security.

³⁶ Athena Institute, *Hate crime record*, available at: www.athenainstitute.eu/en/hatecrimerecord.

³⁷ The Economist (2013), *Anti-Semitism in Hungary: The World Jewish Congress comes to Budapest*, 2 May, available at: www.economist.com/blogs/easternapproaches/2013/05/anti-semitism-hungary.

³⁸ Anonymous report, *Anti-Semitic incidents in Hungary 2012*, available at: www.worldjewishcongress.org/uploads/materials/681908fcbb2c359e82caa6835ed8b7c76cd7096.pdf.

Ireland

Official data

The Central Statistics Office in Ireland records the number of antisemitic incidents reported to the police. As Table 21 shows, the number of reported antisemitic incidents peaked in 2010, before declining again from 2011 on.

Table 21: Antisemitic incidents reported to the police, Ireland, 2004–2012

Year	Reported incidents
2004	2
2005	12
2006	2
2007	2
2008	9
2009	5
2010	13
2011	3
2012	4

Source: Central Statistics Office

Unofficial data

No unofficial data were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of antisemitic incidents in Ireland in 2012

The Irish Minister for Justice requested that a video posted on YouTube directing antisemitic abuse at him should be taken down, according to the Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism.³⁹

³⁹ Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2012), *Minister asks YouTube to remove video directing antisemitic abuse at him*, available at: <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/71135/minister-asks-youtube-remove-video-directing-antisemitic-abuse-him>.

Italy

Official data

No official data on antisemitism were available for Italy at the time this report was compiled.

Unofficial data

The Observatory of contemporary anti-Jewish prejudice (*L'Osservatorio sul pregiudizio antiebraico contemporaneo*) records incidents of antisemitism in Italy, with a particular focus on the internet.⁴⁰ As Table 22 shows, although the number of incidents it recorded declined between 2009 and 2010, since then this number has risen year-on-year.

Table 22: Recorded antisemitic incidents, Italy, 2005–2012

Year	Recorded incidents
2005	49
2006	45
2007	45
2008	35
2009	47
2010	31
2011	58
2012	87

Source: Observatory of contemporary anti-Jewish prejudice

Example of antisemitic incidents in Italy in 2012

The Italian observatory on antisemitism relays an incident reported by the Jewish Community of Milan, in which a group of eight to 10 Moroccans identified two persons as Jews in an incident at a bar. The perpetrators threatened to beat up the two and subjected them to antisemitic and anti-Israeli insults.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Italian observatory on antisemitism, *Episodi di antisemitismo in Italia*, available in Italian at: www.osservatorioantisemitismo.it/notizie/episodi-di-antisemitismo-in-italia.

⁴¹ Italian observatory on antisemitism (2013), *Aggressione antisemita in un bar di Milano*, available at: www.osservatorioantisemitismo.it/episodi-di-antisemitismo-in-italia/aggressione-antisemita-in-un-bar-di-milano.

Latvia

Official data

The Criminal Code in Latvia does not contain provisions relating specifically to antisemitism. Instead, it contains provisions relating to national, ethnic and racial hatred (Section 78), the violation of discrimination prohibitions (Section 149-1), incitement to religious hatred (Section 150), and interference with religious rituals (Section 151), which would subsume cases of antisemitism. Data from the Ministry of the Interior provided to FRA (Table 23) show that while no cases were registered in relation to Sections 149-1, 150 or 151 between 2010 and 2011, a number of criminal offences were recorded under Section 78 in those years.

Table 23: Data on criminal triggering of national, ethnic and racial hatred (Section 78), Latvia, 2010–2012

Type of data/Year	2010	2011	2012
Registered criminal offences	5	11	17
Initiated criminal procedures	4	10	18
Victims	1	0	0
Suspects	4	6	7
Defendants	0	1	3
Convicted persons	3	2	1
Closed criminal procedures	n/a	n/a	2

Source: Information Centre of the Ministry of the Interior, Latvia Security Police

Unofficial data

No unofficial data were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of antisemitic incidents in Latvia in 2012

The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism reported stone throwing or shooting destroyed glass windows at a prayer house of a Jewish cemetery in Riga.⁴²

⁴² Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2012), *Prayer house in a Jewish cemetery damaged by shooting or stone throwing*, available at: <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/73473/prayer-house-jewish-cemetery-damaged-shooting-or-stone-throwing>.

