

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

Antisemitism

Summary overview of the data available
in the European Union 2003–2013

October 2014



EUROPEAN UNION AGENCY FOR FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS



CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Manifestations of antisemitism	3
Limited data collection on antisemitism.....	5
The legal framework.....	7
Data collection for this update.....	9
Data from international organisations	9
Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights.....	9
European Commission against Racism and Intolerance.....	10
National data on antisemitism	13
Austria.....	14
Belgium.....	18
Croatia.....	22
Czech Republic.....	23
Denmark	25
Finland.....	27
France.....	28
Germany	30
Greece.....	33
Hungary.....	34
Ireland	36
Italy.....	37
Latvia.....	38
Lithuania	39
The Netherlands	40
Poland	44
Slovakia.....	46
Spain.....	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 update relates to manifestations of antisemitism as they are recorded by official and unofficial sources in the 28 European Union (EU) Member States. ‘Official data’ is understood here as that 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 organisations (NGOs) and civil society organisations (CSOs).

This update compiles available data on antisemitic incidents collected by international, governmental and non-governmental sources, covering the period 1 January 2003–31 December 2013. No data on manifestations of antisemitism were available for Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Romania and Slovenia at the time this update was compiled.

This is the 10th in a series of yearly updates about data collected on antisemitism published by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) and its predecessor, the European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC).

Manifestations of antisemitism

During the course of the 19th century, anti-Jewish sentiment began to move away from more or less exclusively religious considerations. Instead, they came to be articulated more in terms of assumed negative traits thought to be shared by Jewish populations as a whole.

This process of ‘racialisation’ of Jewish populations became expressed in openly antisemitic political agendas across Europe from the late 19th century onwards. At the end of that century, deadly anti-Jewish pogroms took place in the Russian Empire. The National Socialist (Nazi) regime exemplified the worst excesses of anti-Semitism, with its atrocities carried out prior to and during the Second World War.

After the war, a transformation occurred in the public expression of antisemitism. While open manifestations of antisemitism generally came to be seen and treated as socially unacceptable and punishable by law, and were thereby banished to the fringes of society, there 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 the Second World War. Characteristic of all forms of secondary antisemitism is that they relate to the Holocaust and that they allow speakers to express antisemitic sentiments indirectly. Antisemitism may, for example, be manifested in the denial and/or trivialisation of the Holocaust.

The ongoing 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.

FRA survey on antisemitism in the EU

Antisemitism is still a reality in the EU. Little is known, however, of how it affects Jewish communities. That is why, in 2012, FRA conducted a survey asking self-identified Jews their opinions about trends in antisemitism; how antisemitism affects their everyday life; their personal experiences as victims or witnesses of antisemitic incidents; their worries about becoming a victim of an antisemitic attack; and their actual experiences of discrimination because they are Jewish.

- Two thirds of respondents (66 %) across the EU Member States surveyed consider antisemitism to be a problem. Three quarters of respondents (76 %) indicate that antisemitism has worsened during the previous five years in the country where they live.
- Three quarters (75 %) of respondents consider online antisemitism to be a problem. Almost three quarters of respondents (73 %) said that antisemitism online has increased during the previous five years.
- In the 12 months preceding the survey, 26 % of all respondents experienced an incident or incidents involving verbal insult or harassment because they were Jewish; 4 % experienced physical violence or threats of violence.
- Almost half (46 %) of the respondents worried about becoming the victim of an antisemitic verbal insult or harassment in the subsequent 12 months, and one third (33 %) feared a physical attack in the same period.
- Almost two thirds (64 %) of those who experienced physical violence or threats of violence did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation. Three quarters (76 %) of the respondents who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years preceding the survey did not report the most serious incident. More than four in five (82 %) of those who said that they felt discriminated against because they are Jewish in the 12 months preceding the survey did not report the most serious incident to any organisation.
- Close to one quarter (23 %) of the respondents said that they at least occasionally avoid visiting Jewish events or sites because they would not feel safe there, or on the way there, as a Jew. Over one quarter of all respondents (27 %) avoid certain places in their local area or neighbourhood at least occasionally because they would not feel safe there as a Jew.
- One in 10 respondents experienced discrimination when looking for work or at work in the 12 months preceding the survey.
- Over half of all survey respondents (57 %) heard or saw someone claiming that the Holocaust was a myth, or that it had been exaggerated, in the 12 months preceding the survey.
- Large proportions of respondents said they had considered emigrating from the Member State they live in because they do not feel safe there as Jews.

FRA's survey on 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. These countries are home to more than 90 % of the estimated Jewish population in the EU. This was the first EU survey to collect comparable data on Jewish people's experiences and perceptions of hate-motivated crime, discrimination and antisemitism.

FRA (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights) (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): http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2013-discrimination-hatecrimeagainst-jews-eu-member-states_en.pdf.

Detailed survey results on individual EU Member States are available through the survey data explorer tool at: <http://fra.europa.eu/DVS/DVT/as2013.php>.

Limited data collection on antisemitism

Despite the negative effects of antisemitism on Jewish populations in particular but also 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 any great detail.¹ This lack of systematic data collection contributes to gross under-reporting on the nature and characteristics of antisemitic incidents that occur in the EU. It also contributes to limiting 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, and to assess the effectiveness of existing policies. An added effect is that offenders are often able to carry out attacks with relative impunity, with Jewish populations continuing to face antisemitic violence, whether verbal, non-verbal or physical.

Where data exist, they are generally not comparable, not least because they are collected using different methodologies and sources across EU Member States. 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.

There are a number of reasons why incidents motivated by anti-Semitism are often not recorded as such, in part because EU Member States' criminal codes often lack specific provisions to that effect. The category of 'antisemitic incidents' is often not included on police reporting forms or is subsumed under generic categories of incidents. In addition, front-line police officers often lack the training necessary to recognise incidents as being motivated by antisemitism. A further limitation of official data collection is that victims or

¹ FRA (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights) (2012), *Making hate crime visible in the European Union: acknowledging victims' rights*. Luxembourg, Publications Office, <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2012/making-hate-crime-visible-european-union-acknowledging-victims-rights>. All hyperlinks were accessed in October 2014.

witnesses of antisemitic incidents often do not report them to the authorities or any other organisation, as the findings of the FRA survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews confirm.²

Making hate crime visible in the European Union

Violence and crimes motivated by racism, xenophobia, religious intolerance or a person's disability, sexual orientation or gender identity – often referred to as 'hate crime' – are a daily reality throughout the EU, as data collected by FRA consistently shows. Such crimes not only harm the victim, they are also generally prejudicial to fundamental rights, namely to human dignity and with respect to non-discrimination.

Victims and witnesses of hate crimes are reluctant to report them, whether to law enforcement agencies, the criminal justice system, NGOs or victim support groups. As a result, victims of such crimes are often unable or unwilling to seek redress against the perpetrators, with many hate crimes remaining unreported, unprosecuted and, therefore, invisible. In such cases, the rights of the victims may not be fully respected or protected, and EU Member States may not be upholding the obligations they have towards victims of crime.

The EU and its Member States can combat hate crime and address the related fundamental rights violations both by making them more visible and holding perpetrators accountable. This entails encouraging victims and witnesses to report crimes and incidents, while increasing their confidence in the ability of the criminal justice system to deal with this type of criminality decisively and effectively.

The FRA report on making hate crime visible is designed to help the EU and its Member States tackle these fundamental rights violations both by making them more visible and by bringing perpetrators to account.

FRA (2012), Making hate crime visible in the European Union: acknowledging victims' rights, Luxembourg, Publications Office, <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2012/making-hate-crime-visible-european-union-acknowledging-victims-rights>.

Jewish and other 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, in some cases there may be doubts about the validity and reliability of the collected data, and also about their comparability.

The current state of official and unofficial data collection is such that the present update can provide only a partial overview of the situation of antisemitism in EU Member State. At best, this report provides an overview of the data available on antisemitism in EU Member States. Because of gaps in data collection and

² FRA (2013), *Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU Member States: experiences and perceptions of antisemitism*. Luxembourg, Publications Office, <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/discrimination-and-hate-crime-against-jews-eu-member-states-experiences-and>.

high levels of under-reporting, 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 or serve as a basis for a comparison between countries.

