

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

Antisemitism

Overview of data available
in the European Union 2005–2015

November 2016



EUROPEAN UNION AGENCY
FOR FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS



Country codes

Country code	EU Member State
AT	Austria
BE	Belgium
BG	Bulgaria
CY	Cyprus
CZ	Czech Republic
DE	Germany
DK	Denmark
EE	Estonia
EL	Greece
ES	Spain
FI	Finland
FR	France
HR	Croatia
HU	Hungary
IE	Ireland
IT	Italy
LT	Lithuania
LU	Luxembourg
LV	Latvia
MT	Malta
NL	Netherlands
PL	Poland
PT	Portugal
RO	Romania
SE	Sweden
SK	Slovakia
SI	Slovenia
UK	United Kingdom

CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Limited data collection on antisemitism.....	5
Legal framework.....	7
Data collection for this overview	10
Reports and evidence from international organisations	11
United Nations (UN).....	11
European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI).....	17
Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR).....	19
National data on antisemitism.....	21
Austria.....	23
Belgium.....	28
Bulgaria.....	33
Croatia.....	34
Cyprus	35
Czech Republic.....	36
Denmark	39
Estonia	41
Finland	42
France	43
Germany.....	48
Greece.....	52
Hungary	53
Ireland.....	55
Italy	56
Latvia	58
Lithuania.....	59
Luxembourg.....	60
Malta	61
The Netherlands.....	62
Poland.....	67
Portugal	69
Romania.....	70
Slovakia	72
Slovenia.....	73
Spain	74
Sweden.....	76
United Kingdom.....	78
Concluding remarks – persisting gaps in data collection.....	84

Introduction

In 2015, terrorist attacks in the European Union (EU) took many lives. Jewish people, in particular, were targets of deadly attacks in Denmark and France, continuing the trend of such antisemitic attacks from those in Toulouse, 2012, and Brussels, 2014. The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) collected responses from Jewish communities in the immediate aftermath of the attacks in January 2015, which evidenced the profound impact of the events on the broader Jewish community. Such communities reported to FRA fear and insecurity, increased security measures, closed schools in many EU Member States and requests for police to enhance protection.¹ Terrorist attacks, antisemitic incidents and hate crime violate fundamental rights, including the right to human dignity, the right to equality of treatment, and the freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

Antisemitism can be expressed in the form of verbal and physical attacks, threats, harassment, property damage and graffiti or other forms of text, including on the internet. The present report relates to manifestations of antisemitism as they are recorded by international organisations, and by official and unofficial sources in the 28 EU Member States. ‘Official data’ are understood here as those collected by law enforcement agencies, authorities that are part of criminal justice systems and relevant state ministries at the national level. ‘Unofficial data’ refers to data collected by civil society organisations.

This annual report compiles the available evidence on antisemitic incidents collected by international, governmental and non-governmental sources, covering the period 1 January 2005–31 December 2015, where data are available. In addition, it includes a section that presents evidence from international organisations. No official data on reported antisemitic incidents in 2015 were available for eight Member States by the time this report was compiled in September 2016.

Twelve years after FRA’s predecessor, the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, released its first report on the manifestations of antisemitism in the EU, there is little progress to report with regard to data collection on antisemitism in the EU.

Limited data collection on antisemitism

Despite the serious negative consequences of antisemitism for Jewish populations in particular, as a recent FRA survey showed,² and also for society at large, evidence collected by FRA consistently shows that few EU Member States record antisemitic incidents in a way that allows them to collect adequate official data.³ The inadequate recording of hate crime incidents, including those of an antisemitic nature, coupled with victims’ hesitance to report incidents to the authorities, contributes to the gross

¹ FRA (2015), [Reactions to the Paris attacks in the EU: fundamental rights considerations](#), FRA Paper 01/2015, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union (Publications Office).

² FRA (2013), [Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU Member States: experiences and perceptions of antisemitism](#), Luxembourg, Publications Office.

³ For example, FRA (2013), [Antisemitism: Summary overview of the situation in the European Union 2001-2012](#), Luxembourg, Publications Office.

under-reporting of the extent, nature and characteristics of the antisemitic incidents that occur in the EU. It also limits the ability of policymakers 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. Incidents that are not reported are also not investigated or prosecuted, allowing offenders to think that they can carry out such attacks with relative impunity.

The data that do exist are generally not comparable, not least because they are collected using different methodologies and from different sources across EU Member States. Furthermore, although official data collection systems are generally based on police records and/or criminal justice data, authorities do not always categorise incidents motivated by antisemitism under that heading.

FRA's report on the experiences of professionals, such as police officers, judges, public prosecutors and experts from victim support services, working with victims of hate crime outlines some of the factors behind the criminal justice system's inadequate recording of incidents and crimes motivated by hatred.⁴ For example, many professionals lack an understanding of what hate crime is and how it affects people. Furthermore, specific provisions related to hate crime are often lacking in the criminal codes of EU Member States. As the category 'antisemitism' is often absent from police forms and recording databases, reported antisemitic incidents are often not included in police reporting forms, or are 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 witnesses of antisemitic incidents often do not report such incidents to the authorities or any other organisation, as the findings of FRA's survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews confirm.⁵

The current state of official data collection is such that the present report can provide only an overview of the data available on antisemitism in EU Member States. Because of gaps in data collection and high levels of under-reporting, the data presented here cannot be taken as an accurate portrayal of the prevalence of antisemitism in any given EU Member State, nor should these data be used to compare the situation in different countries.

Nevertheless, the comprehensive data that do exist show that antisemitism remains an issue of serious concern and that decisive and targeted policy responses are needed to tackle this phenomenon. The effective implementation of these responses would not only afford Jewish communities better protection against antisemitism, but it would also give a clear signal that, across the EU, the fundamental rights of all people are protected and safeguarded.

In December 2015, as announced in the European Commission's First [Annual Colloquium on Fundamental Rights](#) held in October, the Commission appointed a

⁴ FRA (2016), [Ensuring justice for hate crime victims: professional perspectives](#), Luxembourg, Publications Office.

⁵ FRA (2013), [Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU Member States: Experiences and perceptions of antisemitism](#), Luxembourg, Publications Office.

coordinator on combating antisemitism. The coordinator is a contact point for Jewish communities and contributes to the Commission's policymaking in the area of combating hate crime, hate speech, intolerance and discrimination. This report shows that continued and sustained efforts at the national, European and international levels, as well as at the level of civil society, need to be exerted to improve data collection on hate crime and, in particular, on antisemitism.

Assisting EU Member States in combating hate crime

Building on FRA's conference on hate crime, in December 2013 the Council of the EU called on FRA "to work together with Member States to facilitate exchange of good practices and assist the Member States at their request in their effort to develop effective methods to encourage reporting and ensure proper recording of hate crimes".⁶ In response, all 28 EU Member States, the European Commission, the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) and FRA set up a working party on combating hate crime in the EU, with a two-year mandate. The working party's efforts culminated in an online [compendium of practices for combating hate crime](#). The compendium contains measures from throughout the EU and is aimed at policymakers and law enforcement officers, who are encouraged to review and adapt practices from other countries to their own national context. It is a living document that will be added to continuously.

As of September 2016, FRA is coordinating a dedicated subgroup of experts and professionals to assist Member States with the development of a common methodology for data collection and the recording of hate crime within the European Union High Level Group on racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance.

For more information on FRA's work on hate crime, see <http://fra.europa.eu/en/theme/hate-crime>.

Legal framework

The right to life, the right to human dignity, equality of treatment, and the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion are universal human rights enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. The protection and promotion of these rights are intimately linked with the fight against antisemitism.

At the EU level, the Racial Equality Directive (2004/43/EC)⁷ prohibits discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin in employment and beyond, and the Employment Equality Directive (2000/78/EC)⁸ prohibits discrimination, among others, in employment on the ground of religion or belief. The Victims' Rights

⁶ Council of the European Union (2013), [Council conclusions on combating hate crime in the European Union](#), December 2013.

⁷ Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, OJ 2000 L 180.

⁸ Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, OJ 2000 L 303.

Directive (2012/29/EU)⁹ establishes minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime. It refers explicitly to victims of hate crime, their protection and the specific needs related to their recognition, respectful treatment, support and access to justice.

Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law¹⁰ sets out to define a common EU-wide criminal law approach in the field of countering severe manifestations of racism. This framework decision aims to ensure that the same behaviour constitutes an offence in all EU Member States, and that effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal penalties (including the possibility of imprisonment) are provided for natural and legal persons who have committed or who are liable for offences motivated by racism or xenophobia, or, therefore, also antisemitism.

The framework decision requires EU Member States 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 the public dissemination or distribution of tracts, pictures or other material. It requires the substance of certain offences to be laid down by national law, as well as requiring that national law treats racist motivation as an aggravating factor in other already established offences.

The framework decision also requires EU Member States to punish any conduct that publicly condones, denies or grossly trivialises crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes¹¹ 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 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 punish the condoning, denying or gross trivialising of crimes¹² 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 or aiding and abetting in the commission of the acts described above is also punishable under the framework decision. For legal persons, penalties shall include criminal or non-criminal fines and may also include other penalties, such as exclusion from entitlement to public benefits or aid; temporary or permanent disqualification from the practice of commercial activities; placement under judicial supervision; and a judicial winding-up order.

⁹ Council Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, OJ 2012 L 315.

¹⁰ 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, OJ 2008 L 328.

¹¹ As defined in Articles 6, 7 and 8 of the Statute of the International Criminal Court.

¹² As defined in Article 6 of the Charter of the International Military Tribunal, appended to the London Agreement of 8 August 1945.

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

Despite EU Member States having had to transpose the framework decision into national law by November 2010, 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”.*¹³

The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), in its consolidated case law, has consistently upheld the exclusion of the denial of the Holocaust from the protection of Article 10 (freedom of expression) of the ECHR. For example, in *Lehideux and Isorni v. France*¹⁴ and *Garaudy v. France*,¹⁵ the ECtHR stated that “denying the reality of clearly established historical facts, such as the Holocaust [. . .] undermines the values on which the fight against racism and anti-Semitism are based and constitutes a serious threat to public order. Such acts are incompatible with democracy and human rights because they infringe the rights of others”. In *Udo Walendy v. Germany*,¹⁶ the ECtHR stated that Holocaust denial is a “continuation of the former discrimination of the Jewish people” and “a serious threat to public order” and could not be considered as covered by freedom of expression under Article 10 of the ECHR.

In 2015, the ECtHR confirmed this point of view in *M’Bala M’Bala v. France*.¹⁷ The court held that, since the acts at issue were unmistakably negationist and antisemitic in nature, the humourist Dieudonné M’Bala M’Bala had sought to deflect Article 10 from its real purpose by using his right to freedom of expression for ends incompatible with the letter and spirit of the ECHR, which, if allowed, would contribute to the destruction of convention rights and freedoms.

The Council of Europe’s Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities sets out principles to be respected as well as goals to be achieved by the State Parties, to ensure the protection of persons belonging to national minorities, while fully respecting the principles of territorial integrity and the political independence of States. This convention contains provisions on, among others, non-discrimination and freedoms of assembly, association, expression, thought, conscience and religion, and has been ratified by 24 EU Member States.¹⁸

¹³ 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](#), COM(2014) 27 final, Brussels, 21 January 2014.

¹⁴ ECtHR, *Lehideux and Isorni v. France*, No. 24662/94, 23 September 1998.

¹⁵ ECtHR, *Garaudy v. France*, No. 65831/01, 24 June 2003.

¹⁶ ECtHR, *Walendy v. Germany*, No. 21128/92, 11 January 1995.