Lithuania

Official data

Limited official data on antisemitic incidents are available in Lithuania. A 2010 report by the Special Investigation Division of the Prosecutor General's Office (*Lietuvos Respublikos Prokuratūra*) notes that 36 pre-trial investigations in 2010 pertained to the incitement of antisemitism and hostility towards people of various minority groups, such as Jews, Roma, Poles or Russians. After these pre-trial investigations were completed, 23 cases under Article 170 of the criminal code on incitement against any national, racial, religious or other group were transferred to the courts in 2010. During that year, 13 persons were found guilty and sentenced under Article 170.

Specifically concerning antisemitism, the Prosecutor's Office says that nine pre-trial investigations on antisemitism cases⁴³ were initiated in the first four months of 2011 following the 2010 launch of six such pre-trial investigations. No further official data were available at the time this report was compiled.

Unofficial data

No unofficial data were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of antisemitic incidents in Lithuania in 2012

A young Jewish man wearing traditional clothing was beaten with a knuckleduster by a group of youths in northwest Lithuania when returning home from synagogue, the Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism reports.⁴⁴

⁴³ Prosecutor General's Office (2011), '*Daugėja nusikalstamų veikų asmens lygiateisiškumui ir sąžinės laisvei*', available in Lithuanian at: <http://www.prokuraturos.lt/Naujienos/Prane%c5%a1imaispaudai/tabid/71/ItemID/4018/Default.aspx>.

⁴⁴ Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2012), *A Jew was beaten with a knuckleduster, in danger of losing his eyesight*, available at: <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/74843/jew-was-beaten-knuckle-duster-danger-losing-his-eyesight>.

The Netherlands

Official data

There are two main sources of official data on antisemitic incidents in the Netherlands. The first is the annual report on the situation of criminal discrimination (*Criminaliteitsbeeld discriminatie*), published by the National Diversity Expertise Centre at the Police (*Landelijk Expertisecentrum Diversiteit van de politie*, LECD-Police). The second is the National Discrimination Expertise Centre at the Public Prosecution Service (*Landelijk Expertise Centrum Discriminatie bij het Openbaar Ministerie*, LECD-OM), which collects and publishes data on criminal discriminatory acts brought to the courts (*Cijfers in Beeld: Discriminatiecijfers*).

Table 24 summarises the data on antisemitism published in National Diversity Expertise Centre's annual report (*Poldis*) between 2008 and 2011.⁴⁵ It shows a steady increase in the number of reported criminal discriminatory antisemitic incidents in the Netherlands, which have come to account for about one in every 10 such criminal discriminatory incidents recorded by the police. Of the 283 antisemitic incidents recorded in 2011, 95 targeted public officials while they carried out their duties.

Table 24: Number of reported criminal discriminatory antisemitic incidents, Netherlands, 2008–2011

Year	Antisemitic incidents	As a % of all criminal discriminatory incidents
2008	141	6.3
2009	209	9.4
2010	286	11.4
2011	283	10.7

Source: National Diversity Expertise Centre at the Police

There is a great degree of fluctuation in the absolute number of acts brought to the courts, although the overall percentage of acts relating to antisemitism appears to be relatively stable, except for the years 2007 and 2008 (Table 25).

⁴⁵ Rijksoverheid (2011), *Poldis 2010: criminaliteitsbeeld discriminatie*, available at: www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/rapporten/2011/07/08/poldis-2010-criminaliteitsbeeld-discriminatie.html; Rijksoverheid (2012), *Poldis rapportage 2011*, available at: www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/rapporten/2012/12/18/poldis-rapportage-2011.html.

Table 25: Number of antisemitic criminal acts brought to the courts, Netherlands, 2005–2011

Year	Criminal acts brought to the courts	As a % of all cases
2005	65	23
2006	108	33
2007	50	19
2008	49	17
2009	67	35
2010	78	36
2011	64	32

Source: National Discrimination Expertise Centre at the Public Prosecution Service

There is a great degree of variation among identified perpetrators of acts of antisemitism between 2009 and 2011 (Table 26). While the police explain the 2010 figures as the result of a confrontation between supporters of the Ajax Amsterdam and Feyenoord Rotterdam football teams (as outlined in last year's update), the figures recorded for 2011 are too low to draw any definite conclusions as to the nature of perpetrators.