What this update undoubtedly shows, however, is that antisemitism remains an issue of serious concern in and to the EU. Decisive and targeted policy responses are required to tackle the phenomenon. The effective implementation of such responses would not only afford Jewish communities better protection against antisemitism but 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 engage in continued and sustained efforts if data collection on the matter is to be improved. The ready and regular availability of robust and comparable data on the situation with regard to antisemitism in the EU would enable policy makers and relevant stakeholders to better target interventions to combat it.

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 European Union, and these are described elsewhere.³

For the purposes of this report, the principal legal instrument of interest 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. This framework decision sets out to define a common EU-wide criminal law approach in the field. EU Member States were required to have transposed it into national law by November 2010.

The aim of the framework decision is 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 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. It requires the substance of certain offences to be laid

³ FRA (2012), *Making hate crime visible in the European Union: acknowledging victims' rights*, Luxembourg, Publications Office, <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2012/making-hate-crime-visible-european-union-acknowledging-victims-rights>; FRA, European Court of Human Rights and Council of Europe (2011), *Handbook on European non-discrimination law*, Luxembourg, Publications Office, <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2011/handbook-european-non-discrimination-law>.

down by national law, as well as for national law to acknowledge racist motivation as an aggravating factor in other, already established offences.

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 Rome 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 violence or hatred against such a group or a member of such a group.

Instigating aiding and abetting in the commission of the acts described above is also punishable under the terms of the framework decision. For legal persons, penalties shall include criminal or non-criminal fines and may also entail exclusion from entitlement to public benefits or aid, temporary or permanent disqualification from the practice of commercial activities, placement under judicial supervision and a judicial winding-up order.

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

The European Commission notes that:

“a number of Member States have not transposed fully and/or correctly all the provisions of the Framework Decision, namely in relation to the offences of denying, condoning and grossly trivialising certain crimes. The majority of Member States have provisions on incitement to racist and xenophobic violence and hatred but these do not always seem to fully transpose the offences covered by the Framework Decision. Some gaps have also been observed in relation to the racist and xenophobic motivation of crimes, the liability of legal persons and jurisdiction.”⁴

⁴ European Commission (2014), *Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law*, Brussels, http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/com_2014_27_en.pdf.

Data collection for this update

FRA consulted a variety of sources to obtain the most complete and accurate picture of the data available on the situation with regard to antisemitism in the EU. This update covers all 28 EU Member States. The data presented here were collected through desk research, implementing the following three steps:

1. Official sources of data on antisemitism available in the public domain were consulted, both at international and national levels. Sources at the international level include 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.
2. Specific requests were made to governmental offices through the system of National Liaison Officers in place at FRA⁵ to ensure that the latest available official data on the situation with regard to antisemitism would be taken into consideration in drafting this report.
3. Data on antisemitism published by CSOs and NGOs were consulted.⁶

Data from international organisations

ODIHR compiles official data on antisemitism, which it publishes in its annual report *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 stems from governmental sources (national points of contact on hate crimes, or NPCs), NGOs and intergovernmental organisations. NPCs are requested to fill out a questionnaire on the basis of ODIHR's monitoring 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

⁵ See <http://fra.europa.eu/en/cooperation/eu-member-states/national-liason-officers> for a list of these National Liaison Officers.

⁶ For more information on global trends in antisemitism, see the Moshe Kantor Database for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism and Racism (2014), *Antisemitism worldwide 2013*, <http://kantorcenter.tau.ac.il/general-analyses-1>; and Anti-Defamation League (2014), *ADL Global 100: an index of anti-Semitism*, <http://global100.adl.org>.

*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."*⁷

ODIHR's latest available annual report on hate crime covers the year 2012 and was published in November 2013.⁸ Sixteen EU Member States reported to ODIHR that they record crimes motivated by antisemitism: Austria, Belgium, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. However, only four of these (Germany, Ireland, Sweden and the United Kingdom) provided ODIHR with data on antisemitic crime for the purposes of that report, as can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Antisemitic hate crimes in the OSCE region in 2012, official data submitted by EU Member States

	Antisemitic hate crimes recorded	National point of contact on hate crime
DE	1,374 antisemitic hate crimes	Federal Interior Ministry
IE	4 antisemitic hate crimes	National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism
SE	221 antisemitic hate crimes	National Council for Crime Prevention
UK	307 antisemitic hate crimes in England, Wales and Northern Ireland	Ministry of Justice

Source: ODIHR, 2013, pp. 60–65, pp. 142–144

European Commission against Racism and Intolerance

ECRI includes considerations on antisemitism in its country monitoring work. This work, which is carried out in five-year cycles covering 19 countries per year, examines "the situation concerning manifestations of racism and intolerance in each of the Council of Europe member states".⁹

These considerations include a broad overview of the situation with regard to antisemitism in each country under examination, with ECRI also making recommendations on what it considers to be the main issues this needs to address. All 28 EU Member States have been covered under ECRI's country monitoring work.¹⁰

The main conclusions that can be drawn from this work are as follows:

⁷ ODIHR (2012), *Hate crime*, <http://tandis.odihhr.pl/?p=ki-hc>.

⁸ ODIHR (2013), *Hate crimes in the OSCE region: incidents and responses – annual report for 2012*, Warsaw, ODIHR/OSCE, http://tandis.odihhr.pl/hcr2012/pdf/Hate_Crime_Report_full_version.pdf.

⁹ ECRI (2013), *Country monitoring work*, www.coe.int/t/dqhl/monitoring/ecri/activities/countrybycountry_en.asp.

¹⁰ For more information on ECRI's country monitoring work, see www.coe.int/t/dqhl/monitoring/ecri/activities/countrybycountry_en.asp.

- Antisemitic incidents involving verbal and physical violence continue to occur in EU Member States, and include: threats and insults directed at Jews going to the synagogue, persistent harassment of rabbis, repeated attacks on Jews wearing symbols of their religion, hate speech, antisemitic bullying in schools and damage to or desecration of property, including arson.
- Jewish people wearing visible symbols of their religion are the most likely to be the targets of antisemitic incidents.
- The main perpetrators of antisemitic incidents are neo-Nazis, sympathisers of the far right and far left, Muslim fundamentalists and the younger generation, including schoolchildren. There have also been incidents involving public antisemitic discourse on university campuses.
- Antisemitic stereotyping continues to be a reality in EU Member States.
- Antisemitism is often openly expressed, including in the media and in the context of sporting events.
- Some political parties in EU Member States are openly antisemitic.
- Antisemitic material continues to be published in some EU Member States, often with few or no consequences for those who do so.
- The expression of antisemitism on the internet is on the rise, as evidenced in the open expression of antisemitism in online forums.
- Denial and trivialisation of the Holocaust are becoming more common, with glorification of the Nazi past also in evidence.
- Discussions surrounding property restitution laws have spurred antisemitic sentiments because some members of the general population do not understand why such laws are needed.
- Links are sometimes made between policies followed 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 in relation to the Second World War.
- EU Member States attempt to combat antisemitism through the courts.
- EU Member States actively implement programmes aimed at combating antisemitism, including education programmes and initiatives to support Jewish culture.
- Representatives of Jewish communities report that the communities are well integrated in society.

- 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.
- Education about the Holocaust has been added to school curricula in several EU Member States, but there is a need for more in-depth and uniform teaching about the Holocaust.

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 an antisemitic incident recorded in the Member State of concern, 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 such information is available, the country sections provide data on the types of incidents that are recorded and on the characteristics of both the victims and perpetrators.

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 BVT 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*, LV). These data are published annually in a report on the protection of the constitution (*Verfassungsschutzbericht*), which pertains to right-wing extremism, left-wing extremism, animal rights activism, terrorism, espionage and weapons proliferation.¹¹ 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 between 2012 and 2013.

Table 2: Recorded antisemitic offences motivated by right-wing extremism in Austria, 2003–2013

	Recorded antisemitic offences
2003	9
2004	17
2005	8
2006	8
2007	15
2008	23
2009	12
2010	27
2011	16
2012	27
2013	37

Sources: 2003–2010: *Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz und Terrorismusbekämpfung*; 2011–2013: *Federal Ministry of the Interior*

The Legal and Constitutional Service of the Federal Chancellery (*Bundeskanzleramt Verfassungsdienst*) provided FRA with data on the nature of these recorded offences, covering the period 2009–2013 (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.