¹⁷ ECtHR, *M’Bala M’Bala v. France*, No. 25239/13, 20 October 2015.

¹⁸ Council of Europe (1995), [Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities](#).

The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination (ICERD) obliges all State Parties to take measures to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms. At Council of Europe level, and beyond the ECHR and its protocols, the Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime, concerning the Criminalisation of Acts of a Racist and Xenophobic Nature Committed through Computer Systems, obliges State Parties to establish denial, gross minimisation, approval or justification of genocide or crimes against humanity as criminal offences under their domestic laws.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) does “not permit general prohibition of expressions of an erroneous opinion or an incorrect interpretation of past events”.¹⁹ However, although Article 19 of the ICCPR states that everyone shall have a right to hold opinions without interference and the right to freedom of expression,²⁰ these can be also subjected to certain necessary restrictions provided by the law. According to Article 19(3) of the ICCPR, such restrictions may relate to the rights or reputations of others and to the protection of public order or morals. When invoking such restrictions, the precise nature of the threat to the enumerated grounds must be specifically demonstrated.²¹ Furthermore, Article 20²² declares that any propaganda for war as well as any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law.

Data collection for this overview

To obtain the most complete and accurate data available on antisemitism in the EU, FRA consults a variety of sources in all 28 EU Member States and employs the same methodology every year. The data presented here were collected through desk research, using the following three steps:

1. Sources of data on antisemitism available in the public domain were consulted, both at international and national levels. The former includes the United Nations (UN), the ECRI of the Council of Europe and the ODIHR of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). At the national level, official data published by relevant governmental offices, equality bodies, police forces and authorities within criminal justice systems were consulted.
2. Specific requests were made to governmental offices through the national liaison officers system in each of the Member States at the disposal of FRA.²³ This step was taken to ensure that the latest available official data on antisemitism were taken into consideration when drafting this report.

¹⁹ United Nations (UN), Human Rights Committee (HRC) (2011), [General comment No. 34](#), UN Doc. CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 49.

²⁰ UN, General Assembly, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), 16 December 1966 (entry into force: 23 March 1976), Art. 19.

²¹ UN, HRC (2011), [General comment No. 34](#), UN Doc. CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 35-36.

²² ICCPR, Art. 20.

²³ See FRA’s [list of national liaison officers](#).

3. Data on antisemitism published by civil society organisations were consulted.²⁴

Reports and evidence from international organisations

United Nations (UN)

The issue of countering antisemitism is present in much of the work of the UN. State Parties to the ICERD are obliged to submit regular reports on the implementation of the Convention to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD). The committee examines each report and addresses its concerns and recommendations to the State Party in the form of ‘concluding observations’.²⁵ The concluding observations highlight, among others, the issue of antisemitism in the State Parties and provide adequate recommendations.

The Human Rights Committee (CCPR) is a body of independent experts that monitors the implementation of the ICCPR by its State Parties. The State Parties are obliged to submit to the CCPR regular reports on how the rights are being implemented. The CCPR examines the report and addresses its concerns and recommendations to the State Party as ‘concluding observations’.²⁶

Antisemitism is also addressed within the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), which complements the work of the treaty bodies in the area of the promotion and protection of human rights.²⁷ The UPR is a state-driven process, under the auspices of the Human Rights Council, which provides the opportunity for each state to provide information on what actions they have taken to fulfil their human rights obligations. Its reviews are based on a number of documents, such as reports by governments and treaty bodies, as well as reports from national human rights institutions and non-governmental organisations. States are responsible for implementing the recommendations included in the final outcome report.

²⁴ For more information on global trends on antisemitism, see Kantor Center for the Study of Contemporary European Jewry (2015), [Moshe Kantor Database for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism and Racism: Antisemitism worldwide 2015](#); and Anti-Defamation League (2015), [ADL Global 100: An index of anti-Semitism](#).

²⁵ UN, Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) (2016), [Concluding observations](#).

²⁶ UN, CERD (2016), [Concluding observations](#).

²⁷ UN, HRC (2016), [Universal Periodic Review](#).

Table 1: Observations and recommendations made to EU Member States, by the CCPR, CERD and the State Parties through the UPR, with regard to combating antisemitism, 2005-2015

EU Member State	Observations and recommendations	Source
AT	Hate speech and racial discrimination: 15. The committee welcomes the legislative steps taken to improve the criminal-law response to hate speech and to enforce compliance with rules of conduct for the press with regard to racism, xenophobia, antisemitism or intolerance. It is concerned, however, about the increasing radicalization of extremist groups in the country, including members of the Muslim communities, and the resurgence of far right-wing and other groups inspired by extremist national socialist ideologies and neo-Nazism. The committee is also concerned at the rise of advocacy of racial or religious hatred against Roma, Muslims, Jews, minorities, migrants and asylum seekers, including political hate speech, which have not been systematically countered, and advocacy of hatred against persons of a different faith by some radical Islamist preachers. The committee is concerned that hate speech on the internet and online forums is on the rise (arts. 2, 18, 20 and 26).	CCPR CCPR/C/AUT/CO/5 (CCPR, 2015)
AT	Right-wing extremism and neo-Nazism: 11. While noting the state party's efforts to improve public awareness of new forms of racism in the state party, the committee is concerned at the resurgence of skinhead, far right wing and other groups that are inspired by extremist national socialist ideologies and neo-Nazism. The committee is also concerned at reports of verbal abuse of football players of African descent and the display of antisemitic slogans in football stadiums (arts. 2 and 4).	CERD CERD/C/AUT/CO/18-20 (CERD, 2012)
AT	c) Persistence of racist and xenophobic speech against Muslims, Jews and ethnic minorities in political and media discourse and on the internet (arts. 18, 20 and 26).	CCPR CCPR/C/AUT/CO/4 (CCPR, 2007)
BE	Antisemitism and Islamophobia: 10. In view of the intersectionality of religion and ethnicity in the state party, and while noting the numerous measures the state party has implemented to counter antisemitism and Islamophobia, including awareness campaigns, the creation of a watchdog unit on antisemitism and campaigns against cyber hate, the committee remains concerned at the number of acts of Islamophobia and antisemitism that have occurred in the state party (art. 2).	CERD CERD/C/BEL/CO/16-19 (CERD, 2014)
BE	The committee recommends that the state party: (a) increase its vigilance and reinforce measures to combat antisemitism and Islamophobia; (b) reinforce its awareness-raising campaigns on antisemitism and Islamophobia and promote tolerance among the various ethnic groups of its population; (c) promptly investigate, prosecute and punish, with appropriate penalties, the perpetrators and provide adequate protection to victims; (d) investigate the underlying causes of the antisemitism and Islamophobia in its society and inform the committee on the results. The committee also recommends that the state party provide information in its next periodic report on the outcomes of cases relating to acts of Islamophobia and antisemitism before its domestic courts and tribunals.	CERD CERD/C/BEL/CO/16-19 (CERD, 2014)

BE	c) about the resurgence of antisemitic and racist acts and about the increase in Islamophobic remarks and acts in the State party c) by the spread of this phenomenon in the media and the internet, in particular, and by the increasingly widespread use of Islamophobic rhetoric by, among others, political parties that receive public funding c) a bill to prohibit neo-Nazi demonstrations was not adopted by the chamber of representatives and has expired (arts. 2 and 20).	CCPR CCPR/C/BEL/CO/5 (CCPR, 2010)
BE	r) intensify its efforts to combat antisemitic, racist and Islamophobic acts by investigating such acts and by prosecuting and punishing those responsible for them r) continue its efforts to take effective action against the spread of this phenomenon in the media, particularly the internet r) consider the possibility of resubmitting the bill designed to prohibit neo-Nazi demonstrations and should consider discontinuing public funding for political parties that propagate hate, discrimination or violence.	CCPR CCPR/C/BEL/CO/5 (CCPR, 2010)
BE	w) other measures adopted to prevent and combat racial discrimination in Belgium, especially the 2004 federal action plan to combat racism, antisemitism and xenophobic violence and the setting up of a special unit to monitor racist messages on the internet.	CERD CERD/C/BEL/CO/15 (CERD, 2008)
CZ	94.64. Intensify its work to combat manifestations of neo-Nazism, extremism, racism, xenophobia and antisemitism in view of an increase of such acts in the past years; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Russian Federation.	UPR A/HRC/22/3 (UPR, 2012)
DE	w) the project “youth for tolerance and democracy – against right-wing extremism, xenophobia and antisemitism”, which was implemented from 2001 to 2006, as well as the permanent follow-up through the programme “youth for diversity, tolerance and democracy” launched in January 2007, which is intended to enhance the prevention strategies developed in the previous programme.	CERD CERD/C/DEU/CO/18 (CERD, 2008)
DE	n) the state party’s reservations with regard to the use of the term “race” c) the state party’s strong focus on xenophobia, antisemitism and right-wing extremism may lead to the neglect of other forms of racial discrimination c) the overall legislative design of key provisions of the criminal code may not be sufficiently precise in relation to racist elements in crimes c) the absence of a definition of racial discrimination in the state party’s domestic legislation.	CERD CERD/C/DEU/CO/18 (CERD, 2008)
ES	131.39. Improve policies against discrimination through legislation regulating hate crimes, racism, xenophobia and antisemitism; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Israel	UPR A/HRC/29/8 (UPR, 2015)
FR	120.69 Step up its efforts to combat racist, antisemitic and extremist expressions and actions; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Russian Federation.	UPR A/HRC/23/3 (UPR, 2013)
FR	120.71 Incorporate relevant materials in the school curriculum to combat negative preconception against sections of the French society of migrant background, to complement the national action plan against racism and antisemitism; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Timor-Leste.	UPR A/HRC/23/3 (UPR, 2013)
FR	120.75 Continue the implementation of the national plan of action against racism and antisemitism; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Angola.	UPR A/HRC/23/3 (UPR, 2013)
FR	120.79 The effective implementation of the repressive action provided for in the national action plan against racism and antisemitism (2012–2014), considering the rise of this phenomenon from another age; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Chad.	UPR A/HRC/23/3 (UPR, 2013)