Table 26: Perpetrators of antisemitic acts of criminal discrimination, Netherlands, 2009–2011

Group	2009	2010	2011
White	20 (29.9 %)	57 (74 %)	36 (57.1 %)
Unknown	13 (19.4 %)	8 (10.4 %)	13 (20.6 %)
Turkish/ Moroccan	17 (25.4 %)	7 (9.1 %)	4 (6.3 %)
Other non-White		2 (2.6 %)	4 (6.3 %)
Political conviction		1 (1.3 %)	
Religion/ beliefs	6 (9 %)		
Extreme-right	10 (14.9 %)	1 (1.3 %)	4 (6.3 %)
Surinamese/ Antillean	1 (1.5 %)	1 (1.3 %)	2 (3.2 %)
Total	67	77	63

Source: National Discrimination Expertise Centre at the Public Prosecution Service

Whereas acts of recorded antisemitic criminal discrimination mainly took place on the street or in public spaces in 2009 and 2011, they mainly occurred in the context of sporting events in 2010, for the reasons just explained (Table 27).

Table 27: Locations where antisemitic acts of criminal discrimination are perpetrated, Netherlands, 2009–2011

Location/Year	2009	2010	2011
Street/public place	55	21	28
Internet	17	6	7
Sport/educational institutions	8	33	10
Directed to criminal investigation officers	2	12	3
Housing environment	2	1	9
Service industry		2	3
Press/media		1	
Other	1	2	6

Source: National Discrimination Expertise Centre at the Public Prosecution Service

Unofficial data

A number of civil society organisations in the Netherlands collect data on antisemitic incidents. These data are summarised in Table 28.

The Information and Documentation Centre Israel (*Centrum Informatie en Documentatie Israël*, CIDI) publishes data every year on the number of antisemitic incidents reported to it through hotlines it operates throughout the Netherlands.⁴⁶ The number of reported incidents fell to 114 in 2012 from its peak of 167 in 2009.

Up until 2010, the Anne Frank House published a *Racism and Extremism Monitor*, an annual report on the situation of racism and extremism in the Netherlands.⁴⁷ This report also focuses on antisemitism. The data provided show that the number of recorded violent antisemitic incidents increased in 2009, although it remained lower than in the period from 2002 to 2007.

The Magenta Foundation – with the support of the ministries of Justice and of the Interior – hosts the Complaints Bureau for Discrimination on the Internet (*Meldpunt Discriminatie Internet*, MDI). The Bureau publishes an annual report on complaints reported to it of discrimination relating to internet content.⁴⁸

The latest available data show that the number of complaints it received increased to 285 in 2012 from 252 in 2011. Of the complaints received in 2012, the Bureau deemed 177 to be punishable by law against 212 in 2010.

In 2012, 100 complaints related to Holocaust denial, compared to 56 in 2011. Of these 100 complaints, the Bureau considered 75 punishable by law.

⁴⁶ These reports are available at: www.cidi.nl/antisemitismerapporten.

⁴⁷ These reports are available at: www.annefrank.org/en/Education/Monitor-Homepage/Research.

⁴⁸ These reports are available at: www.meldpunt.nl/site/page.php?lanq=&pageID=34.

Table 28: Data on antisemitism collected by civil society organisations, Netherlands, 2002–2012

Year	Reported incidents / Information and Documentation Centre Israel	Violent incidents / Anne Frank House	Internet-related Complaints/ Complaints Bureau for Discrimination on the Internet
2002	359	46	533
2003	334	39	477
2004	327	n/a	531
2005	159	40	302
2006	261	35	463
2007	81	21	371
2008	108	14	296
2009	167	18	399
2010	124	n/a	414
2011	113	n/a	252
2012	114	n/a	285

Sources: Information and Documentation Centre Israel; Anne Frank House; Complaints Bureau for Discrimination on the Internet

Example of antisemitic incidents in the Netherlands in 2012

The Information and Documentation Centre Israel (CIDI) lists antisemitic incidents it recorded in the Netherlands in its 2012 annual report.⁴⁹ It described one incident in January 2012, in which a lit firework was thrown at a man who was returning home from synagogue with his young son. No injury resulted. He was also subjected to repeated antisemitic insults.