¹¹ These reports are available at: www.bmi.gv.at/cms/bmi_verfassungsschutz.

Table 3: Nature of recorded antisemitic offences in Austria, 2009–2013

	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
2013	35	2	37

Source: Federal Ministry of the Interior

Although not all the activities of right-wing extremists and neo-Nazi sympathisers are antisemitic in nature, the increase from 920 to 1,027 in the number of cases brought to the courts in relation to these activities between 2012 and 2013 must nonetheless be noted (Table 4).

Table 4: Cases brought to the courts, right-wing extremism, 2008–2013

Legal provision	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Prohibition Statute (<i>Verbotsgesetz</i>)	360	396	522	436	466	529
Criminal law on incitement to hatred (<i>Verhetzung - §283 Strafgesetzbuch</i>)	73	33	79	84	83	152
Other criminal offences (<i>Sonstige StGB-Delikte</i>)	304	253	380	368	323	281
Insignia Law (<i>Abzeichengesetz</i>)	21	40	20	26	31	17
Nazi ideology (<i>Art. III Abs. 1 Ziff. 4 EGVG</i>)	77	69	39	49	17	48
Total	835	791	1,040	963	920	1,027

Source: Federal Ministry of the Interior

The Legal and Constitutional Service also provided FRA with data on the clearance rates of cases relating to incitement to hatred and the Prohibition Statute (*Verbotsgesetz*) (Table 5) for 2008–2013. These data show an increase in the number of cases involving the Prohibition Statute, which relates to the banning of the Nazi Party and the prevention of Nazism being revived in Austria. Among other things, the law bans Holocaust denial and revisionism.

Table 5: Cases relating to incitement to hatred and the Prohibition Statute: clearance rates, 2008–2013

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
2013	Incitement to hatred	152	not available	not available	not available
	Prohibition Statute	529	not available	not available	not available

Source: Federal Ministry of the Interior

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 calendar year.¹² Fifty-three such reports were made to ZARA in 2013, 55 % of which consisted of swastikas or antisemitic graffiti (Table 6).

¹² These reports are available at: www.zara.or.at/index.php/beratung/rassismus-report.

Table 6: Unofficial data on antisemitic incidents in Austria, 2003–2013

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
2013	29

Sources: ZARA, racism reports 2003–2013

Example of an antisemitic incident in Austria in 2013

In its *Racism Report 2013: Case report on racist incidents and structures in Austria*, ZARA reports the following antisemitic incident.

At the end of April, Mr S. witnessed a pedestrian passing by an orthodox Jewish person on a street in Vienna. The pedestrian insulted the Jewish person with antisemitic statements such as “dirty Jew” and “Jewish pig”. Mr S. took photos of the offender and together with other witnesses threatened to call the police, after which the perpetrator fled. Mr S. filed a criminal complaint with the police on the same day.

Belgium

Official data

The Federal Police record and publish data on Holocaust denial and revisionism, which are reproduced in Table 7.¹³

Table 7: Cases of Holocaust denial and revisionism recorded by the Belgian Federal Police, 2006–2013

	Holocaust denial or trivialisation	Approving of or justifying the Holocaust	Not specified	Total
2006	0	1	0	1
2007	2	2	0	4
2008	3	5	1	9
2009	4	7	0	11
2010	1	1	0	2
2011	0	2	0	2
2012	1	6	0	7
2013	0	4	1	8

Source: Federal Police

The national equality body in Belgium (the Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities and the Fight against Discrimination and Racism, formerly the Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism) receives and handles complaints from members of the public pertaining to discrimination on many grounds. In 2013, it dealt with 85 cases relating to antisemitism, compared with 88 in 2012 and 62 in 2011 (Table 8).¹⁴

¹³ Federal Police (2013), *Statistiques policières de criminalité, Belgique 2000–2012*, available in French at: http://www.polfed-fedpol.be/crim/crim_statistieken/stat_2013_trim4_fr.php; available in Dutch at: http://www.polfed-fedpol.be/crim/crim_statistieken/stat_2013_trim4_nl.php.

¹⁴ Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism (2013), *Discrimination/Diversité: rapport annuel 2012*, available in French at: http://diversite.be/diversiteit/files/File//publications/rapport_annuel/2013/Disc_Div/CGKR_IV_discr_FR.pdf; available in Dutch at: http://diversite.be/diversiteit/files/File//publications/rapport_annuel/2013/Disc_Div/CGKR_IV_discr_NL.pdf.

Table 8: Complaints of antisemitism received by the Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities and the Fight against Discrimination and Racism for which it was competent, 2003–2013

Year	Complaints of antisemitism
2003	30
2004	69
2005	58
2006	64
2007	67
2008	66
2009	108
2010	57
2011	62
2012	88
2013	85

Source: Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities and the Fight against Discrimination and Racism, annual report on discrimination

In 2013, there were 23 complaints relating to declarations of an antisemitic nature made on the internet (Table 9). The steepest decrease in comparison with 2012 is in cases of vandalism (from 11 to 2). The number of cases of verbal aggression and threats remains the same as in 2012 (15), as does the number of acts of violence (4).

In 2013, the most common complaints related to antisemitic incidents received by the Interfederal Centre concerned Holocaust denial, followed by antisemitism on the internet and verbal aggression, as Table 9 shows.

Table 9: Complaints of antisemitism received by the Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities and the Fight against Discrimination and Racism for which it was competent, by category, 2004–2013

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Verbal aggression and threats	23	18	14	17	16	24	8	9	15	20
Letters, articles	14	9	16	8	3	1	3	6	5	5
Media	5	2	1	3	0	1	2	0	5	1
Internet	10	11	21	25	26	35	31	32	28	23
Violence	9	6	3	0	5	10	7	6	4	4
Vandalism	3	6	3	9	7	18	5	2	11	2
Holocaust denial	3	6	3	1	8	11	1	4	13	25
Public manifestations	2	0	3	4	1	8	0	3	7	5

Source: Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities and the Fight against Discrimination and 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 the Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities and the Fight against Discrimination and Racism. 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 Comité van de Joodse Gemeenten van Antwerpen*), with the support of the Israelite Central Consistory of Belgium (*Consistoire central Israélite de Belgique*).

Data published annually by Antisemitisme.be¹⁵ show that 64 incidents were reported to it in 2013, compared with 80 in 2012 (Table 10).

Table 10: Antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be, 2003–2013

	Reported antisemitic incidents
2003	28
2004	46
2005	60
2006	66
2007	69
2008	73
2009	109
2010	52
2011	65
2012	80
2013	64

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

As Table 11 shows, there is a much variation in the types of antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be. Ideological antisemitism – which, according to Antisemitisme.be, often translates into the expression of sentiments against the State of Israel – and antisemitic incidents on the internet account for the largest proportions of reported incidents.

¹⁵ These reports are available in French at: www.antisemitisme.be/fr/category/analyses/; and in Dutch at: www.antisemitisme.be/nl/category/analyses-nl/.

Table 11: Types of antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be, 2009–2013

	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
2013 (n = 64)	6	4	5	28	21

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

Example of an antisemitic incident in Belgium in 2013

Antisemitisme.be reports that during a summer camp organised in Brussels, a 10-year-old child was insulted and threatened by another child in the group when the latter noticed the Star of David pendant that the child was wearing. The child was called a “dirty Jew” and the aggressor threatened that at the end of the summer camp he would be badly beaten. A teacher intervened and the offender eventually apologised to the other child.

Croatia

Official data

The Ministry of the Interior told FRA that it recorded no criminal acts motivated by antisemitism in Croatia in 2013.

Unofficial data

No unofficial data on antisemitism in Croatia were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of an antisemitic incident in Croatia in 2013

The Internet Centre Anti Racism Europe (I CARE) reported that, in July: “A memorial plaque honouring World War II concentration camp victims who died on the Croatian island of Pag has been vandalised again [for the third time], just weeks after being restored.”¹⁶ I CARE describes itself as 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”.¹⁷

¹⁶ Internet Centre Anti Racism Europe (2013), ‘Memorial to Croatia concentration camp victims destroyed’, www.icare.to/articleHC.php?id=47815&lang=en.