FR	120.84 Allocate the necessary resources for the implementation of the national plan of action against racism and antisemitism; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Greece.	UPR A/HRC/23/3 (UPR, 2013)
FR	n) the committee is aware of the continued reports of serious antisemitic violence, directed at persons who are wearing visible symbols of the Jewish faith in public places or who are known to be members of the Jewish community, as well as inter-ethnic violence (articles 2, 6, 18 and 26).	CCPR CCPR/C/FRA/CO/4 (CCPR, 2008)
FR	r) redouble efforts to fight racist and antisemitic violence, and to undertake public education on the necessity for mutual respect among citizens of a democratic polity.	CCPR CCPR/C/FRA/CO/4 (CCPR, 2008)
HU	94.53. Make efforts to actively combat homophobic, antisemitic and anti-Roma rhetoric, including by ensuring law enforcement and judicial authorities are made aware of guidelines on identifying and investigating racially motivated crime; UPR Recommending State/Entity – United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.	UPR A/HRC/18/17 (UPR, 2011)
HU	c) the virulent and widespread anti-Roma statements by public figures, the media, and members of the disbanded Magyar Gárda c) the persistent ill-treatment and racial profiling of the Roma by the police; indications of rising antisemitism in the state party. The constitutional court's restrictive interpretation of article 269 of the penal code on incitement to violence, which may be incompatible with the state party's obligations under article 20 (art. 20).	CCPR CCPR/C/HUN/CO/5 (CCPR, 2010)
LT	15. The committee is concerned that, despite a number of legislative and institutional measures taken by the state party, xenophobic and in particular antisemitic incidents continue to occur. The committee is also concerned that manifestations of hatred and intolerance towards members of national or ethnic minorities as well as LGBT individuals remain widespread particularly on the internet (arts. 2, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 27).	CCPR CCPR/C/LTU/CO/3 (CCPR, 2012)
LT	88.23. Develop public awareness campaigns to combat manifestations of discrimination and racism, including xenophobia, homophobia, antisemitism, and other forms of intolerance in order to further protect and strengthen the rights of members of minority groups, including lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals and the Roma community; UPR Recommending State/Entity – United States of America.	UPR A/HRC/19/15 (UPR, 2011)
LT	89.23. Enact a more robust set of policies and procedures to combat antisemitism, and that a public strategy be developed to dissuade prejudices and intolerance towards the Jewish population and its culture, including with respect to Jewish memorial and commemorative sites within Lithuania, UPR Recommending State/Entity – Canada.	UPR A/HRC/19/15 (UPR, 2011)
LV	92.10. Codify the prohibition of the propaganda for xenophobia, antisemitism, neo-Nazism, and provide for criminal liability for such acts and establish racism as an aggravating circumstance; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Russian Federation.	UPR A/HRC/18/9 (UPR, 2011)
PL	Situation of national and ethnic minorities: 12. Despite the efforts of the state party in promoting the rights of persons belonging to minorities, including implementation of the act on national and ethnic minorities and regional languages, the committee is concerned about ongoing negative stereotypes of national and ethnic minorities. The committee is particularly concerned about racist behaviour against Roma, Jews and people of African and Asian descent. The committee	CERD CERD/C/POL/CO/20-21 (CERD, 2014)

	requested information on the status of the Slowincy and notes that, according to the response of the delegation of the state party, no such group as the Slowincy currently resides on the territory of Poland (arts. 2, 4, 5 and 7).	
PL	Situation of the Jewish community: 14. Considering the tragic experience of the Jewish community in Poland and its virtual extermination, particularly during the occupation in the second world war, the committee expresses concern about the continuing prevalence of antisemitic sentiment and incidents in Poland, despite numerous activities undertaken to counter this. It is also concerned about the information it has received regarding the attitude of certain polish authorities who have discontinued investigations in some cases of antisemitism on the grounds that the victim did not belong to the Jewish community (arts. 4 and 6).	CERD CERD/C/POL/CO/20-21 (CERD, 2014)
PL	Bearing in mind the tragic experience of the Jewish community in Poland, particularly during the occupation in the second world war, the committee recommends that the state party intensify its efforts to combat antisemitism and efficiently prosecute its manifestations by sensitizing prosecutors and judges to the need to apply the law and the convention proactively.	CERD CERD/C/POL/CO/20-21 (CERD, 2014)
PL	90.50. Enact public awareness campaigns and government training, as well as increased enforcement of anti-discrimination and hate crime laws, in order to decrease antisemitism and discrimination against members of ethnic minority groups; UPR Recommending State/Entity – United States of America.	UPR A/HRC/21/14 (UPR, 2012)
PL	90.62. Intensify measures to combat the manifestation of racism and antisemitism, including by police officers; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Belarus.	UPR A/HRC/21/14 (UPR, 2012)
PL	c) significant rise in cases of racial hatred filed with law enforcement agencies, but notes with regret the reportedly low investigation and prosecution rate c) remains concerned about persistent manifestations of antisemitism, including physical attacks, desecration of Jewish cemeteries and the dissemination of antisemitic propaganda through the internet and print media, despite numerous measures taken by the state party (art. 2).	CCPR CCPR/C/POL/CO/6 (CCPR, 2010)
PL	r) step up efforts to promote tolerance and combat prejudice, particularly within the national programme against racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, which was extended until 2013 r) pay particular attention to the monitoring of the impact of the previous and current national programmes r) include in its next periodic report detailed information on the number of investigations carried out into incidences and manifestations of antisemitism, as well as prosecutions instigated and sentences passed in each case.	CCPR CCPR/C/POL/CO/6 (CCPR, 2010)
PL	n) the continued incidence of antisemitic activities in the state party, including the desecration of Jewish cemeteries, antisemitic hate speech and the dissemination of antisemitic material via the internet.	CERD CERD/C/POL/CO/19 (CERD, 2009)
PL	r) sensitize the public on the problems relating to antisemitism and to reinforce its efforts to prevent and punish such acts and to provide, in its next periodic report, information on any measures taken in this regard.	CERD CERD/C/POL/CO/19 (CERD, 2009)
PT	Recommendation no. 8, para. 101: 8. Strengthen efforts and measures to counter the dissemination of racist, xenophobic and antisemitic	UPR

	propaganda, which generate incitement to racial hatred; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Mauritius.	A/HRC/13/10 (UPR, 2009)
SE	145.61. Investigate, prosecute and punish all hate crimes against visible minorities, including Muslims, afro-swedes, Roma and Jews; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Azerbaijan.	UPR A/HRC/29/13 (UPR, 2015)
SE	145.71. Do everything in its power to continue to live up to its well-deserved reputation, particularly by working actively to combat xenophobic, racist, antisemitic and Islamophobic acts which are tending to increase in the country; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Comoros.	UPR A/HRC/29/13 (UPR, 2015)
SE	145.92. Guarantee effective protection, in law and practice, of the rights of national and religious minorities, firstly Muslims, Jews as well as the Sami; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Russian Federation.	UPR A/HRC/29/13 (UPR, 2015)
SE	145.122. Continue implementing measures and funding programmes to combat antisemitism; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Israel.	UPR A/HRC/29/13 (UPR, 2015)
SE	Accountability for hate speech including racism in political discourse: 12.the committee expresses its concern about the increase in reports of racially motivated hate speech against visible minorities, including Muslims, afro-swedes, Roma and Jews, in particular by some far-right politicians. The committee is also concerned about the reported increase of hate speech in the media and on the internet, including by certain media professionals. The committee believes that additional measures need to be taken to address the issue of hate speech in the media (arts. 2, para. 1 (a); 4 (a), (b) and (c); and 7).	CERD CERD/C/SWE/CO/19-21 (CERD, 2013)
SE	According to information from the living history forum, following a survey conducted in 2004 and examining antisemitism, Islamophobia, homophobia and general intolerance among school youths in relation to attitudes, victimization, self-reported crime and the dissemination of extremist propaganda, “intolerance towards minority groups – which may manifest itself in such forms as discrimination, harassment, insults, threats and physical violence – constitutes a serious social problem” in the state party c) while appreciating the state party’s efforts to combat hate crimes, including the establishment of the hate-crime hotline in 2007, the committee reiterates its concern about the increase of reported racially motivated crimes in recent years as well as the low number of prosecutions compared with the number of reported hate speech incidents (arts. 20 and 26).	CCPR CCPR/C/SWE/CO/6 (CCPR, 2009)
SK	Positive aspects: 3. The committee notes with appreciation a number of legislative and policy developments towards the elimination of racial discrimination, including:(a)the amendment to the anti-discrimination act which will go into effect as of 1 April 2013 regulating temporary special measures aimed at eliminating disadvantages based, inter alia, on race, ethnicity, gender, and promoting equal opportunities for work, in compliance with relevant European union directives; (b)the establishment in 2012 of the office of the plenipotentiary of the government for national minorities operating as an advisory body; (c)the revision in august 2011 of the national action plan for the decade of Roma inclusion 2005-2015 for the years 2011-2015 and the adoption in January 2012 of the strategy for the integration of Roma up to 2020, in line with the European	CERD CERD/C/SVK/CO/9-10 (CERD, 2013)

	commission framework and in consultation with civil society organizations; (d)the adoption in June 2011 of the conception to combat extremism for the years 2011–2014;(e)the adoption in May 2009 of the fifth action plan for the prevention of all forms of discrimination, racism, xenophobia and other expression of intolerance for the period 2009–2011 and the setting up in 2011 of the committee for the prevention and elimination of racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and other forms of intolerance.	
SK	w) the adoption of an action plan for the prevention of all forms of discrimination, racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and other expressions of intolerance for the period 2009–2011, and other measures aimed at eliminating discrimination, such as the “community programme for employment and social solidarity, progress”.	CERD CERD/C/SVK/CO/6-8 (CERD, 2010)
SK	w) the steps taken to combat and prevent racially motivated violence, including the introduction of stronger punishments in the criminal code as well as the establishment of an inter-ministerial task force entrusted with the implementation of the action plan for the prevention of all forms of discrimination c) about the increase in racially motivated attacks, including antisemitic violence and violence targeting Roma and non-EU migrants, sometimes perpetrated by neo-Nazi skinhead groups (arts. 4, 5(b), and 7).	CERD CERD/C/SVK/CO/6-8 (CERD, 2010)
SK	r) to intensify its efforts to combat and prevent racially motivated offenses, in particular violence against Roma, Jews, and non-EU migrants, including by ensuring that all racially-motivated acts of violence are duly investigated and prosecuted, and that perpetrators are punished, taking into account the racial motivation of such acts as an aggravating circumstance r) carry out awareness-raising campaigns on this matter r) take further measures to promote tolerance among ethnic groups r) to provide updated statistical data on the number and nature of reported hate crimes, prosecutions, convictions and sentences imposed on perpetrators, disaggregated by age, gender and national or ethnic origin of victims.	CERD CERD/C/SVK/CO/6-8 (CERD, 2010)

Source: FRA, 2016 (with data compiled from the [Universal Human Rights Index](#))

European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)

ECRI includes considerations of antisemitism in its country-monitoring work. This work proceeds by cycles to examine “the situation concerning manifestations of racism and intolerance in each of the Council of Europe member states”.²⁸

These considerations include a broad overview of the situation regarding antisemitism in the particular country under examination, and ECRI also makes recommendations on what it considers the main issues to be addressed by the country under examination. All 28 EU Member States have been covered under ECRI’s country-monitoring work.²⁹

²⁸ Council of Europe, European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) (2016), [Country monitoring work](#).

²⁹ For more information on ECRI’s country monitoring work, see the Council of Europe’s [webpage](#) on the topic.

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

- Antisemitic incidents continue to occur in EU Member States and include verbal and physical violence; threats; insults directed at Jews going to the synagogue; 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 targeted by antisemitic incidents.
- The main perpetrators of antisemitic incidents are 'Islamists' and radicalised young Muslims, including schoolchildren, as well as neo-Nazis and sympathisers of extreme-right and extreme-left groups. There have also been incidents of 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 publish it.
- Expressions of antisemitism on the internet are on the rise, as evidenced by the open expressions of antisemitism in online forums.
- Denial and trivialisation of the Holocaust are becoming more visible in general, and more common in some countries; glorification of the Nazi past is also still in evidence.
- Discussions surrounding property restitution laws sometimes spur antisemitic sentiments in some EU Member States because the general public does not understand why such laws are needed.
- Links are often made between policies taken by the State of Israel and members of Jewish communities at the local level, as well as Jews in general.
- Antisemitic incidents intensify during periods of increased conflict in the Middle East, and the nature and tone of the news coverage of the conflict are contributing factors.
- Antisemitic demonstrations are sometimes organised by far-right groups to coincide with events in the Jewish calendar or with anniversaries of historical events of significance to Jewish communities, especially in relation to the Second World War and the Holocaust.
- EU Member States actively implement programmes to combat antisemitism, including education programmes and initiatives to support Jewish culture.
- Representatives of Jewish communities report that these communities are well integrated into society.