⁴⁹ Information and Documentation Centre Israel (2013), *Monitor antisemitische incidenten in Nederland 2012*, available at: www.cidi.nl/pdf/Monitor_Antisemitisme_2012.pdf.

Poland

Official data

Police statistics in Poland do not detail the numbers of antisemitic crimes, because the police collect data according to provisions of the Criminal Code, which does not contain any articles specifically on antisemitic crimes.

In December 2011, after the division of the Ministry of Interior and Administration into two separate ministries, a special Section for the Protection of Human Rights (*Zespół do Spraw Ochrony Praw Człowieka*) was created within the Ministry of the Interior, replacing the previous Monitoring Team on Racism and Xenophobia (*Zespół Monitorowania Rasizmu i Ksenofobii*).

The section, among its other duties, collects data on racist incidents brought to its attention (mainly through press releases), including antisemitic incidents, and takes preventive action. It recorded 21 incidents related to antisemitism in 2012, following 25 in 2011 and 30 in 2010. Of these 21 cases, 11 concerned hate speech, eight concerned the desecration of cemeteries, and the other two the vandalism of Jewish property.

Unofficial data

The Foundation for the Preservation of the Polish Heritage in Poland (FODZ) reports yearly on antisemitic incidents it reports to prosecution services, the police or other authorities (Table 29).⁵⁰

Table 29: Antisemitic incidents reported by The Foundation for the Preservation of Jewish Heritage in Poland to prosecution services, police or other authorities, 2003–2011

Year	Incidents reported to the authorities
2003	3
2004	6
2005	3
2006	13
2007	14
2008	7
2009	13
2010	11
2011	7

Source: Foundation for the Preservation of the Polish Heritage in Poland

⁵⁰ These reports are available at: <http://fodz.pl/?d=5&id=79&l=en>.

Example of antisemitic incidents in Poland in 2012

More than 20 gravestones were destroyed at a Jewish cemetery in Lodz, the Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism reported.⁵¹

⁵¹ Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2012), *Gravestones destroyed at Jewish cemetery*, available at: <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/76038/gravestones-destroyed-jewish-cemetery>.

Spain

Official data

No official data were available at the time this report was compiled.

Unofficial data

The Observatory of antisemitism in Spain (*Observatorio de antisemitismo en España*) records antisemitic events that occur in Spain, which it presents in the form of a chronology.⁵² This chronology covers a number of categories, including the internet, media, attacks against property, attacks against persons, trivialisation of the Holocaust, delegitimising Israel, and others (Table 30).

Table 30: Antisemitic events in Spain recorded by the Observatory of antisemitism in Spain, 2009–2012

Antisemitic events/Year	2009	2010	2011	2012
Internet		1	2	3
Media	10	3	7	6
Attacks on property	4	1	2	9
Attacks on persons	5	4	2	4
Trivialisation of the Holocaust		1	3	4
Delegitimising Israel			5	7
Incidents		1	1	4
Instigation to antisemitism		1	2	4
Legal decisions		6		
Total	19	18	24	41

Note: The same event can be included in several categories.

Source: Observatory of antisemitism in Spain

Example of antisemitic incidents in Spain in 2012

The Observatory of antisemitism in Spain provides a chronology of antisemitic incidents it records in Spain during the course of the year. One such incident involved the arrest of four people who allegedly pushed another person off a tram in Alicante, resulting in injuries to the victim. The offenders allegedly carried out the attack after the victim refused their request to give the Nazi salute.⁵³

⁵² Observatory of antisemitism in Spain, available in Spanish at: <http://observatorioantisemitismo.fcje.org/>.

⁵³ Observatory of antisemitism in Spain (2012), 29 Abr/12, lugar:Alicante, available at: <http://observatorioantisemitismo.fcje.org/?paged=7>.

Slovakia

Official data

The Ministry of Justice in Slovakia collects data on the number of persons sentenced for crimes motivated by antisemitism, which it provided to FRA (Table 31). These data are based on information submitted by judges who indicate bias motivation when rendering their sentences.