¹⁷ Internet Centre Anti Racism Europe (2013), ‘Purpose, Objectives & Philosophy’, www.icare.to/abouticare.html.

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.¹⁸ These reports also provide data on the number of recorded criminal offences motivated by antisemitism (Table 12). These data show that the number of recorded criminal offences was higher in 2013 than in the previous year, but did not reach the level of the years before that. Recorded criminal offences motivated by antisemitism made up 7 % of the total number of extremist criminal offences, compared with 5 % in 2012.

Table 12: Recorded criminal offences motivated by antisemitism in the Czech Republic, 2005–2013

	Recorded criminal offences
2005	23
2006	14
2007	18
2008	27
2009	48
2010	28
2011	18
2012	9
2013	15

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.¹⁹ The latest report shows that it recorded nearly twice as many antisemitic incidents in 2013 as in 2012, with most recorded on the internet and in the media, as Table 13 shows.

¹⁸ The reports are available at: www.mvcr.cz/mvc/en/article/documents-on-the-fight-against-extremism.aspx.

¹⁹ Židovská obec v Praze, *Výroční zpráva o projevech antisemitismu v České republice za rok 2013*, available in Czech at: http://kehilaprag.cz/index.php?option=com_docman&Itemid=276&lang=cs.

Table 13: Numbers and types of antisemitic incidents recorded in the Czech Republic, 2004–2013

	Attacks: physical	Attacks: property	Threats	Harassment	Media/ internet	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
2013	1	3	3	6	162	175

Sources: 2004–2010: Fórum proti Antisemitismu, Zpráva o stavu antisemitismu v. ČR za rok 2010, www.fzo.cz/projekty-fzo/forum-proti-antisemitismu; 2011–2013: Jewish Community of Prague

Example of an antisemitic incident in the Czech Republic in 2013

The Jewish Community in Prague lists a number of antisemitic incidents in its *Annual report on anti-Semitism symptoms in the Czech Republic 2013*.²⁰ The report mentions an incident of a person chanting "Heil Hitler!" near the Lauder Jewish School.

²⁰ Jewish Community in Prague (2014), *Annual report on anti-Semitism symptoms in the Czech Republic 2013*, p. 10, http://kehilaprag.cz/index.php?option=com_docman&Itemid=276&lang=cs.

Denmark

Official data

The Danish Security and Intelligence Service (*Politiets Efterretningstjeneste*, PET) reports nine cases of extremist crimes targeting Jews in 2012, compared with five in 2011.²¹

The Ministry of Justice 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 2013. The Director of Public Prosecutions decided to endorse the recommendation of the Regional Public Prosecutor to prosecute in two cases concerning antisemitic statements.

Unofficial data

Unofficial data on antisemitism in Denmark are available from two NGOs: the Mosaic Religious Community (*Det Mosaiske Trossamfund*, MT) and the Documentation and Advisory Centre on Racial Discrimination (*Dokumentations- og rådgivningscentret om racediskrimination*, DACoRD). The Mosaic Religious Community recorded 43 incidents in 2013, compared with 40 in 2012 (Table 14).

Table 14: Antisemitic incidents recorded by the Mosaic Religious Community (MT) and the Documentation and Advisory Centre on Racial Discrimination (DACoRD), 2003–2013

	MT	DACoRD
2003	29	1
2004	37	6
2005	37	3
2006	40	4
2007	10	1
2008	4	3
2009	22	21
2010	not available	not available
2011	not available	not available
2012	40	not available
2013	43	not available

Sources: MT (2014), *Oversigt over anmeldte antisemitiske hændelser til Mosaisk Troessamfund 2013*, www.mosaiske.dk/sites/default/files/1391428382/AKVAH_2014%20Rapport.pdf, and DACoRD

²¹ Denmark, PET (2013), *Kriminelle forhold i 2012 med mulig ekstremistisk baggrund*, available in Danish at: www.pet.dk/~media/Forebyggende%20sikkerhed/RACI-rapporter/2012RACIrapportendeligversionpdf.ashx.

Example of an antisemitic incident in Denmark in 2013

One of the antisemitic incidents listed by the Mosaic Religious Community consisted of a man shouting the following out of the window of his car in front of the Copenhagen Synagogue: “The Jews have their own country. Now, they are taking over everything. Make room for the Jews. They took over Ukraine. And now, they are taking over Europe!” He also shouted “*Heil Hitler!*”²²

²² MT (2014), *Rapport om antisemitiske hændelser i Danmark 2013*, www.mosaiske.dk/sites/default/files/1391428382/AKVAH_2014%20Rapport.pdf.

Finland

Official data

Every year, the Police College of Finland (*Poliisiammattikorkeakoulu*) publishes a report on suspected hate crimes reported to the police.²³ The data for this publication are based on keyword searches of police reports enabling the identification of 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, 2008–2013

	Antisemitic crimes reported to the police
2008	1
2009	10
2010	4
2011	6
2012	8
2013	not available

Source: Police College of Finland

Unofficial data

No unofficial data on antisemitism in Finland were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of an antisemitic incident in Finland in 2013

The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism reports that in Finland a free paper issued to over 360,000 homes by a supermarket chain has been publishing conspiracy theories, many of them antisemitic. The Simon Wiesenthal Center urged the Finnish President “to invoke the prestige of his office to vigorously condemn [...] and take all possible measures to prohibit a pernicious racism that violates anti-discrimination provisions of the European Union”. In October, the owner of the supermarket chain was fined €45,000 for inciting hatred against an ethnic group. The court also ordered him to remove the offensive articles from the company’s website.²⁴ The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism “is a state forum that monitors antisemitic activities throughout the world. It coordinates the struggle against this phenomenon with various government bodies and Jewish organizations around the world.”²⁵

²³ Finland, Poliisiammattikorkeakoulu (2013), *Poliisin tietoon tullut viharikollisuus Suomessa 2012*, www.poliisiammattikorkeakoulu.fi.

²⁴ Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2013), ‘Supermarket chain investigated for vicious antisemitism’ and ‘Simon Wiesenthal Center condemns Finland’s Juha Kärkkäinen, tycoon publisher of antisemitic free newspapers as a “national danger”’, <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/77426/supermarket-chain-investigated-vicious-antisemitism> and <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/80741/simon-wiesenthal-center-condemns-finland's-juha-karrkainen-tycoon-publisher-antisemiti>.

²⁵ Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2013), ‘About us’, <http://antisemitism.org.il/eng/aboutus>.

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 a detailed report on racism, antisemitism and xenophobia on an annual basis.²⁶

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

The number of antisemitic actions and threats recorded in France declined by 31% from 2012 (614) to 2013 (423).²⁷ While Jews represent less than 1 per cent of the French population, 40 % of racist violence perpetrated in France in 2013 targeted Jews. The regions most affected were Île-de-France, Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur and Rhône-Alpes.

Table 16: Antisemitic actions and threats recorded in France, 2003–2013

	Antisemitic actions and threats
2003	601
2004	974
2005	508
2006	571
2007	402
2008	459
2009	815
2010	466
2011	389
2012	614
2013	423

Source: CNCDH

In 2013, 105 violent antisemitic actions were recorded in France, a decrease of nearly 41 % from 2012. Of the 105 violent actions recorded, 49 (47 %) were offences against persons, including one attempted homicide. In this case, in April 2013 in Paris, a rabbi and his son were walking to the synagogue wearing, respectively, a hat and a yarmulke, when an individual attacked them with a knife.

Among the 105 victims of violent actions, 13 people were injured and in need of medical assistance. Ten minors were targeted. The remaining violent actions were offences against property: 52 cases of property damage (49 % of all

²⁶ These reports are available at: www.cncdh.fr/fr/dossiers-thematiques/racisme.

²⁷ CNCDH (2014), *Contribution de la ligue internationale contre le racisme et l'antisémitisme* (LICRA), p. 391, www.cncdh.fr/sites/default/files/cncdh_racisme_2012_basse_def.pdf.

violent actions), predominantly to private property (homes and vehicles), and three cases of arson (3 % of all violent actions).