- There are forums for dialogue to bring together members of Jewish and Muslim communities and local government representatives to promote mutual understanding and take joint action to combat intolerance. More such initiatives are needed.
- Several EU Member States have added education about the Holocaust to school curricula, but there is a need for more in-depth and good-quality teaching about the Holocaust.

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR)

ODIHR's online hate crime reporting database covers all 28 EU Member States and includes six 'bias motivations', one of which is antisemitism. The data presented in the online database stem from governmental sources (national points of contact on hate crimes), civil society organisations and intergovernmental organisations. National points of contact on hate crimes are requested to fill out a questionnaire on the basis of ODIHR's definition of a hate crime:

"a criminal act motivated by bias towards a certain group. For a criminal act to qualify as a hate crime, it must meet two criteria: The act must be a crime under the criminal code of the legal jurisdiction in which it is committed. The crime must have been committed with a bias motivation. 'Bias motivation' means that the perpetrator chose the target of the crime on the basis of protected characteristics. A 'protected characteristic' is a fundamental or core characteristic that is shared by a group, such as 'race', religion, ethnicity, language or sexual orientation. The target of a hate crime may be a person, people or property associated with a group that shares a protected characteristic".³⁰

At the time of writing, ODIHR's latest available online hate crime reporting database covered the year 2015.³¹ Twelve EU Member States (Austria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom) provided ODIHR with data on antisemitic crimes for the purposes of the database, as shown in Table 2.

³⁰ Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) (2012), [Hate crime](#).

³¹ ODIHR, [Hate crime online database](#).

Table 2: Antisemitic hate crimes in the OSCE region in 2015, official data submitted by EU Member States

EU Member State	Number of antisemitic hate crimes recorded	National Points of Contact in Combating Hate Crime
AT	41	Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs; Austrian Federal Chancellery; Federal Ministry of Interior, Federal Agency for State Protection and Counter Terrorism
HR	2	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration
CZ	1	Ministry of the Interior, Security Policy Department
DA	13	Ministry of Justice, Law Department, Criminal Law Division
FR	715	Ministry of Justice
DE	192	Federal Ministry of Interior
IE	2	Garda Racial, Intercultural and Diversity Office
NL	428	Ministry of Security and Justice
PL	50	Ministry of Interior, Department of Control, Complaints and Petitions
ES	9	Observatory for Racism and Xenophobia in Spain
SE	149	National Council for Crime Prevention
UK	786	Ministry of Justice

Source: *ODIHR online hate crime reporting [database](#)*

National data on antisemitism

In this section, each country is considered separately, given that national-level data are not comparable. After presenting official data on antisemitism, information on the types of incidents and the characteristics of the victims and perpetrators of antisemitic incidents are given, if available.

Unofficial data published by civil society organisations are then presented, with seven Member States (Belgium, the Czech Republic, Greece, France, Hungary, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom) having established cooperation mechanisms with civil society organisations.

Measuring trends in data pertaining to antisemitism

It is not possible to compare the number of recorded incidents of antisemitism between EU Member States, as the official statistics in each Member State are based on different criteria and methodologies. Instead, the reader should consider the national trends and assess the increase or decrease in recorded antisemitic incidents from one year to another, and over a number of years, on the basis of percentage changes in collected data.

In addition to tables containing the official data pertaining to antisemitism, trend data are presented in the form of line graphs if both of the following two conditions were fulfilled:

- the data were collected using the same methodology for at least three years in a row during the 2005–2015 period;
- the mid-point of the trend line for the series was not below 20 cases.

The assessed time period depends on the number of years in which data were collected without major changes in the recording system or definitions used – this varies from 11 years to three years, the latter being the minimum needed for trend analysis.

EU Member States with few recorded incidents of antisemitism were excluded from the trend analysis, but these data are presented in tables in the relevant sections of this report. If the number of recorded incidents is low (in this case, under 20 cases per year), the direction and magnitude of the trend is likely to be highly susceptible to changes from one year to the next, making reliable trend analysis difficult.

To identify trends that underlie annual changes in the number of recorded incidents, linear regression lines were fitted to the national data. The slopes of the linear regression lines were used to determine the direction and magnitude of the trends. Although for some countries this methodology produced trend lines that are very close to the actual data, as in the case of the United Kingdom (Figure 26), for other countries, such as France (Figure 9), the data show a high degree of variability (fluctuations) between consecutive years, which might limit the explanatory value of the linear regression models.

It should also be emphasised that ascending or descending trend lines should not be interpreted as growing or declining antisemitism. The increase or decrease in recorded

incidents might mean, for example, that more people are reporting incidents or that police are becoming more efficient at recording incidents.

In accordance with the criteria presented above, trend lines based on official data were developed for 10 Member States (Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Sweden and the United Kingdom). Trend lines based on unofficial data were developed for nine Member States (Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom).

Austria

Official data

The main source of official data on antisemitic offences in Austria is the Federal Agency for State Protection and Counter Terrorism (*Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz und Terrorismusbekämpfung*, BVT). The BVT collects data submitted to it on a monthly basis by the Provincial Agencies for State Protection (*Landesämter für Verfassungsschutz*, 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.³² Data on antisemitism (Table 3) are subsumed under the category of right-wing extremism.

Table 3: Recorded antisemitic offences motivated by right-wing extremism in Austria, 2005–2015

Year	Recorded antisemitic offences
2005	8
2006	8
2007	15
2008	23
2009	12
2010	27
2011	16
2012	27
2013	37
2014	58
2015	41


Sources: 2005–2010: BVT; 2011–2015: Federal Ministry of the Interior

Statistics show (Figure 1) that the number of antisemitic offences recorded in Austria decreased between 2014 and 2015. The number of recorded annual incidents during the 2005–2015 period was highest in 2014.

The Federal Ministry of the Interior communicated data to FRA on the nature of these recorded offences, covering the 2009–2015 period (Table 4). 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. The more detailed breakdown of antisemitic incidents in Table 4 shows that both recorded categories of antisemitic offences decreased in 2015 compared with 2014.

³² Austria, Federal Ministry of the Interior (*Bundesministerium für Inneres*) (2016), [Verfassungsschutzbericht](#).

Figure 1: Recorded antisemitic offences motivated by right-wing extremism in Austria, 2005-2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005-2015.

Source: 2005-2010: BVT; 2011-2015: Federal Ministry of the Interior

Table 4: Nature of recorded antisemitic offences in Austria, 2009-2015

Year	Verbal expressions (including on the internet) or damage to property	Offences against an individual 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
2014	53	5	58
2015	40	1	41

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 cases of racist graffiti reported to it in the preceding calendar year.³³ Sixty-seven such reports were made to ZARA in 2015, out of which 33 reports (49 %) concerned swastikas or antisemitic graffiti (Table 5).

³³ Civil Courage and Anti-racism Work (*Zivilcourage und Anti-Rassismus-Arbeit*, ZARA) (2016), [Rassismus Reports 2000-2015](#).

Table 5: Unofficial data on antisemitic incidents in Austria, 2005–2015

Year	Swastikas or antisemitic graffiti reported to ZARA
2005	10
2006	9
2007	60
2008	33
2009	86
2010	78
2011	33
2012	22
2013	29
2014	31
2015	33

Source: ZARA, *Racism reports 2005–2015*

Figure 2: Incidents of swastikas or antisemitic graffiti reported to ZARA in Austria, 2005–2015

Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005–2015.

Source: ZARA, *Racism reports 2005–2015*

The Forum Against Antisemitism (*Forum gegen Antisemitismus*, FgA) reports annually on antisemitic incidents through its own data collection,³⁴ including on antisemitic incidents reported to it through emails, phone calls or personally, and data gathered through media monitoring. The number of recorded antisemitic incidents has been increasing since 2012, reaching its peak in 2015, with 465 recorded incidents (Table 6). Compared with 2014, there was an increase of 82 % in the number of recorded antisemitic incidents in 2015; the highest increase was in incidents of hate speech online (Table 7). The FgA has not changed its recording methodology. It explains that the increase is a result of the higher awareness of hate

³⁴ Forum Against Antisemitism (*Forum gegen Antisemitismus*, FgA) (2016), [Reports 2013–2015](#).


speech among internet users and, therefore, an increase in the number of users reporting hate speech; and possibly because of an actual increase in the incidence of hate speech online.

Table 6: Unofficial data on antisemitic incidents in Austria, 2008-2015

	Antisemitic incidents recorded by FgA
2008	46
2009	200
2010	70
2011	71
2012	135
2013	137
2014	255
2015	465

Source: FgA 2008-2015

Figure 3: Unofficial data on antisemitic incidents in Austria, 2008-2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005-2015.

Source: FgA 2008-2015

Table 7: Nature of recorded antisemitic incidents, 2008–2015

Year	Insults/ threats	Hate speech online	Threat- ening phone calls	Threat- ening letters	Defama- tory phone calls	Defama- tory letters	Vandalism	Attacks	Internet hacking
2008	7	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	28	1	n.a.
2009	33	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	47	7	n.a.
2010	19	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	23	4	n.a.
2011	18	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	20	4	n.a.
2012	26	18	n.a.	n.a.	38	38	34	6	n.a.
2013	21	n.a.	3	3	49	49	54	7	n.a.
2014	21	83	6	6	79	79	57	9	n.a.
2015	18	205	5	30	30	120	50	2	5

Note: n.a. = not available.

Source: FgA 2008–2015

Belgium

Official data

The Federal Police record and publish data on Holocaust denial and revisionism, which are reproduced in Table 8.³⁵

Table 8: Cases of Holocaust denial and revisionism recorded by the Belgian Federal Police, 2006-2015

Year	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	7	1	8
2014	1	4	0	5
2015	3	4	0	7

Source: Federal Police

The national equality body in Belgium (Unia, formerly the Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities) is competent to receive and handle complaints from members of the public pertaining to discrimination on many grounds. In 2015, it recorded 57 cases related to antisemitism – a 50 % decrease from 2014, when it dealt with 130 such cases (Table 9).³⁶

³⁵ Belgium, Federal Police (2016), *Statistiques policières de criminalité, Belgique 2000-2015* (in French); *Politiele Criminaliteitsstatistieken* (in Dutch).

³⁶ Unia (2015), *Rapport annuel 2015: Le vivre ensemble mis à l'épreuve*.


Table 9: Complaints of antisemitism received by the Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities, 2005–2014, and Unia, 2015

Year	Complaints of antisemitism
2005	58
2006	64
2007	67
2008	66
2009	109
2010	57
2011	62
2012	88
2013	85
2014	130
2015	53

Sources: Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities, annual report on discrimination; Unia, annual report

There was a sharp decrease in the number of complaints of antisemitism filed in 2015 compared with 2014. The figures recorded in 2014 exceed those recorded in 2013; this contributes to the generally increasing overall trend for the 2005–2015 period (Figure 4).

Figure 4: Complaints of antisemitism received by the Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities, 2005–2014, and Unia, 2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005–2015.

Source: Unia, annual report

The number of complaints in all categories decreased in 2015, compared with 2014 (Table 10). In 2015, the most common complaints received by the Interfederal Centre in relation to antisemitic incidents were related to the internet (20), followed by Holocaust denial (12), and verbal aggression and threats (9), as Table 10 shows.