Table 31: Number of persons sentenced for crimes motivated by antisemitism, Slovakia, 2002-2012

Year	Number of persons sentenced
2002	0
2003	3
2004	6
2005	0
2006	0
2007	2
2008	5
2009	2
2010	3
2011	1
2012	4

Source: Ministry of Justice

Unofficial data

No unofficial data were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of antisemitic incidents in Slovakia in 2012

“Vandals destroyed 55 graves at a Jewish cemetery in Kosice, eastern Slovakia” in April 2012, causing material damage of €50,000,⁵⁴ according to a report by the Internet Centre Anti Racism Europe (I CARE – an “information disseminator for the European NGO-community working in the fields of anti-discrimination, Human Rights, antisemitism, diversity and migration, with a focus on anti-racism”).⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Internet Centre Anti Racism Europe (2012), *Vandals destroy 55 Jewish graves in Slovakia*, available at: www.icare.to/articleHC.php?id=38905&lang=en.

⁵⁵ Internet Centre Anti Racism Europe (2013), *Purpose, Objectives & Philosophy*, available at: www.icare.to/abouticare.html.

Sweden

Official data

The National Council for Crime Prevention (*Brottsförebyggande rådet*, Brå) publishes an annual report on statistics of police reports of crimes motivated by ethnicity, religion or faith, sexual orientation and gender identity.⁵⁶ The National Council for Crime Prevention is an agency of the Ministry of Justice and acts as a centre for research and development within the judicial system.

Changes in the counting rules or in the definition of what constitutes a hate crime are such that the data presented in Table 32 are only comparable between the years 2002 and 2003; between the years 2004 and 2007; and for the years from 2008 onwards.

Table 32: Crimes with an antisemitic motive reported to the police, Sweden, 2002–2012

Year	Crimes reported to the police
2002	102
2003	105
2004	151*
2005	111
2006	134
2007	118
2008	159*
2009	250
2010	161
2011	194
2012	221

Note: * Not comparable to previous years due to counting rule changes.

Source: National Council for Crime Prevention

The number of crimes with an antisemitic motive reported to the police increase sharply between 2008 and 2009, before declining markedly between 2009 and 2010, after which they increase again. As Table 33 shows, most crimes with an antisemitic motive target persons.

⁵⁶ These reports are available at: www.bra.se/bra/publikationer.html.

Table 33: Categories of crimes with an antisemitic motive reported to the police, Sweden, 2008–2012

Crime categories/Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Violent crime	17	20	15	14	14
Threat	63	90	63	77	87
Defamation	17	20	20	14	10
Vandalism/graffiti	21	36	22	31	27
Hate speech	37	75	34	54	79
Other crimes	4	9	7	4	4
Total	159	250	161	194	221

Source: National Council for Crime Prevention (2013), *Hatbrott 2012: Statistik över självrapporterad utsatthet för hatbrott och polisanmälningar med identifierade hatbrottsmotiv*, available at: www.bra.se/download/18.6b82726313f7b234a5839/1372231125966/2013_16_Hatbrott_2012.pdf

Unofficial data

No unofficial data were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of antisemitic incidents in Sweden in 2012

In its *Threat assessment report*, Jewish Security Sweden (*Judisk Säkerhet Sverige*, JSS) lists antisemitic incidents that occurred in Stockholm in 2012, among which is the following: “A star of David and the text ‘Jewish whore’ are spray painted on a store at the bottom of an apartment building where a Jewish family lives.”⁵⁷

⁵⁷ Jewish Security Sweden (2013), *Threat assessment report*, Stockholm: Jewish Security Sweden.