Twenty-two actions targeting synagogues were identified, with two recorded actions detrimental to Jewish cemeteries and places of remembrance. Of all violent actions, 12 related to neo-Nazi ideology (mainly involving swastikas). Police investigations have led to the arrest of 25 people, including three minors.

Of the 105 violent actions identified, 50 (48 %) were committed in Ile-de-France, followed far behind by Provence-Alpes-Côte d’Azur (13 %) and Rhône-Alpes (13 %).

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 situation with regard to antisemitism in France. In its annual report on antisemitism, the SPCJ replicates the data from the CNCDH presented above. In addition, it provides detailed descriptions of antisemitic incidents.²⁸

Example of an antisemitic incident in France in 2013

According to the SPCJ report, the following incident took place in March. Before handing in the apartment keys to his Jewish landlord, a tenant damaged the premises and sprayed graffiti in black paint in all the rooms from floor to ceiling. There were a number of neo-Nazi graffiti (swastikas, references to Hitler) as well as the words “GO HOME JUDE”. A complaint was filed.

²⁸ For more information on the SPCJ, see: <http://antisemitisme.org/>.

Germany

Official data

In Germany, official data on antisemitism are collected through 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.²⁹

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 data show that the number of politically motivated antisemitic crimes recorded has declined since 2009, although there was an increase on the previous year in 2012. A steady increase in violent acts has, however, been recorded since 2011.

Table 17: Number of politically motivated crimes with an antisemitic motive by category of perpetrator recorded in Germany, 2003–2013

	Right-wing	Left-wing	Foreigner	Other	Total
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
2012	1,314	3	38	19	1,374
2013	1,218	0	31	26	1,275

Source: KPMD PMK

²⁹ These reports are available at: www.verfassungsschutz.de/de/oeffentlichkeitsarbeit/publikationen/verfassungsschutzbericht

Table 18: Number of politically motivated acts of violence with an antisemitic motive by category of perpetrator recorded in Germany, 2003–2013

	Right-wing	Left-wing	Foreigner	Other	Total
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
2012	37	0	4	0	41
2013	46	0	4	1	51

Source: KPMD PMK

Unofficial data

The Amadeu Antonio Foundation has been collecting data on antisemitic incidents from the German press and from projects and initiatives concerned with antisemitism since 2002. These data are presented as a chronology of events, which is updated on an ongoing basis.³⁰ The foundation notes that this chronology is not exhaustive. People can therefore report and reference other antisemitic incidents of which they may be aware.

As Table 19 shows, there is a high degree of fluctuation in the number of antisemitic incidents recorded by the Amadeu Antonio Foundation, with almost twice as many recorded in 2013 (65) as in 2012 (33).

³⁰ 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/chronik-antisemitischer-vorfaelle-2013/.

Table 19: Antisemitic incidents recorded in Germany, 2003–2013

	Recorded antisemitic incidents
2003	81
2004	36
2005	60
2006	113
2007	80
2008	83
2009	56
2010	71
2011	42
2012	33
2013	65

Source: Amadeu Antonio Foundation

Example of an antisemitic incident in Germany in 2013

The Antonio Amadeu Foundation reports that in June a 49-year-old man from the municipality of Diez (Rhineland-Palatinate) was fined €5,200 by the district court for inciting hatred against citizens of the Jewish faith. He had published statements on his website to the effect that ‘international Jewry’ and the Allies were responsible for the outbreak of the Second World War. The court argued that the right to freedom of expression was significantly exceeded in this case.³¹

³¹ Antonio Amadeu Foundation (2013), ‚Betreiber einer Internetseite wegen antisemitischer Volksverhetzung verurteilt‘, www.amadeu-antonio-stiftung.de/die-stiftung-aktiv/themen/gegen-as/antisemitismus-heute/chronik-antisemitischer-vorfaelle-1/chronik-antisemitischer-vorfaelle-2013.

Greece

Official data

According to data sent by local district attorneys' offices to the Ministry of Justice, Transparency and Human Rights, which was communicated to FRA, few prosecutions are initiated per year in Greece for crimes covered by Law 927/1979, which criminalises acts or activities intended to cause racial discrimination, such as public incitement to discrimination, hatred or violence on the sole grounds of racial or national origin. Five cases pertaining to antisemitism were prosecuted in 2010, three in 2011 and one in 2012. No cases pertaining to antisemitism were prosecuted by the Greek authorities in 2013.

Unofficial data

No unofficial data on antisemitism in Greece were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of an antisemitic incident in Greece in 2013

The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism reports that in October the Golden Dawn party issued an announcement following measures taken against it by the Greek government. In the announcement, the party blamed Greek Jews for being behind these measures and told them "not [to] get involved in Greek affairs".³²

³² The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2013), 'Golden Dawn issues scathing announcement against Greek Jews', <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/81996/golden-dawn-issues-scathing-announcement-against-greek-jews>.

Hungary

Official data

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

Unofficial data

The Federation of Jewish Communities in Hungary (*Magyarországi Zsidó Hitközségek Szövetsége, Mazsihisz*) prepared its first annual report on antisemitism in Hungary in 2013. In this report, seven categories of antisemitic incidents are recorded (Table 20), amounting to a total of 95 incidents, compared with 100 incidents recorded in 2012.

Table 20: Numbers and types of antisemitic incidents recorded in Hungary in 2013

	Physical atrocity	Verbal insult	Threats/harassment	Vandalism	Political antisemitism	Antisemitic hate speech	Other	Total
2013	6	7	2	25	21	21	13	95

Source: *Mazsihisz*

The Athena Institute is an NGO that monitors extremist activity in Hungary. It has been recording incidents of hate crime – including the antisemitic incidents presented in Table 21 – since 2009, using a variety of sources that include press accounts and reports published by the government and NGOs.³³

The Action and Protection Foundation (*Tett és Védelem Alapítvány, TEV*) published its first report on antisemitic incidents in May 2013. Between May 2013 and October 2013, TEV recorded 45 antisemitic acts.³⁴

Table 21: Number of recorded antisemitic incidents in Hungary, 2009–2013

	Athena Institute	TEV
2009	9	
2010	8	
2011	10	
2012	12	
2013	not available	45*

Note: *Between May 2013 and October 2013

Sources: Athena Institute; TEV

³³ Athena Institute, 'Hate crime record', www.athenainstitute.eu/en/hatecrimerecord_full.

³⁴ TEV, 'Publications', <http://tev.hu/en/publikaciok-2/>.

Example of an antisemitic incident in Hungary in 2013

The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism reports that the head of Hungary's Raoul Wallenberg Association was assaulted at a football match. The victim said that football fans near him were chanting "*Sieg Heil!*" When he asked them to stop, he was threatened and called a "Jewish communist". At the end of the match, as he was leaving the stadium with his family, two men blocked his way. One said, "It is *Sieg Heil*, even so!" (in Hungarian "*Csak azért is Sieg Heil!*") and the other hit him. The victim was hospitalised with a broken nose. Police pressed charges against the assailant.³⁵

³⁵ The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2013), 'Head of Hungary's Raoul Wallenberg Association injured in antisemitic attack', <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/78886/head-hungary%E2%80%99s-raoul-wallenberg-association-injured-antisemitic-attack>.

Ireland

Official data

The Central Statistics Office in Ireland records the number of antisemitic incidents reported to the police. As Table 22 shows, two antisemitic incidents were recorded in 2013.

Table 22: Antisemitic incidents reported to the police, Ireland, 2004–2013

	Reported incidents
2004	2
2005	12
2006	2
2007	2
2008	9
2009	5
2010	13
2011	3
2012	5
2013	2

Source: Central Statistics Office

Unofficial data

No unofficial data on antisemitism in Ireland were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of an antisemitic incident in Ireland in 2013

The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism reports that the headquarters of the Anglo Irish Bank in Dublin’s Docklands were vandalised with antisemitic graffiti. The messages read “Zionist engineered global financial holocaust”, “Jewish supremacist destruction of indigenous Europeans” and “Zionist global financial terrorism”.³⁶

³⁶ Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2013), ‘Unfinished Anglo HQ defaced with antisemitic graffiti’, <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/79726/unfinished-anglo-hq-defaced-antisemitic-graffiti>.