Table 10: Complaints of antisemitism received by the Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities, 2005–2014, and Unia, 2015

Year	Verbal aggression and threats	Letters or articles	Media	Internet	Violence	Vandalism	Holocaust denial	Others
2005	18	9	2	11	6	6	6	0
2006	14	16	1	21	3	3	3	3
2007	17	8	3	25	0	9	1	4
2008	16	3	5	26	0	7	8	1
2009	24	1	1	35	10	18	11	9
2010	8	3	2	31	7	5	1	0
2011	9	6	0	32	6	2	4	3
2012	15	5	5	28	4	11	13	7
2013	20	4	0	23	4	2	25	7
2014	26	6	3	41	6	5	31	12
2015	9	0	3	20	3	2	12	4

Sources: Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities, annual report on discrimination; Unia, annual report

Unofficial data

Antisemitisme.be is the main civil society organisation that records data on antisemitism in Belgium. It records acts of antisemitism through a dedicated telephone and fax hotline and email address, and through regular contact with Unia. 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.be³⁷ show that it received reports of 70 incidents in 2015, as compared with 109 reported incidents in 2014 (Table 11).

³⁷ Antisemitisme.be (2016), [Reports in French](#) and [Reports in Dutch](#).


Table 11: Antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be, 2005–2015

Year	Reported antisemitic incidents
2005	60
2006	66
2007	69
2008	73
2009	109
2010	52
2011	65
2012	80
2013	64
2014	109
2015	70

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

The incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be in 2014 equal the peak amount reported in 2009 (Figure 5). The overall trend appears to be increasing, with only three years (2010, 2013 and 2015) marked by declining figures in the analysed period.

Figure 5: Antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be, 2005–2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005–2015.

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

As Table 12 shows, there is a great degree of variation in the types of antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be. After the shootings of 24 May 2014 at the Jewish Museum of Belgium, when four people were killed, the category ‘attack’ was added to the types of antisemitic incidents in the 2014 Antisemitisme.be report. 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.

Table 12: Types of antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be, 2009–2015

	Violence	Threats	Desecration/ property damage	Ideological	Internet	Attack
2009	11	13	22	29	34	-
2010	7	3	5	12	25	-
2011	7	5	3	23	27	-
2012	5	6	13	26	30	-
2013	6	4	5	28	21	-
2014	6	11	11	33	47	1
2015	3	11	3	24	29	0

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

Bulgaria

Official data

The Bulgarian government informed FRA that, between 2009 and 2011, three persons were convicted on charges related to spreading antisemitism and National Socialism. No data were available for 2015.

Unofficial data

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

Croatia

Official data

The Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Croatia recorded two criminal offences motivated by antisemitism in 2015. In 2012, one criminal offence motivated by antisemitism was recorded, and in 2013 and 2014, no antisemitic criminal offences were recorded by the police in Croatia.

Unofficial data

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

Cyprus

Official data

The Cyprus Police records antisemitic incidents under the category 'Motive in incidents and/or cases of racial nature and/or racial motive'. No antisemitic incidents were recorded by the police in Cyprus in 2015.

Unofficial data

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

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.³⁸ These reports also provide data on the number of recorded criminal offences motivated by antisemitism (Table 13).³⁹ These data show a 200 % increase in recorded antisemitic offences in 2014 (45) as compared with 2013 (15). The number of offences in 2015 (47) was similar to the number in 2014.

Table 13: Recorded criminal offences motivated by antisemitism in the Czech Republic, 2005-2015

Year	Recorded criminal offences
2005	23
2006	14
2007	18
2008	27
2009	48
2010	28
2011	18
2012	9
2013	15
2014	45
2015	47


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

After recording fewer than 20 antisemitic offences for three consecutive years (2011-2013), the number of offences recorded in 2014 and 2015 reached almost the same level recorded in 2009, when the highest number in the analysed period was recorded (Figure 6).

³⁸ Czech Republic, Ministry of the Interior (*Ministerstvo Vnitra*) (2016), [Výroční zprávy o extremismu a koncepcie boje proti extremismu](#).

³⁹ Czech Republic, Ministry of the Interior (*Ministerstvo Vnitra*) (2016), [Zpráva o extremismu na území České republiky v roce 2015](#).

Figure 6: Recorded criminal offences motivated by antisemitism in the Czech Republic, 2005–2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005–2015.

Source: Ministry of the Interior

Unofficial data

The Federation of the Jewish Communities in the Czech Republic (*Federace židovských obcí v ČR*) reports annually on antisemitic incidents in the Czech Republic.⁴⁰ This includes incidents reported to it by members of the public, as well as incidents that the Federation of the Jewish Communities in the Czech Republic identifies through its own data collection. The report shows that 231 antisemitic incidents were recorded in 2015. As Table 14 shows, the number of incidents recorded in 2015 is similar to the number recorded in 2014.

⁴⁰ Czech Republic, Federation of the Jewish Communities in the Czech Republic (*Federace židovských obcí v ČR*) (2016), [Výroční zpráva o projevech antisemitismu v České republice za rok 2015](#).


Table 14: Numbers and types of antisemitic incidents recorded in the Czech Republic, 2005-2015

Year	Attacks: physical	Attacks: property	Threats	Harassment	Media/web	Total
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
2014	1	5	9	29	209	253
2015	0	4	3	31	193	231

Sources: 2004-2010: Forum Against Antisemitism; 2011-2014: Jewish Community of Prague; 2015: Federation of the Jewish communities in the Czech Republic

Three consecutive years of an increasing number of incidents suggests an upward trend, even though the number of recorded incidents had been stable or even decreasing, as the data reported for 2005-2011 show (Figure 7).

Figure 7: Recorded antisemitic incidents in the Czech Republic, 2005-2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005-2015.

Sources: 2005-2010: Forum Against Antisemitism; 2011-2014: Jewish Community of Prague, 2015: Federation of the Jewish communities in the Czech Republic

Denmark

Official data

The Danish Security and Intelligence Service (*Politiets Efterretningstjeneste*, PET) reported 10 cases of extremist crimes targeting Jews in 2013, compared with 15 in 2012 (Table 15).⁴¹

Table 15: Extremist crimes targeting Jews recorded by PET, 2005–2015

Year	Recorded incidents
2011	5
2012	15
2013	10
2014	Not available
2015	Not available

Source: PET

The Ministry of Justice communicated data to FRA on cases related to Section 266b of the Criminal Code on racially discriminating statements submitted to the Director of Public Prosecutions in 2015. The Director of Public Prosecutions decided to endorse the recommendation of the Regional Public Prosecutor to prosecute in five cases related to antisemitic statements. Three of these cases led to convictions. In 2014 and 2013, two cases were prosecuted.

Unofficial data

Unofficial data on antisemitism in Denmark are available from the Mosaic Religious Community (*Det Mosaiske Trossamfund*, MT). MT recorded 53 incidents in 2014, compared with 44 in 2013 (Table 16 and Figure 8).⁴²

⁴¹ Denmark, Danish Security and Intelligence Service (PET) (2015), [Kriminelle forhold i 2013 med mulig ekstremistisk baggrund](#).


⁴² Denmark, Mosaic Religious Community (MT) (2015), [Rapport om antisemitiske hændelser i Danmark 2014](#).

Table 16: Antisemitic incidents recorded by MT, 2005-2015

Year	Recorded incidents
2005	37
2006	40
2007	10
2008	4
2009	22
2010	Not available
2011	Not available
2012	40
2013	44
2014	53
2015	Not available

Source: MT

Figure 8: Antisemitic incidents recorded by MT, 2012-2014



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2012-2014.

Source: MT

Estonia

Official data

The Estonian government informed FRA that no antisemitic incidents or crimes were recorded in 2015.

Unofficial data

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

Finland

Official data

Every year, the Police College of Finland (*Poliisiammattikorkeakoulu*) publishes a report on suspected hate crimes reported to the police.⁴³ The data for this publication are based on keyword searches of police reports to enable the identification of hate crimes. Since 2008, the report has covered religiously motivated hate crimes, including antisemitic crimes (Table 17). Seven antisemitic incidents were reported in 2014, out of which four cases concerned verbal threats/harassments, one case was related to property crimes, one case involved an assault and one involved verbal provocation.

Table 17: Antisemitic crimes reported to the police, 2008–2015

Year	Antisemitic crimes reported to the police
2008	1
2009	10
2010	4
2011	6
2012	8
2013	11
2014	7
2015	Not available

Source: *Police College of Finland*

Unofficial data

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

⁴³ Finland, Police College of Finland (*Poliisiammattikorkeakoulu*) (2015), [Poliisin tietoon tullut viharikollisuus Suomessa 2014](#).

France

Official data

The French National Consultative Commission on Human Rights (*Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme*, CNCDH) compiles a detailed report on the fight against racism, antisemitism and xenophobia on an annual basis.⁴⁴

This report covers antisemitic actions and threats (Table 18). Antisemitic actions are defined as homicides and attempted homicides, terror attacks and attempted terror attacks, arson and attempted arson, defacing and vandalising, and physical violence and assault. Antisemitic threats cover speech acts, threatening gestures and insults, graffiti (inscriptions), pamphlets and emails.

After the highest ever number of antisemitic actions and threats was recorded in France in 2014 (851), the number slightly decreased in 2015 (808).⁴⁵ According to the report, the absolute number of reported acts remains high, with the threshold of 800 acts having been exceeded three times since 2005: in 2009, 2014 and 2015.

Table 18: Antisemitic actions and threats recorded in France, 2005–2015

	Antisemitic actions and threats
2005	508
2006	571
2007	402
2008	459
2009	815
2010	466
2011	389
2012	614
2013	423
2014	851
2015	808


Source: CNCDH annual reports

From the data on the number of antisemitic incidents, it is apparent that the numbers of incidents recorded in 2009 and 2014 are noteworthy departures from the long-term trend. However, the number of reported incidents decreased only slightly in 2015 (Figure 9).

⁴⁴ France, National Consultative Commission on Human Rights (*Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme*) (CNCDH) (2016), [Racism reports](#).

⁴⁵ France, CNCDH (2016), [La Lutte contre le Racisme, l'Antisemitism et la xénophobie: les Essentiels](#), p. 8.

Figure 9: Antisemitic actions and threats recorded in France, 2005-2015




Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005-2015.

Source: CNCDH

Separate trend analyses for actions and threats over the 2010-2015 period show that the number of threats reported (601 in 2015) is consistently higher than the number of actions reported (207 in 2015), and that the trend line for antisemitic threats shows a steeper rise over the six-year period than the trend line for antisemitic actions. The number of antisemitic actions decreased slightly in 2015 compared with 2014, and the corresponding six-year trend line indicates that the increase in recorded antisemitic actions is more moderate than the increase in threats (Figure 10).

Figure 10: Antisemitic actions and threats recorded in France, 2010-2015



Note: The dotted linear regression lines indicate the trends based on data for 2010-2015.

Source: CNCDH

In 2015, 207 violent antisemitic actions were recorded in France, compared with 241 in 2014. Of the 207 violent actions recorded, 31 were homicides or attempts,

66 involved physical violence against persons and 109 involved acts of vandalism or defacing (Table 19).


Table 19: Types of antisemitic actions recorded in France, 2010-2015

Year	Homicides or attempts	Physical violence	Terror attacks or attempts	Arson or attempts	Defacing and vandalising	Total
2010	1	56	–	8	66	131
2011	0	57	0	7	65	129
2012	6	96	2	2	71	177
2013	1	49	0	3	52	105
2014	0	108	2	5	126	241
2015	31	66	1	0	109	207

Source: CNCDH

Two types of violent antisemitic actions recorded in higher numbers in 2015 than in 2010 – physical violence, and defacing and vandalising – show similar trends over the 2010-2015 period (Figure 11): in both cases, the trend lines increase and the numbers recorded in 2014 are the highest in the series. Defacing and vandalising incidents were consistently reported in higher numbers than physical violence incidents, apart from in 2012.