United Kingdom

Official data

Every year, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) publishes official data on hate crimes reported in England, Northern Ireland and Wales, collating data from regional police forces, including antisemitic crimes.⁵⁸

The data published by Association relate to ‘recordable crimes’ according to the Home Office counting rules, that is, incidents that victims or any other person perceive as a hate crime.⁵⁹

As Table 34 shows, the number of recorded hate crimes motivated by antisemitism has been receding since 2009, with 440 such crimes recorded in 2011. More than three quarters of all recorded antisemitic hate crimes are recorded in the London Metropolitan and Greater Manchester areas. It must be noted, however, that “improvements in the way forces collect and record hate crime data mean that direct year-on-year comparisons can be misleading. Individual forces are better placed to reflect on statistical variation in their geographical areas.”⁶⁰

Table 34: Recorded hate crimes motivated by antisemitism, England, Northern Ireland and Wales, 2009–2011

Year	2009	2010	2011
Recorded hate crimes	703	488	440

Source: Association of Chief Police Officers

Concerning Scotland, the Scottish Government reports every year on the number of charges for religiously aggravated offending, covering the financial year (Table 35). “Information about the nature of the religiously offensive conduct which related to the aggravation was taken from the police report of the incident. There is no separate section within police reports for the police to state which religious belief in their view was targeted and an assessment was made by the researchers involved in this work on the religion which appeared to be targeted based on a description of the incident and the details about what was said or done by the accused.”⁶¹

⁵⁸ These reports are available at: www.report-it.org.uk/hate_crime_data1.

⁵⁹ For more on definitions used by the Association of Chief Police Officers in collecting these data see: www.report-it.org.uk/what_is_hate_crime.

⁶⁰ True Vision, Association of Chief Police Officers, ‘Total of recorded hate crime from regional forces in England, Wales and Northern Ireland during the calendar year 2010’, available at: http://report-it.org.uk/hate_crime_data1.

⁶¹ Scottish Government Social Research (2013), *Religiously aggravated offending in Scotland 2012-13*, p. 14, available at: www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0042/00424865.pdf.

Table 35: Number of charges referring to conduct derogatory towards Judaism, Scotland, 2010–2012

Year	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Number of charges	16	14	27
As a percentage of all religiously aggravated charges	2.3	1.6	3.9

Source: Scottish Government Social Research (2013), Religiously aggravated offending in Scotland 2012-13, available at: www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0042/00424865.pdf

Unofficial data

The Community Security Trust (CST) is a charity that works at the national level in the United Kingdom to provide advice and represent the Jewish community in matters of antisemitism, terrorism, policing and security. The Community Security Trust has been recording antisemitic incidents that occur in the United Kingdom since 1984. It “classifies as an antisemitic incident any malicious act aimed at Jewish people, organisations or property, where there is evidence that the act has antisemitic motivation or content, or that the victim was targeted because they are (or are believed to be) Jewish.”⁶²

The data it collects are published in an annual report on antisemitic incidents.⁶³

As Table 36 shows, the number of antisemitic incidents recorded by the Community Security Trust increased to 640 in 2012 from 608 in 2011.

Table 36: Antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom recorded by the Community Security Trust, 2002–2012

Year	Recorded antisemitic incidents
2002	350
2003	375
2004	532
2005	459
2006	598
2007	561
2008	546
2009	929
2010	645
2011	608
2012	640

Source: Community Security Trust

The Community Security Trust also publishes data on the category of incidents that are recorded, as Table 37 shows. The most common types of antisemitic

⁶² Community Security Trust (2012), *Antisemitic incidents report 2011*, p. 8, available at: www.thecst.org.uk/docs/Incidents%20Report%202011.pdf.

⁶³ These reports are available at: www.thecst.org.uk/index.cfm?content=7&Menu=6.

incidents consist of abusive behaviour, followed by assaults and then damage and desecration of property.

In 2012, the most common targets of antisemitic incidents were random Jewish individuals in public (291), followed by synagogues and their congregants (84).

Table 37: Categories of antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom recorded by the Community Security Trust, 2004–2012

Category of incidents/Year	Extreme violence	Assault	Damage and desecration	Threats	Abusive behaviour	Literature
2004	4	79	53	93	272	31
2005	2	79	48	25	278	27
2006	4	110	70	28	366	20
2007	1	116	65	24	336	19
2008	1	87	76	28	317	37
2009	3	121	89	45	606	62
2010	0	114	83	32	385	25
2011	1	91	63	29	394	8
2012	2	67	53	39	467	12

Source: Community Security Trust

Concerning perpetrators, physical descriptions were available for 169 of the 640 incidents reported by the Community Security Trust in 2012: “86 offenders were described as ‘White – North European’ (51 per cent); 3 offenders were described as ‘White – South European’ (2 per cent); 10 offenders were described as ‘Black’ (6 per cent); 51 offenders were described as ‘South Asian’ (30 per cent); 1 offender was described as ‘South East Asian’ (1 per cent); and 18 offenders were described as being ‘Arab or North African’ (11 per cent).”⁶⁴

The sex of the perpetrator could be identified for 306 incidents, broken down as follows: 243 incidents perpetrated by men, 51 by women and 12 by mixed groups of women and men.