Italy

Official data

No official data on antisemitism in Italy were available 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.³⁷ As Table 23 shows, the number of incidents it recorded in 2013 declined significantly from 2012.

Table 23: Antisemitic incidents recorded in Italy, 2005–2013

	Recorded incidents
2005	49
2006	45
2007	45
2008	35
2009	47
2010	31
2011	58
2012	87
2013	49

Source: Observatory of Contemporary Anti-Jewish Prejudice

Example of an antisemitic incident in Italy in 2013

The Observatory of Contemporary Anti-Jewish Prejudice reports many incidents concerning antisemitic graffiti and other antisemitic displays that took place during 2013. For example, in June the Jewish community in Padua reported that a large swastika had been graffitied on the main community building.³⁸

³⁷ Observatory of Contemporary Anti-Jewish Prejudice, 'Episodi di antisemitismo in Italia', available in Italian at: www.osservatorioantisemitismo.it/notizie/episodi-di-antisemitismo-in-italia.

³⁸ Observatory of Contemporary Anti-Jewish Prejudice (2013), 'Svastica di fronte alla sede della comunità ebraica di Padova', www.osservatorioantisemitismo.it/episodi-di-antisemitismo-in-italia/svastica-di-fronte-alla-sede-della-comunita-ebraica-di-padova/.

Latvia

Official data

No official data on antisemitism in Latvia were available at the time this report was compiled.

Unofficial data

No unofficial data on antisemitism in Latvia were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of an antisemitic incident in Latvia in 2013

The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism reports that antisemitic graffiti were spray-painted on houses in the streets of Riga.³⁹

³⁹ Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2013), 'Antisemitic graffiti', <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/76873/antisemitic-graffiti>.

Lithuania

Official data

No new official data on antisemitism in Lithuania were available at the time this report was compiled.

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

Concerning antisemitism specifically, the Prosecutor's Office says that nine pre-trial investigations were initiated in the first four months of 2011 in relation to cases of antisemitism,⁴⁰ 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 on antisemitism in Lithuania were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of an antisemitic incident in Lithuania in 2013

The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism reports that Lithuanian police investigated antisemitic slogans written near the site of a former Nazi labour camp in the state's capital. The unknown perpetrators wrote "*Juden Raus*" and "*Heil Hitler*" and drew a swastika on a nearby pole. The police discovered the graffiti two days after Hitler's birthday in April.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Prosecutor General's Office, 'Daugėja nusikalstamų veikų asmens lygiateisiškumui ir sąžinės laisvei', available in Lithuanian at: www.prokuraturos.lt/Naujienos/Prane%c5%a1imaispaudai/tabid/71/ItemID/4018/Default.aspx.

⁴¹ Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2013), 'Antisemitic graffiti', <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/78849/antisemitic-graffiti>.

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 with regard to criminal discrimination (*Criminaliteitsbeeld discriminatie*) published by the police's National Diversity Expertise Centre (*Landelijk Expertise centrum 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 LECD-Police's annual reports between 2008 and 2012.⁴² The number of antisemitic incidents recorded in the Netherlands in 2012 is not comparable with that of previous years because of a change in the police reporting template. This change enabled police officers to indicate whether racist or religiously motivated discriminatory incidents targeted Jews. Whereas 859 incidents with antisemitic connotations were recorded by the police in 2012, 38 of these were considered to be intentionally antisemitic.

Table 24: Number of reported criminal discriminatory antisemitic incidents in the Netherlands, 2008–2012

	Antisemitic incidents	As a % of all criminal discriminatory incidents
2008	141	6.3
2009	209	9.4
2010	286	11.4
2011	293	10.7
2012	859*	26*

Note: *Not comparable with previous years because of a change in the police reporting template. The total number of criminal discriminatory incidents recorded in the Netherlands increased from 2,802 to 3,292 between 2011 and 2012. This increase is attributed to increases recorded in two regions in the Netherlands where the RADAR anti-discrimination agency was subcontracted to manage the registration process.

Source: LECD-Police

As Table 25 shows, although there is a much fluctuation in the number of cases of criminal discriminatory acts brought to the courts, the overall percentage of criminal acts relating to antisemitism appears to be relatively stable, except for the years 2007 and 2008.

⁴² See 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; Tierhof, B., Hermens, N., Drost, L. and van der Vos, L. (2013), *Poldis rapportage 2012 met themarapportage antisemitisme*, www.verwey-jonker.nl/doc/vitaliteit/Poldis_rapportage_2012_7371_web.pdf.

Table 25: Number of antisemitic criminal discriminatory acts registered at the Public Prosecution Service in the Netherlands, 2005–2012

	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
2012	42	28

Source: LECD-OM

There is considerable variety among identified perpetrators of acts of antisemitism between 2009 and 2012 (Table 26). The police explain the figures recorded for 2010 as the result of a confrontation between supporters of the Ajax Amsterdam and Feyenoord Rotterdam football teams, with the Feyenoord supporters targeting Amsterdam supporters with antisemitic abuse. The figures recorded for 2011 and 2012 are too low to draw any definite conclusions on the nature of perpetrators.

Table 26: Perpetrators of antisemitic acts of criminal discrimination, 2009–2013

Group	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
White	20 (29.9 %)	57 (74 %)	36 (57.1 %)	40 (95 %)	not available
Unknown	13 (19.4 %)	8 (10.4 %)	13 (20.6 %)	1 (2 %)	not available
Turkish/ Moroccan	17 (25.4 %)	7 (9.1 %)	4 (6.3 %)	0	not available
Other non-white	0	2 (2.6 %)	4 (6.3 %)	0	not available
Political conviction	0	1 (1.3 %)	0	0	not available
Religion/ beliefs	6 (9 %)	0	0	1 (2 %)	not available
Extreme right	10 (14.9 %)	1 (1.3 %)	4 (6.3 %)	0	not available
Surinamese/ Antillean	1 (1.5 %)	1 (1.3 %)	2 (3.2 %)	0	not available
Total	67	77	63	42	not available

Source: LECD-OM

Whereas acts of antisemitism were mainly recorded on the street or in public places in 2009 and 2011, they were mainly recorded in the context of sporting events in 2010, as a result of the incident described above (Table 27). In 2012, antisemitic acts occurred in sports as well as in public spaces and on the internet.

Table 27: Locations where antisemitic acts of criminal discrimination are perpetrated in the Netherlands, 2009–2013

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Street/public place	55	21	28	8	not available
Internet	17	6	7	6	not available
Sport/educational institutions	8	33	10	20	not available
Directed at criminal investigation officers	2	12	3	1	not available
Residential environment	2	1	9	4	not available
Service industry	0	2	3	0	not available
Press/media	0	1	0	2	not available
Other	1	2	6	0	not available

Source: LECD-OM

Unofficial data

A number of CSOs 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.⁴³ The number of reported incidents increased by nearly 30 % in 2013: from 113 incidents in 2011 and 114 incidents in 2012 to 147 incidents in 2013.

The Anne Frank House publishes a *Racism and Extremism Monitor*, an annual report on the situation with regard to racism and extremism in the Netherlands.⁴⁴ This report also focuses on antisemitism. The data provided show that the number of recorded violent antisemitic incidents almost doubled between 2011 and 2012, from 30 to 58.

The Magenta Foundation – with the support of the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of the Interior – hosts the Complaints Bureau for Discrimination on the Internet (*Meldpunt Discriminatie Internet*, MDI). The MDI publishes an annual report on complaints reported to it of discrimination relating to internet content.⁴⁵

The latest available data show that the number of complaints it received decreased from 285 in 2012 to 250 in 2013. Of the complaints received in 2013, 175 were deemed by MDI to be punishable by law, a similar number to that for 2012 (177). In 2013, 74 complaints were related to Holocaust denial, compared with 100 in 2012.

⁴³ These reports are available at: www.cidi.nl/sectie/antisemitisme/cidi-antisemitismemonitor/.

⁴⁴ These reports are available at: www.annefrank.org/en/Education/Monitor-Homepage/Research.

⁴⁵ These reports are available at: www.meldpunt.nl/site/page.php?lang=&pageID=34.