Figure 11: Types of violent antisemitic actions recorded in France, 2010-2015



Note: The dotted linear regression lines indicate the trends based on data for 2010-2015.

Source: CNCDH


The remaining 601 incidents concern antisemitic threats; this number is comparable to the 610 incidents reported in 2014. Of the 601 antisemitic threats reported in 2015, 250 were in the form of writings and inscriptions (graffiti), 259 were in the form of threatening words, gestures and insults, while 92 threats were delivered in the mail or through leaflets (Table 20).

Table 20: Types of antisemitic threats recorded in France, 2010–2015

Year	Threatening words and gestures, insults	Flyers and hate mail	Graffiti	Total
2010	110	57	168	335
2011	114	46	100	260
2012	219	46	172	437
2013	152	38	128	318
2014	261	60	289	610
2015	259	92	250	601

Source: CNCDH

If antisemitic threats are considered by category, ‘threatening words and gestures, insults’ and ‘graffiti’ show similar trends over the 2010–2015 period (Figure 12): in both cases, the corresponding trend lines show an increase and the numbers recorded in 2014 are the highest in the series.

Figure 12: Types of antisemitic threats recorded in France, 2010–2015


Note: The dotted linear regression lines indicate the trends based on data for 2010–2015.

Source: CNCDH

Unofficial data

The Service for the Protection of the Jewish Community (*Service de Protection de la Communauté Juive, SPCJ*) records complaints of antisemitism, and since 2010 has cooperated with the Ministry of the Interior in an effort to gain a more accurate insight into the situation of 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.⁴⁶ In 2015, the number of recorded antisemitic incidents decreased slightly compared with 2014. Out of 2,034 recorded racist acts, 40 % targeted Jews (808), compared with 851 recorded antisemitic incidents in 2014. If antisemitic acts are considered according to geographical areas in France, the areas that are the most affected are

⁴⁶ For more information on the SPCJ, see www.antisemitisme.fr.

Paris (57 antisemitic acts), Seine-Saint-Denis (21), Alpes Maritimes (13) and Bouches-du-Rhône (12).⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Service for the Protection of the Jewish Community (*Service de Protection de la Communauté Juive*) (2016), [Report on Antisemitism in France](#).

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*).

Data on the number of antisemitic crimes (Table 21) and on the number of antisemitic acts of violence (Table 22) are collected under separate subgroups of the main topic 'hate crime'. The data are also subdivided into right-wing crime, left-wing crime, crime based on foreign ideology and others, in order to get a multi-dimensional view of the motivation and background of the perpetrator.

After a notable increase in the number of antisemitic crimes recorded in 2014, there has been a slight decrease in the recorded data in 2015.

Table 21: Number of politically motivated crimes with an antisemitic motive by category of perpetrator recorded in Germany, 2005-2015

Year	Right wing	Left wing	Foreign ideology	Other	Total
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
2014	1,342	7	176	71	1,596
2015	1,246	5	78	37	1,366

Source: KPMD PMK


Table 22: Number of politically motivated acts of violence with an antisemitic motive by category of perpetrator recorded in Germany, 2005–2015

Year	Right wing	Left wing	Foreign ideology	Other	Total
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
2014	32	1	12	0	45
2015	30	1	4	1	36

Source: KMPD PMK

The data on politically motivated antisemitic crimes for 2014 interrupt a four-year stretch marked by declining numbers of such crimes, and the number of antisemitic crimes recorded in 2014 is more in line with official records for the 2005–2009 period. The number recorded in 2015 is lower than that recorded in 2014. The overall trend in recorded crimes appears to be declining (Figure 13).

Figure 13: Politically motivated crimes with an antisemitic motive recorded in Germany, 2005–2015




Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005–2015.

Source: KMPD PMK

As for antisemitic acts of violence (Figure 14), the trend also appears to be declining. Although reported figures are still higher than the 29 recorded acts of violence in 2011, the data for 2014 and 2015 interrupt two consecutive years (2011–2013) marked by increasing numbers of violent acts.

Figure 14: Politically motivated acts of violence with an antisemitic motive recorded in Germany, 2005-2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005-2015.

Source: KMPD PMK

Unofficial data

The Amadeu Antonio Foundation in Germany has been collecting data on antisemitic incidents from the German press and from projects and initiatives related to antisemitism since 2002. These data are presented as a chronology of events, which is updated on a continual basis.⁴⁸ The foundation notes that this chronology is not exhaustive and gives people the possibility to report and reference other antisemitic incidents of which they may be aware.

As Table 23 and Figure 15 show, there is a high degree of fluctuation in the number of antisemitic incidents recorded by the Amadeu Antonio Foundation between 2005 and 2015, with nearly three times more incidents (173) recorded in 2014 than in 2013 (65 incidents). In 2015, there was a decrease in the number of recorded antisemitic incidents (102) compared with 2014.


⁴⁸ Antonio Amadeu Foundation, [Chronik antisemitischer Vorfälle](#).

Table 23: Recorded antisemitic incidents in Germany, Antonio Amadeu Foundation, 2005–2015

Year	Recorded antisemitic incidents
2005	60
2006	113
2007	80
2008	83
2009	56
2010	71
2011	42
2012	33
2013	65
2014	173
2015	102

Source: Amadeu Antonio Foundation

Figure 15: Recorded antisemitic incidents in Germany, Antonio Amadeu Foundation, 2005–2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005–2015.

Source: Amadeu Antonio Foundation

Greece

Official data

The Directorate of State Security informed FRA that the Hellenic Police recorded, and referred to the Ministry of Justice, four incidents motivated by antisemitism in 2014. The cases concern antisemitism online, putting up an antisemitic sign at a workplace, daubing antisemitic slogans at a Holocaust remembrance monument and the desecration of a Jewish cemetery. Two of these cases were prosecuted (Table 24), one case has been closed as the perpetrator remains unknown and one case has been sent back to the public prosecutor for further processing after a supplementary police investigation.

In 2015, two antisemitic incidents were recorded by the Hellenic Police. The first referred to damage and the writing of an antisemitic slogan on the wall of a Jewish cemetery, and the second involved damage and the writing of slogans on a Holocaust monument. Both cases were forwarded to the prosecuting authorities, but no prosecution was initiated in 2015.

Table 24: Number of prosecuted cases pertaining to antisemitism in Greece, 2010-2015

Year	Prosecuted cases
2010	5
2011	3
2012	1
2013	0
2014	2
2015	0

Source: District Attorneys' Offices to the Ministry of Justice, Transparency and Human Rights

Unofficial data

In 2015, the Racist Violence Recording Network, consisting of 36 civil society organisations and created by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the National Commission for Human Rights to monitor and record hate crime in Greece, recorded four antisemitic incidents, all of which involved the desecration of Jewish property and symbols.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ Racist Violence Recording Network (2016), [Annual report 2015](#).

Hungary

Official data

No official data on antisemitism are recorded in Hungary.

Unofficial data


The Federation of Jewish Communities in Hungary (Mazsihisz) prepared its first annual report on antisemitism in Hungary in 2013. In the first report, six categories of antisemitic incidents were recorded (Table 25), totalling 95 incidents. In 2014 and 2015, five categories were recorded, and 2015 data are available for two categories. In 2015, there was a 50 % decrease in the number of recorded incidents compared with 2013 (Figure 16).

Table 25: Numbers and types of antisemitic incidents recorded in Hungary, 2013–2015

Year	Physical assaults	Threats	Vandalism	Political antisemitism	Hate speech	Other	Total
2013	6	9	25	21	21	13	95
2014	7	4	28	13	21	–	73
2015	2	4	Not available	Not available	Not available	–	47

Source: *The Federation of Jewish Communities in Hungary*

Figure 16: Number of antisemitic incidents recorded in Hungary, 2013–2015



Note: *The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2013–2015.*

Source: *The Federation of Jewish Communities in Hungary*

The Action and Protection Foundation (TEV) monitors and analyses antisemitism in Hungary. Since 2013, TEV, through the Brussels Institute, has collaborated with the Prime Minister’s Office to exchange and coordinate data on antisemitism nationwide.

In 2015, TEV recorded 52 antisemitic incidents (Table 26 and Figure 17). Among these were two assaults, five cases of vandalism, two cases of threats and 43 cases of hate speech.⁵⁰


Table 26: Number of recorded antisemitic incidents in Hungary, 2013–2015

Year	TEV
2013	61*
2014	37
2015	52

Note: * Between May 2013 and December 2013.

Source: TEV

Figure 17: Number of recorded antisemitic incidents in Hungary, 2013–2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2013–2015.

Source: TEV

⁵⁰ Action and Protection Foundation (TEV) (2016), [Annual report](#).

Ireland

Official data

The Central Statistics Office (CSO) in Ireland records the number of antisemitic incidents reported to the police. Two antisemitic incidents were reported in 2015 (Table 27).

Table 27: Antisemitic incidents reported to the police in Ireland, 2005–2015

Year	Reported incidents
2005	12
2006	2
2007	2
2008	9
2009	5
2010	13
2011	3
2012	5
2013	2
2014	4
2015	2

Source: CSO

Unofficial data

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

Italy

Official data


The divisions for general investigations and special operations (DIGOS) collect data on antisemitic criminal conduct. The Ministry of Interior communicated these data to FRA. The data show that the number of incidents of antisemitic criminal conduct recorded in Italy increased from 16 in 2010 to 58 in 2014 (Table 28 and Figure 18).

Table 28: Recorded incidents of antisemitic criminal conduct in Italy, 2010–2015

Year	Cited persons	Arrested persons	Total
2010	9	0	16
2011	1	1	23
2012	20	6	28
2013	43	0	32
2014	23	0	58
2015	Not available	Not available	Not available

Source: Directorate of the Preventive Police, DIGOS

Figure 18: Recorded incidents of antisemitic criminal conduct in Italy, 2011–2014



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2011–2014.

Source: Directorate of the Preventive Police, DIGOS

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.⁵¹ As Table 29 shows, the number of recorded antisemitic incidents decreased from 86 in 2014 to 61 in 2015.


⁵¹ Osservatorio antisemitismo, [Episodi di antisemitismo in Italia](#).

Table 29: Recorded antisemitic incidents in Italy, 2005–2015

Year	Recorded incidents
2005	49
2006	45
2007	45
2008	35
2009	47
2010	31
2011	58
2012	87
2013	49
2014	86
2015	61

Source: Observatory of Contemporary Anti-Jewish Prejudice

Figure 19: Recorded antisemitic incidents in Italy, 2005–2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005–2015.

Source: Observatory of Contemporary Anti-Jewish Prejudice

Latvia

Official data

The Latvian government informed FRA that in 2014, one case concerning antisemitism was investigated but not prosecuted, as no offence was found. In 2015, 10 incidents involving antisemitism were recorded; these incidents were perpetrated by five males. All 10 incidents were referred to the prosecution. The prosecution made a decision to prosecute in one of the cases and was successful in convicting the offender.

Unofficial data

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

Lithuania

Official data

No official data on antisemitism since 2011 were available for Lithuania at the time of compiling this report.

Unofficial data

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

Luxembourg

Official data

The Luxembourgish government informed FRA that no cases pertaining to antisemitism were dealt with by the criminal justice system and no antisemitic incidents were recorded by the police in 2015.

Unofficial data

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

Malta

Official data

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

Unofficial data

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

The Netherlands

Official data

The main source of official data on antisemitic incidents in the Netherlands is the annual report on the situation of criminal discrimination (*Criminaliteitsbeeld discriminatie – Poldis*), outsourced to the Verwey-Jonker Institute by the Dutch National Expertise Centre on Diversity of the police (*Landelijk Expertisecentrum Diversiteit van de politie*, LECD-Police). Another source of official data is the annual report on incidents of discrimination reported to anti-discrimination bureaus (*Antidiscriminatiebureaus* and *antidiscriminatievoorzieningen*), published by the National Association against Discrimination (*Landelijke Vereniging tegen Discriminatie*).