In the 233 cases in which the perpetrators’ ages could be identified, 148 of the perpetrators were adults and 82 were minors, with the remaining three consisting of groups of minors and adults together.

Example of antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom in 2012

The Community Security Trust provides examples of antisemitic incidents it records in its annual report, such as the following, which took place in London: “A visibly Jewish man was walking through an area with a large Jewish population, when a car pulled up alongside him and the two white male occupants motioned to him to come over, as if to ask for directions. When he did

⁶⁴ Community Security Trust (2013), *Antisemitic incidents report 2012*, p. 21, available at: www.thecst.org.uk/docs/Incidents%20Report%202012.pdf.

so, one of them shouted 'Heil Hitler' and said, 'Do you know what a bath plug is – you've got one on your head.'"⁶⁵

⁶⁵ Community Security Trust (2013), *Antisemitic incidents report 2012*, p. 25, available at: www.thecst.org.uk/docs/Incidents%20Report%202012.pdf.

Concluding remarks – persisting gaps in data collection

This update echoes the findings of the FRA survey on antisemitism; the phenomenon of antisemitism remains an issue of concern in the EU that must be tackled. It is therefore imperative for policy and civil society actors at all levels, as well as members of the general population, to remain vigilant and persist in their efforts to combat antisemitism.

In order to do so, however, the relevant stakeholders need to be able to rely on robust data on antisemitic incidents that would enable them to target their interventions more effectively. As this and previous FRA updates have shown, such data are often lacking.

As Table 38 indicates, there remain large gaps in data collection on antisemitism in EU Member States, with each collecting different types of data. The current state of affairs prevents any meaningful comparison of officially collected data between Member States, while increasing the relevance of and need for surveys on perceptions and experiences of antisemitism among self-identified Jews, such as that conducted by FRA.

Table 38: Official data on recorded antisemitic incidents in EU Member States, 2002–2012 – summary table

Country code/ Year	Recorded data	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
AT	Antisemitic offences committed by right-wing extremists	20	9	17	8	8	15	23	12	27	16	27
BE	Cases of Holocaust denial and revisionism					1	4	9	11	2	2	7
CZ	Criminal offences motivated by antisemitism				23	14	18	27	48	28	18	9
DE	Politically motivated crimes with an antisemitic motive	1,771	1,344	1,449	1,748	1,809	1,657	1,559	1,690	1,268	1,239	
EL	Prosecutions pertaining to antisemitism									5	3	1
FI	Antisemitic crimes							1	10	4	6	
FR	Antisemitic actions and threats	936	601	974	508	571	402	459	815	466	389	614
HR	Criminal acts motivated by antisemitism											1
IE	Antisemitic incidents			2	12	2	2	9	5	13	3	4
NL	Criminal discriminatory antisemitic incidents							141	209	286	283	
SE	Crimes with an antisemitic motive	102	105	151*	111	134	118	159*	250	161	194	221
SK	Persons sentenced for crimes motivated by	0	3	6	0	0	2	5	2	3	1	4

Antisemitism – Summary overview of the situation in the European Union 2002–2012

	antisemitism											
UK – England, Northern Ireland, Wales	Hate crimes motivated by antisemitism								703	488	440	
UK – Scotland**	Charges referring to conduct derogatory towards Judaism									16	14	27

Notes: Comparisons are not possible between Member States.

* Data not comparable with the previous year.

** Fiscal year (1 April–31 March).

Source: FRA desk research, 2013

Another issue of concern is that the number of recorded events in many Member States is often so low that is difficult to discern any trends in the manifestation of antisemitism. Low numbers of recorded incidents should not be taken as an indication that antisemitism is not an issue of concern in Member States.