Table 28: Data on antisemitism collected by CSOs in the Netherlands, 2003–2013

	Reported incidents, CIDI	Violent incidents, Anne Frank House	Internet-related Complaints, MDI
2003	334	39	477
2004	327	not available	531
2005	159	40	302
2006	261	35	463
2007	81	21	371
2008	108	14	296
2009	167	18	399
2010	124	19	414
2011	113	30	252
2012	114	58	285
2013	147	not available	250

Sources: CIDI; Anne Frank House; MDI

Example of an antisemitic incident in the Netherlands in 2013

CIDI lists antisemitic incidents it recorded in the Netherlands in its 2013 annual report.⁴⁶ In one incident that took place in June, a resident of an old people's home in Rotterdam performed a Nazi salute in front of another resident. He told her he was friends with Adolf Hitler and that "they forgot to gas you". Then, in front of witnesses, he grabbed her Star of David pendant, pulled her closer and bit her. The incident was reported to police and the perpetrator apologised for his actions.

⁴⁶ CIDI (2014), *Monitor antisemitische incidenten in Nederland 2012*, www.cidi.nl/pdf/Monitor_Antisemitisme_2012.pdf.

Poland

Official data

In December 2011, after the Ministry of the Interior and Administration split into two separate ministries, a special Task Force 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*).

This new section, among other things, collects data on racist incidents brought to its attention including antisemitic incidents, and takes preventative action. It recorded 30 incidents related to antisemitism in 2010, compared with 25 in 2011, 21 in 2012 and 25 in 2013. Of these 25 cases, 21 involved hate speech and seven involved desecration of cemeteries.

Unofficial data

The Foundation for the Preservation of Jewish Heritage in Poland (*Fundacja Ochrony Dziedzictwa Żydowskiego*, FODZ) reports yearly on antisemitic incidents it refers to prosecution services, the police or other authorities (Table 29).⁴⁷

Table 29: Antisemitic incidents reported by FODZ to prosecution services, police or other authorities, 2003–2013

	Incidents reported to the authorities
2003	3
2004	6
2005	3
2006	13
2007	14
2008	7
2009	13
2010	11
2011	7
2012	5
2013	10

Source: FODZ

Example of an antisemitic incident in Poland in 2013

The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism reports that a historian and political scientist at the Polish Academy of Sciences claimed in an interview with Polish magazine *Focus Historia* that Jews took an active part in the murder of other Jews during the Second World War. The interview appeared in a special

⁴⁷ These reports are available at: <http://fodz.pl/?d=5&id=79&l=en>.

edition of the magazine focusing on the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. In the interview, titled 'Are the Jews themselves guilty?', the historian also claimed that Jews brought the Holocaust on themselves. "For many generations, the Jews, not the Catholic Church, worked to bring the Holocaust about. It looks like the Jews haven't learned their lesson and haven't come to any conclusions yet," he said.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ *Focus Historia* (2013), <https://forumemjot.wordpress.com/2013/04/06/zydzy-byli-sami-sobie-winni-wywiad-z-prof-krzysztofem-jasiewiczem-opublikowany-w-kwietniowym-numerze-focus-historia-ekstra/>.

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 30). These data are based on information submitted by judges who indicate bias motivation when rendering their sentences.

Table 30: Number of persons sentenced for crimes motivated by antisemitism, 2003–2013

	Number of sentenced persons
2003	3
2004	6
2005	0
2006	0
2007	2
2008	5
2009	2
2010	3
2011	1
2012	4
2013	2

Source: Ministry of Justice

Unofficial data

No unofficial data on antisemitism in Slovakia were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of an antisemitic incident in Slovakia in 2013

No example of an antisemitic incident in Slovakia in 2013 could be identified.

Spain

Official data

In 2013, the Crime Statistics System (*Sistema Estadístico de Criminalidad, SEC*), which registers incidents dealt with by all police bodies, recorded three antisemitic incidents and 42 incidents committed against religious beliefs and practices (which may include antisemitic incidents).

Unofficial data

The Observatory on Antisemitism in Spain (*Observatorio de antisemitismo en España*) records antisemitic events that occur in Spain, which it presents in the form of a chronology.⁴⁹ This chronology covers a number of types of incident, including antisemitism on the internet and in the media, attacks against property, attacks against people, trivialisation of the Holocaust, and delegitimisation of Israel (Table 31).

Table 31: Antisemitic events in Spain recorded by the Observatory on Antisemitism in Spain, 2009–2013

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Internet	0	1	2	3	2
Media	10	3	7	6	0
Attacks on property	4	1	2	9	3
Attacks on people	5	4	2	4	0
Trivialisation of the Holocaust	0	1	3	4	4
Delegitimisation of Israel	0	0	5	7	0
Incidents	0	1	1	4	2
Instigation to antisemitism	0	1	2	4	3
Legal decisions	0	6	0	0	3

Note: The same event may be included in several categories

Source: Observatory on Antisemitism in Spain

Example of an antisemitic incident in Spain in 2013

The Observatory on Antisemitism in Spain reports an incident in which two people were arrested and charged with dissemination of Nazi ideology using a radio station that broadcasts music on the internet. The two men were broadcasting songs with lyrics inciting violence and promoting hatred, racism, antisemitism and anti-immigration feeling.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Observatory on Antisemitism in Spain, available in Spanish at: <http://observatorioantisemitismo.fcje.org/>.

⁵⁰ Observatory on Antisemitism in Spain (2013), 'Detenidos por difundir ideología nazi a través de una radio en Internet', <http://observatorioantisemitismo.fcje.org/?p=1220>.

Sweden

Official data

The National Council for Crime Prevention (*Brottsförebyggande rådet*, Brå) publishes an annual report on statistics on police reports of crimes motivated by ethnicity, religion or faith, sexual orientation and gender identity.⁵¹ Brå 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 and in the definition of what constitutes a hate crime are such that the data presented in Table 32 are comparable only between the years 2004 and 2007 and for the years from 2008 onwards.

Table 32: Crimes with an antisemitic motive reported to the police in Sweden, 2003–2012

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

Note: *Not comparable with previous years

Source: Brå

Numbers 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 people.

⁵¹ These reports are available at: www.bra.se/bra/publikationer.html.

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

	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: Brå (2013), *Hatbrott 2012: Statistik över självrapporterad utsatthet för hatbrott och polisanmälningar med identifierade hatbrottsmotiv*, www.bra.se/download/18.6b82726313f7b234a5839/1372231125966/2013_16_Hatbrott_2012.pdf

Unofficial data

No unofficial data on antisemitism in Sweden were available at the time this report was compiled.

Example of an antisemitic incident in Sweden in 2013

The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism reports that a Swedish local politician resigned after denying the Holocaust. He became the third public figure to be embroiled in scandals involving antisemitism in Sweden in 2013. The politician, who was a member of a local council in a Stockholm suburb, resigned from his party and the city council hours after the publication of an interview in which he said that the Holocaust may never have happened, or that “Israel inflated the number” of victims.⁵²

⁵² Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (2013), ‘Swedish politician resigns after Holocaust denial’, available at: <http://antisemitism.org.il/article/78568/swedish-politician-resigns-after-holocaust-denial>.

United Kingdom

Official data

Every year, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) publishes official data on hate crimes, including antisemitic crimes, reported in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, collating data from regional police forces.⁵³

The data published by ACPO 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.⁵⁴

As Table 34 shows, the numbers of recorded hate crimes motivated by antisemitism have been falling since 2009, with 307 such crimes recorded in 2012. 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”.⁵⁵

Table 34: Recorded hate crimes motivated by antisemitism in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, 2009–2012

	2009	2010	2011	2012	1 April 2012–31 March 2013
Recorded hate crimes	703	488	440	307	385*

Note: *Data not comparable with the previous year

Source: ACPO

In 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.”⁵⁶

⁵³ These reports are available at: www.report-it.org.uk/hate_crime_data1.

⁵⁴ For more on definitions used by ACPO in collecting these data, see www.report-it.org.uk/what_is_hate_crime.

⁵⁵ True Vision, ACPO, ‘Total of recorded hate crime from regional forces in England, Wales and Northern Ireland during the calendar year 2012’, www.report-it.org.uk/files/acpo_recorded_hate_crimes_2012-13_as_posted.pdf.

⁵⁶ Scottish Government (2013), *Religiously aggravated offending in Scotland 2012–13*, p. 14; www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0042/00424865.pdf.