Table 30 summarises the data on antisemitism published in *Poldis* between 2008 and 2014.⁵² The number of antisemitic incidents recorded in the Netherlands in 2012 cannot be compared with that of previous years because of a change in the police reporting template: “On the old form, police officers could indicate if an incident is related to antisemitism. On the new form, police officers can tick the subcategory ‘Jewish’ under the main categories of ‘race’ and ‘religion’”.⁵³ According to *Poldis*, this change has led to fewer antisemitic incidents being recorded under the generic categories of ‘race’, ‘religion’ and ‘belief’, with a commensurate increase in the number of incidents being reported under the subcategory ‘Jewish’.

Table 30: Number of reported criminal discriminatory antisemitic incidents in the Netherlands, 2008-2014

Year	Antisemitic incidents	As a percentage of all criminal discriminatory incidents	Intentionally antisemitic incidents
2008	141	6.3	Not available
2009	209	9.4	Not available
2010	286	11.4	Not available
2011	294	13	30
2012	859*	26*	38*
2013	717	21	34
2014	358	6	76

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


Source: LECD-Police and Verwey-Jonker Institute

⁵² See Rijksoverheid (2011), [Poldis 2010: Criminaliteitsbeeld discriminatie](#); Rijksoverheid (2012), [Poldis rapportage 2011](#); Tierholf, B., Hermens, N., Drost, L. and van der Vos, L. (2013), [Poldis rapportage 2012 – Met themarapportage antisemitisme](#); Tierholf, B., Hermens, N., Drost, L. and Scheffelaar, A. (2014), [Poldis rapportage 2013 – Met themarapportage moslimdiscriminatie](#); Tierholf, B., Hermens, N. and Drost, L. (2015), [Discriminatiecijfers Politie 2014](#).

⁵³ Tierholf, B., Hermens, N., Drost, L. and van der Vos, L. (2013), [Poldis rapportage 2012 – Met themarapportage antisemitisme](#), p. 12.

In 2014, the police recorded 358 incidents with antisemitic connotations, whereas 76 of these were considered to be intentionally antisemitic – that is, specifically targeting Jews or Jewish property, such as a swastika painted on a synagogue, as opposed to a swastika carved on a bench in a public. The data show that 717 antisemitic incidents were recorded in 2013, and 34 of these were categorised as intentionally antisemitic. Although the overall trend indicates that the number of antisemitic incidents has declined over the past couple of years (Figure 20), the number of intentional incidents has risen (Figure 21).


Figure 20: Incidents of antisemitic criminal discrimination in the Netherlands, 2012-2014



Note: The dotted linear regression lines indicate the trends based on data for 2008-2011 and 2012-2014. The dotted vertical line indicates a change in the recording methodology and the gap in the series indicates that those changes affect the comparability of the data.

Source: The police’s National Expertise Centre on Diversity – Criminaliteitsbeeld discriminatie

Figure 21: Intentionally antisemitic incidents in the Netherlands, 2012-2014



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2012-2014.

Source: The police’s National Expertise Centre on Diversity – Criminaliteitsbeeld discriminatie

As Table 31 shows, there has been much fluctuation in the number of incidents of antisemitic discrimination reported to anti-discrimination bureaus in the Netherlands over the 2005–2015 period.⁵⁴

Table 31: Number of incidents of antisemitic discrimination reported to anti-discrimination bureaus in the Netherlands, 2005–2015

Year	Number of incidents of antisemitic discrimination
2005	94
2006	132
2007	72
2008	123
2009	129
2010	124
2011	134
2012	91*
2013	66*
2014	147
2015	104

Note: * Not comparable with the previous year, as not all anti-discrimination bureaus provided data on reported incidents of antisemitism to the national organisation of anti-discrimination bureaus (Landelijke Brancheorganisatie van Antidiscriminatiebureaus), which is responsible for compiling these data.

Source: Art1.nl

Unofficial data

Two civil society organisations in the Netherlands collect data on antisemitic incidents (see Table 32), and the Anne Frank Foundation also replicates data from the police in its periodic reporting on racist, antisemitic and extremist violence in the Netherlands.⁵⁵

The Information and Documentation Centre Israel (*Centrum Informatie en Documentatie Israël*, CIDI) publishes data every year on the number of antisemitic incidents reported through the hotlines it operates throughout the Netherlands.⁵⁶ The number of reported incidents in 2015 decreased by 26 % compared with 2014: from 171 incidents in 2014 to 126 incidents in 2015. Among these, there were 18 incidents of vandalism, compared with 20 in 2014, and five incidents of physical violence in 2015, compared with six in 2014. Sixteen incidents took place in schools, the highest number since 2005.

⁵⁴ Art1. (2016), [Kerncijfers 2015: Landelijk overzicht van klachten en meldingen over discriminatie](#).

⁵⁵ Anne Frank Foundation (2015), [Rapport 'Racisme, antisemitisme en extreemrechts geweld in Nederland' verschenen](#).

⁵⁶ Information and Documentation Centre Israel (*Centrum Informatie en Documentatie Israël*, CIDI) (2016), [Antisemitismerrapporten](#).

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 of discrimination relating to internet content.⁵⁷

The data available at the time of writing this report show that the number of complaints received increased from 250 in 2013 to 328 in 2014. Of the complaints received in 2014, 188 were deemed by MDI to be punishable by law, whereas 175 such cases were identified in 2013. In 2014, 55 complaints were related to Holocaust denial, compared with 77 in 2013.

Table 32: Data on antisemitism collected by civil society organisations in the Netherlands, 2005–2015


Year	Incidents reported to CIDI	Internet-related complaints to MDI
2005	159	302
2006	261	463
2007	81	371
2008	108	296
2009	167	399
2010	124	414
2011	112	252
2012	96	285
2013	100	250
2014	171	328
2015	126	142

Sources: CIDI; MDI

The number of antisemitic incidents reported to CIDI in 2014 is higher than the number reported in eight of the nine previous years. In the period analysed, a higher number of incidents was reported only in 2006. The linear trend for the 2005–2015 period, however, still suggests a downwards trend overall (Figure 22).

⁵⁷ Dutch Complaints Bureau for Discrimination on the Internet (*Meldpunt Discriminatie Internet*, MDI) (2016), [Annual reports](#).

Figure 22: Data on antisemitism collected by CIDI in the Netherlands, 2005-2015




Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005-2015.

Source: CIDI

Although the number of internet-related complaints collected by MDI (Figure 23) are highly variable from year to year, the overall trend since 2006 is declining and the peak recorded in 2004 is still unmatched.

Figure 23: Internet-related complaints about antisemitism collected by MDI in the Netherlands, 2005-2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005-2015.

Source: MDI

Poland

Official data

The Human Rights Protection Team (*Zespół do Spraw Ochrony Praw Człowieka*) within the Ministry of the Interior and Administration collects data on racist incidents brought to its attention, including antisemitic incidents, and takes preventative action. The sources of information are as follows: notifications from individuals, NGOs and public institutions; press materials; elaborations prepared by NGOs; and information sent by police units. The Human Rights Protection Team cooperates with human rights organisations and organisations that represent minority communities. These organisations communicate any information they receive about incidents from victims, witnesses or other sources to the Human Rights Protection Team.

The Human Rights Protection Team recorded 25 incidents related to antisemitism in 2013, 39 in 2014 and 22 in 2015 (Table 33). Of these 22 cases in 2015, 17 involved hate speech and four involved damage to memorials.


Table 33: Number of antisemitic incidents in Poland, 2010–2015

Year	Number of antisemitic incidents
2010	30
2011	25
2012	21
2013	25
2014	39
2015	22

Source: Ministry of the Interior and Administration

After a peak in 2014, the number of recorded antisemitic incidents dropped in 2015 (Figure 24).

Figure 24: Number of antisemitic incidents in Poland, 2010–2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2010–2015.

Source: Ministry of Interior and Administration

In addition to the data collected by the Human Rights Protection Team, Polish police conducted 157 proceedings related to antisemitism in 2015. Among these, 153 involved various forms of hate speech, graffiti and inscriptions, including 100 committed via the internet, and one proceeding involved insults and unlawful threats through direct contact against a person of Jewish origin.

Unofficial data

The Foundation for the Preservation of Jewish Heritage in Poland (FODZ) provides information yearly on the antisemitic incidents it reports to prosecution services, the police or other authorities (Table 34).⁵⁸

Table 34: Antisemitic incidents reported by FODZ to prosecution services, police or other authorities, 2005-2015

Year	Incidents reported to the authorities
2005	3
2006	13
2007	14
2008	7
2009	13
2010	11
2011	7
2012	5
2013	10
2014	5
2015	3

Source: FODZ

⁵⁸ Foundation for the Preservation of Jewish Heritage in Poland (FODZ) (2016), [Monitoring of Antisemitism in Poland](#).

Portugal

Official data

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

Unofficial data

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

Romania

Official data

Antisemitic crimes are not recorded separately in the centralised police statistics in Romania. Nevertheless, the Romanian Ministry of Internal Affairs informed FRA that in 2014 two cases of antisemitic incidents were recorded by the police and referred to the prosecution. In 2015, one antisemitic incident was recorded by the police and was prosecuted.

The authorities communicated to FRA that a total of 22 antisemitic criminal cases were recorded in Romania between 2005 and 2015, as Table 35 shows.

Table 35: Number of criminal cases pertaining to antisemitism in Romania, 2005-2015

Year	Antisemitic criminal cases
2005	2
2006	2
2007	1
2008	0
2009	1
2010	1
2011	0
2012	3
2013	3
2014	5
2015	4

Source: Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice

The National Council for Combating Discrimination (NCCD) monitors, investigates and sanctions cases of discrimination based on antisemitism, and data on such cases are available from 2007 onwards (Table 36). Most of the cases relate to the use of or the intent to use fascist symbols.

Table 36: Number of discrimination cases based on antisemitic behaviour in Romania, 2007–2015

Year	Number of filed cases	Discrimination proved	Discrimination not proved	NCCD did not have competence	Closed cases	Ongoing cases
2007	4	2	0	0	2	0
2008	8	3	2	1	2	0
2009	4	0	3	0	1	0
2010	6	2	3	0	1	0
2011	5	3	1	0	1	0
2012	11	6	1	2	2	0
2013	5	1	1	0	3	0
2014	12	2	4	2	2	2
2015	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available

Source: NCCD

Unofficial data

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

Slovakia

Official data

The Ministry of Justice in Slovakia collects data on the number of persons sentenced for crimes motivated by antisemitism (Table 37). These data are based on information submitted by judges who indicate bias motivation when rendering their sentences.

Table 37: Number of persons sentenced for crimes motivated by antisemitism, 2005-2015

Year	Number of sentenced persons
2005	0
2006	0
2007	2
2008	5
2009	2
2010	3
2011	1
2012	4
2013	2
2014	1
2015	0

Source: Ministry of Justice

Unofficial data

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

Slovenia

Official data

FRA has been informed that the Slovenian police did not record any antisemitic incidents with elements of offence or crime in 2015.