Consider that 76 % of respondents in the eight EU Member States that took part in FRA’s survey on antisemitism did not report the most serious incident of antisemitic harassment they experienced in the five years preceding the survey to any organisation; the figures for non-reporting of experienced physical violence and vandalism are 64 % and 53 %, respectively. These very high rates of non-reporting indicate that even where the numbers of reported incidents are low, antisemitism remains an issue of concern.

Conversely, it cannot be said that antisemitism is necessarily a bigger problem in Member States where the highest numbers of incidents are recorded, compared to those where fewer incidents are recorded. There are a number of factors that affect how many incidents are recorded beyond the size of the Jewish population in any given Member State. These include, for example, the willingness and ability of victims and witnesses to report these incidents, which reflects in part their trust in the authorities’ ability to deal with the fall-out from such incidents appropriately.

Not only do victims and witnesses need to be encouraged to report antisemitic incidents, but the authorities need to have systems in place that would enable the recording of such incidents in the first place. In the words of the British Association of Chief Police Officers: “The Police Service is committed to reducing the under-reporting of hate crime and would view increases in this data as a positive indicator, so long as it reflects an increase in reporting and not an increase in the actual incidence of crime which we strive to reduce.”⁶⁶

Policy actors at the levels of the EU and Member States need to share this commitment if antisemitism is to be countered effectively. Where data on the

⁶⁶ True Vision, ACPO, ‘Total of recorded hate crime from police forces in England, Wales and Northern Ireland during the calendar year 2011’, available at: [www.report-it.org.uk/files/final_acpo_hate_crime_data_2011_\(revised_oct_2011\)_1.pdf](http://www.report-it.org.uk/files/final_acpo_hate_crime_data_2011_(revised_oct_2011)_1.pdf).

characteristics of incidents, victims and perpetrators are missing, policy responses can often only be approximate and deal with the issue at hand in a partial way.

While official data can be complemented by unofficial data, few NGOs and CSOs have sufficient human and financial resources to collect robust and reliable data on antisemitism. As a result, much reporting by these types of organisations remains anecdotal and can only provide a glimpse of the reality of antisemitism in EU Member States. Their efforts in monitoring the situation on the ground and providing assistance to victims would benefit from a stronger commitment among policy actors, which would translate into more robust support from the state for civil society infrastructure.

When it comes to countering phenomena as complex as antisemitism, the data that are collected and the policy responses that are implemented based upon them need to reflect and respond to that complexity. Sustained efforts therefore need to be made at the national and international levels to improve data collection on antisemitism and other forms of hatred and prejudice to enable EU Member States to combat such phenomena more effectively. These efforts must concentrate on official and unofficial data collection alike, so as to enable the drawing of a more complete and accurate picture of the situation of antisemitism in the EU.

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

Antisemitism – Summary overview of the situation in the European Union 2002–2012

November 2013

2013 — 56 p. — 21 x 29.7 cm

ISBN 978-92-9239-087-7

doi:10.2811/4899

A great deal of information on the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights is available on the Internet. It can be accessed through the FRA website at fra.europa.eu.

Country codes

AT	Austria
BE	Belgium
CZ	Czech Republic
DE	Germany
EL	Greece
FI	Finland
FR	France
HR	Croatia
IE	Ireland
NL	Netherlands
SE	Sweden
SK	Slovakia
UK	United Kingdom

HOW TO OBTAIN EU PUBLICATIONS

Free publications:

- via EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>);
- at the European Union's representations or delegations. You can obtain their contact details on the Internet (<http://ec.europa.eu>) or by sending a fax to +352 2929-42758.

Priced publications:

- via EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>).

Priced subscriptions (e.g. annual series of the *Official Journal of the European Union* and reports of cases before the Court of Justice of the European Union):

- via one of the sales agents of the Publications Office of the European Union (http://publications.europa.eu/others/agents/index_en.htm).



FRA – European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights
Schwarzenbergplatz 11 ■ 1040 Vienna ● Austria ▲ T +43 (1) 580 30 - 0
■ F +43 (1) 580 30 - 699 ● fra.europa.eu ▲ info@fra.europa.eu
■ facebook.com/fundamentalrights ● twitter.com/EURightsAgency