Table 35: Number of charges relating to derogatory conduct towards Judaism in Scotland, 2010–2013

	2010–11	2011–12	2012–13	2013–14
Number of charges	16	14	27	9
As a percentage of all religiously aggravated charges	2.3	1.6	3.9	2

Source: Scottish Government (2013),

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 CST 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”.⁵⁷ The data it collects are published in an annual report on antisemitic incidents.⁵⁸

As Table 36 shows, the number of antisemitic incidents recorded by the CST in 2013 was 529, an 18 % decrease from 2012, when 649 antisemitic incidents were recorded, and the lowest annual number since 2005.

Table 36: Antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom recorded by the CST, 2003–2013

	Recorded antisemitic incidents
2003	375
2004	532
2005	459
2006	598
2007	561
2008	546
2009	929
2010	645
2011	608
2012	649
2013	529

Source: CST

⁵⁷ CST, *Antisemitic incidents report 2011*, p. 8, www.thecst.org.uk/docs/Incidents%20Report%202011.pdf.

⁵⁸ These reports are available at: www.thecst.org.uk/index.cfm?content=7&Menu=6.

The CST also publishes data on the categories of incidents that are recorded, as Table 37 shows. The most common types of antisemitic incidents involve abusive behaviour, followed by assaults and then damage to or desecration of property.

In 2013, the most common targets in antisemitic incidents were random Jewish people in public (185), followed by private homes (58) and synagogues and their congregants (57).

Table 37: Categories of antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom recorded by the CST, 2004–2013

	Extreme violence	Assault	Damage or 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	2	91	63	29	394	8
2012	2	67	53	39	467	12
2013	0	69	49	38	368	5

Source: CST

Physical descriptions of the perpetrators were available for 146 of the 529 incidents reported by the CST in 2013: “86 offenders were described as ‘White – North European’ (59 %); 4 offenders were described as ‘White – South European’ (3 %); 11 offenders were described as ‘Black’ (8 %); 37 offenders were described as ‘South Asian’ (25 %); and 8 offenders were described as being ‘Arab or North African’ (5 %).”⁵⁹

The gender of the perpetrator could be identified for 247 incidents, broken down as follows: 212 incidents perpetrated by men, 26 by women and nine by mixed groups of women and men.

The age of the perpetrators could be identified in 166 cases. In 114 cases they were adults and in 49 cases they were minors; in the remaining three cases, the perpetrators were groups of minors and adults together.

The CST recorded 86 antisemitic incidents that involved the use of internet-based social media in 2013 (16 % of the 529 incidents), compared with 81 in 2012 and just 12 in 2011. Of these 86 antisemitic incidents, 81 were in the category of abusive behaviour and four were in the category of threats. One

⁵⁹ CST (2014), *Antisemitic incidents report 2013*, p. 21, www.thecst.org.uk/docs/Incidents%20Report%202013.pdf.

incident that involved the use of social media also involved a violent assault and was recorded in that category.

Example of an antisemitic incident in the United Kingdom in 2013

The CST provides examples in its annual report of the antisemitic incidents it records, among which the following took place in 2013 in Manchester. Five Jewish schoolboys were walking home from school when they were approached by five children from a local school, four of whom were male and one female. The offenders asked, “Are you Jewish?” and then said, “We’re German, we are going to shoot you. You should be sent to Auschwitz concentration camp.”

Concluding remarks – persisting gaps in data collection

This update echoes the findings of the FRA survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU Member States.⁶⁰ It shows that the phenomenon of antisemitism remains an issue of concern to and in the EU that needs to be tackled. It is therefore imperative that policy makers and civil society actors at all levels, as well as members of the general population, remain vigilant and continue 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 efficiently. Such data are often lacking. Indeed, as Table 38 indicates, there remain large gaps in data collection on antisemitism in EU Member States, with each Member State collecting different types of data. This prevents any meaningful comparison of officially collected data between Member States, while increasing the relevance of and need for surveys on the perceptions and experiences of antisemitism among self-identified Jews, such as that conducted by FRA.

Table 38: Gaps in official data on recorded antisemitic incidents in EU Member States, 2003–2013

	Recorded data	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009*	2010	2011	2012	2013
AT	Antisemitic offences committed by right-wing extremists	9	17	8	8	15	23	12	27	16	27	37
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	15
DE	Politically motivated crimes with an antisemitic motive	1,344	1,449	1,748	1,809	1,657	1,559	1,690	1,268	1,239	1,374	1,275
DK	Extremist crimes targeting Jews	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	9	-
EL	Prosecutions pertaining to antisemitism	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	3	1	0
ES	Antisemitic incidents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
FI	Antisemitic crimes	-	-	-	-	-	1	10	4	6	8	-
FR	Antisemitic actions and threats	601	974	508	571	402	459	815	466	389	614	423
HR	Criminal acts motivated by antisemitism	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0
IE	Antisemitic incidents	-	2	12	2	2	9	5	13	3	4	2
NL	Criminal discriminatory antisemitic incidents	-	-	-	-	-	141	209	286	283	293	859**
PL	Antisemitic incidents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	25	21	25
SE	Crimes with an antisemitic motive	105	151**	111	134	118	159**	250	161	194	221	-
SK	Persons sentenced for crimes motivated by antisemitism	3	6	0	0	2	5	2	3	1	4	2

⁶⁰ FRA (2013), *Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU Member States: Experiences and perceptions of antisemitism*, http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2013-discrimination-hatecrimeagainst-jews-eu-member-states_en.pdf; data available through data explorer tool at: <http://fra.europa.eu/DVS/DVT/as2013.php>.

UK - EN, NI, WAL	Hate crimes motivated by antisemitism	-	-	-	-	-	-	703	488	440	307	385**
UK - SCO**	Charges referring to conduct derogatory towards Judaism	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	14	27	9

Notes: Comparisons are not possible between Member States; a dash denotes that no data are available, because these data were not collected, not communicated, not published or do not cover the entire year.

*As noted in the 2011 FRA report on the situation with regard to antisemitism in the EU, the higher number of incidents recorded in 2009 tends to correspond with Israel's Cast Lead military operation, which took place in the winter of 2008-2009.

**Data not comparable with the previous year.

***Fiscal year (1 April-31 March).

Source: FRA desk research, 2014

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

Likewise, it cannot be said that antisemitism is necessarily a bigger problem in Member States where the highest numbers of incidents are recorded than in those with fewer recorded incidents. As well as the size of the Jewish population in any given Member State, there are a number of other factors that affect how many incidents are recorded, including the willingness and ability of victims and witnesses to report these incidents, and the degree of trust victims feel in the authorities to deal with 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 to enable such incidents to be recorded 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."⁶¹

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 characteristics of incidents, victims and perpetrators are missing, policy responses can often only be very general. More comprehensive and accurate data would allow for targeted policy responses.

⁶¹ 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).

While official data can be complemented by unofficial data, few CSOs have sufficient human and financial resources to collect robust and reliable data on antisemitism. As a result, much reporting by such 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 stronger support from the state for related civil society infrastructures.

When it comes to countering a phenomenon as complex as antisemitism, the data that are collected and the policy responses that are implemented on that basis 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, enabling EU Member States to combat such phenomena more effectively. These efforts must concentrate on official and unofficial data collection alike to enable the drawing of a more complete and accurate picture of the situation with regard to antisemitism in the EU.

Country codes

Code	EU Member State	Code	EU Member State
AT	Austria	FR	France
BE	Belgium	HR	Croatia
CZ	Czech Republic	IE	Ireland
DE	Germany	NL	Netherlands
DK	Denmark	PL	Poland
EL	Greece	SE	Sweden
ES	Spain	SK	Slovakia
FI	Finland	UK	United Kingdom



FRA – European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

Schwarzenbergplatz 11 ■ 1040 Vienna ■ Austria ■

Tel +43 158030-0 ■ Fax +43 158030-699

fra.europa.eu ■ info@fra.europa.eu ■ [facebook.com/fundamentalrights](https://www.facebook.com/fundamentalrights)

■ [linkedin.com/company/eu-fundamental-rights-agency](https://www.linkedin.com/company/eu-fundamental-rights-agency) ■

twitter.com/EURightsAgency