Unofficial data

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

Spain

Official data

The Crime Statistics System (SEC) registers incidents from all police bodies. Three antisemitic incidents were recorded in the database in 2013, and 24 antisemitic incidents were recorded in 2014 (Table 38). Five male perpetrators and one female perpetrator were identified by the police, and 11 incidents were cleared. This increase in the number of recorded incidents is the result of an improved recording system, which is part of the Spanish comprehensive approach to combating hate crime.⁵⁹ In 2015, recorded antisemitic hate crimes decreased by 62 % (to nine cases) compared with 2014, representing 0.7 % of total recorded cases with bias motivation.

Table 38: Number of recorded antisemitic incidents recorded in the SEC, 2013-2015

Year	Recorded antisemitic incidents
2013	3
2014	24
2015	9

Source: Ministry of the Interior

Table 39: Type of recorded antisemitic incidents recorded in the Spanish Crime Statistics System, 2014-2015

Year	Physical injuries	Mild harassment	Threats	Vandalism	Robbery	Coercion	Property damages	Total
2014	5	1	6	2	1	2	7	24
2015	0	0	5	3	0	1	0	9

Source: Ministry of the Interior

In 2014, the Attorney General opened 15 cases pertaining to crimes motivated by antisemitism. Seven cases were dismissed, six criminal proceedings were opened by the court, and two cases were closed and the perpetrators convicted. Fourteen perpetrators were charged with crimes of incitement to violence, and justification of genocide and/or the Holocaust; one of them was charged with disseminating antisemitic material.

In 2015, the Attorney General opened eight cases related to crimes motivated by antisemitism. Most of them involved the use of antisemitism in social networks on the internet, and one case involved an open letter containing antisemitic expressions that was published in a newspaper.

⁵⁹ See Ministry of Interior (Ministerio del Interior) (2015), [Informe sobre incidentos relacionados con los delitos de odio en España](#).

Unofficial data

The Observatory on Antisemitism in Spain (*Observatorio de antisemitismo en España*) records antisemitic events that occur in Spain, and presents its findings in the form of a chronology.⁶⁰ This chronology covers a number of categories, including the internet, the media, attacks against property, attacks against persons, trivialisation of the Holocaust, delegitimising Israel and others (Table 40).

Table 40: Antisemitic events in Spain recorded by the Observatory of Antisemitism in Spain, 2009–2015

Year	Internet	Media	Attacks on property	Attacks on persons	Trivialisation of the Holocaust	Delegitimising Israel	Incidents	Instigation of antisemitism	Legal decisions pertaining to antisemitism
2009	0	10	4	5	0	0	0	0	0
2010	1	3	1	4	1	0	1	1	6
2011	2	7	2	2	3	5	1	2	0
2012	3	6	9	4	4	7	4	4	0
2013	2	0	3	0	4	0	2	3	3
2014	2	3	2	0	1	0	1	1	Not available
2015	0	3	3	0	0	0	1	3	Not available

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

Source: Observatorio de antisemitismo en España

⁶⁰ See the website of the [Observatorio de antisemitismo en España](#).

Sweden

Official data

The National Council for Crime Prevention (*Brottsförebyggande rådet*, Brå) publishes a report annually that includes statistics on police reports in which Brå has identified details of crimes motivated by ethnicity, religion or faith, sexual orientation or gender identity.⁶¹ Brå is an agency of the Ministry of Justice and acts as a centre for research and development within the judicial system.

Because of changes in the counting rules or in the definition of what constitutes a hate crime, the data presented in Table 41 are comparable only between the years 2005 and 2007, and for the years from 2008 onwards. Since 2008, the highest number of cases with an identified antisemitic motive was reported in 2014.⁶²

Table 41: Police reports with an identified antisemitic motive, 2005–2015

Year	Crimes reported to the police
2005	111
2006	134
2007	118
2008	159*
2009	250
2010	161
2011	194
2012	221
2013	193
2014	267
2015	not available

Note: * Not comparable with previous years because of changes in the counting rules.


Source: Brå

Repeated changes in the recording methodology limit the extent to which trend analysis is feasible. Nevertheless, the available data show that the 2005–2007 period is marked by a slightly increasing trend (Figure 25). After a change in the data recording process, there was a sharp increase in the number of crimes with an antisemitic motive reported to the police between 2008 and 2009, followed by a sharp decline between 2009 and 2010, before the number increased again and reached a peak in 2014.

It should be noted that, from 2012 onwards, the numbers were estimated based on a sample taken from all the cases recorded in the police database; this does not affect the comparability of the data.

⁶¹ Sweden, National Council for Crime Prevention (*Brottsförebyggande rådet*, Brå) (2016), [Annual Reports](#).

⁶² Sweden, Brå (2015), [Hatbrott 2014: Statistik över självrapporterad utsatthet för hatbrott och polisanmälningar med identifierade hatbrottsmotiv](#).

Figure 25: Police reports with an identified antisemitic motive in Sweden, 2005–2014

Note: The dotted linear regression lines indicate the trends based on data for 2005–2014. The dotted vertical lines indicate changes in the recording methodology, and gaps in the series indicate where those changes affect the comparability of the data.

Source: Brå

As Table 42 shows, most crimes with an antisemitic motive target individual persons.

Table 42: Police reports with an identified antisemitic motive by principal offence, 2008–2015

Year	Violent crime	Unlawful threat and non-sexual molestation	Defamation	Criminal damage/g raffiti	Agitation against a population group	Other crimes	Total
2008	17	63	17	21	37	4	159
2009	20	90	20	36	75	9	250
2010	15	63	20	22	34	7	161
2011	14	77	14	31	54	4	194
2012	14	87	10	27	79	4	221
2013	4	61	20	12	93	2	193*
2014	12	80	26	54	92	2	267**
2015	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Note: n.a. = not available.

* The sum of types of crimes with antisemitic motives is 192. However, Brå reports a total of 193 crimes with antisemitic motives.

** The sum of types of crimes with antisemitic motives is 266. However, Brå reports a total of 267 crimes with antisemitic motives.

Source: Brå

Unofficial data

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

United Kingdom

Official data

Every year the National Police Chief’s Council (NPCC – formerly the Association of Chief Police Officers) publishes official data on hate crimes, including antisemitic crimes, reported in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, collating data from regional police forces.⁶³

The data published by NPCC 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.⁶⁴

As Table 43 shows, the number of recorded hate crimes motivated by antisemitism has been receding 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”.⁶⁵ The data recorded in 2014/2015 show a two-fold increase compared with 2013/2014.

Table 43: Recorded hate crimes motivated by antisemitism in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, 2009–2015

	Recorded hate crimes
2009	703
2010	488
2011	440
2012	307
1 April 2012–31 March 2013	385*
1 April 2013–31 March 2014	318
1 April 2014–31 March 2015	629

Note: * Data not comparable with the previous year.

Source: NPCC


A change in the recording methodology in England, Wales and Northern Ireland limits the extent to which trend analysis is feasible. After a decrease between 2013 and 2014, the data for 2015 indicate a sharp increase in the number of antisemitic incidents (Figure 26).

⁶³ United Kingdom, National Police Chief’s Council (NPCC), [Hate crime data](#).

⁶⁴ United Kingdom, NPCC, [Definitions in collecting these data](#).

⁶⁵ True Vision, ACPO (2013), *Total of recorded hate crime from regional forces in England, Wales and Northern Ireland during the calendar year 2012*.

Figure 26: Recorded antisemitic crimes under Home Office counting rules in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, 2009–2015 (fiscal years)



Note: The dotted linear regression lines indicate the trends based on data for 2009–2015. The dotted vertical line indicates a change in the recording methodology, and the gap in the series indicates where those changes affect the comparability of the data.

Source: NPCC

In Scotland, the Scottish Government reports every year on the number of charges of religiously aggravated offences, covering each financial year (Table 44).⁶⁶ “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.”⁶⁷ The majority of recorded religiously aggravated offences target Roman Catholics and Protestants.

Table 44: Number of charges referring to derogatory conduct towards Judaism in Scotland, 2010–2015

Year	Number of charges	As a percentage of all religiously aggravated charges
2010–2011	16	2.3
2011–2012	14	1
2012–2013	27	4
2013–2014	9	2
2014–2015	25	4

Note: Fiscal year (1 April–31 March).

Source: Scottish Government

⁶⁶ Scottish Government (2015), [Religiously aggravated offending in Scotland 2014–15](#).

⁶⁷ Scottish Government (2013), [Religiously aggravated offending in Scotland 2012–13](#), p. 14.

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. "In 2015, CST signed a national data sharing agreement with the National Police Chiefs' Council [. . .]. As a result of this agreement CST now shares anonymised antisemitic incident data with several police forces around the UK."⁶⁸

The CST "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."⁶⁹ The data it collects are published annually in a report on antisemitic incidents.⁷⁰

As Table 45 shows, after reaching a peak in 2014 (1,179), there was a 22 % decrease in antisemitic incidents recorded by the CST in 2015 (924).⁷¹

Table 45: Antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom recorded by the CST, 2005-2015

Year	Recorded antisemitic incidents
2005	459
2006	598
2007	561
2008	546
2009	931
2010	646
2011	609
2012	650
2013	535
2014	1,179
2015	924

Source: CST

The peaks in 2009 and 2014 are exceptions to the otherwise relatively stable trend in the number of recorded incidents (Figure 27). Although the number of incidents decreased again in 2015, the number of incidents reported is still well above the numbers observed before 2014; therefore, an increasing trend can be observed.


⁶⁸ Community Security Trust (CST) (2016), [Antisemitic incidents report 2015](#), p. 8.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁷⁰ CST, [CST Publications](#).

⁷¹ CST (2016), [Antisemitic incidents report 2015](#).

Figure 27: Antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom recorded by the CST, 2005–2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005–2015.

Source: CST

The CST also publishes data on the category of recorded incidents, as Table 46 shows. The most common types of antisemitic incidents involve abusive behaviour, followed by threats, damage and desecration, assault and extreme violence.

In 2015, the most common antisemitic incidents were directed at random Jewish people in public (354), followed by visibly Jewish individuals in public (161), incidents targeting Jewish organisations, companies and events (76), and homes, including people and vehicles at their homes (75). The available data also show the number of incidents involving synagogues (50), high-profile public figures (33), students and academics (21), and cemeteries (2).

In addition, “[a] total of 85 antisemitic incidents took place at schools or involved Jewish schoolchildren or teaching staff, compared to 66 in 2014. Of the 85 incidents of this type in 2015, 38 took place at Jewish schools, 16 at non-faith schools and 31 affected Jewish schoolchildren on their journeys to and from school. 12 of the 85 school-related incidents were in the category of Assault; 12 involved Damage and Desecration of Jewish property; seven were in the category of Threats; and 54 were in the category of Abusive Behaviour.”⁷²

⁷² CST (2016), [Antisemitic incidents report 2015](#), p. 24.


Table 46: Types of antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom recorded by the CST, 2005-2015

	Extreme violence	Assault	Damage and desecration	Threats	Abusive behaviour	Literature
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	611	62
2010	0	115	83	32	391	25
2011	2	93	64	30	413	7
2012	2	67	53	39	477	12
2013	0	69	49	38	374	5
2014	1	80	81	91	896	30
2015	4	82	65	76	685	12

Source: CST

In four of the six categories in Table 46, there was a decrease in the number of incidents in 2015 compared with the previous year. If the various incident types are examined separately, it is apparent that although the number of incidents of threats, damage and desecration, abusive behaviour and literature fell in 2015 compared with 2014, extreme violence increased from one case in 2014 to four cases in 2015, and assault stayed more or less the same (from 80 incidents in 2014 to 82 incidents in 2015). The peak values were recorded in 2009 for both assaults, and damage and desecration incidents, and in 2014 for threats. Based on the recorded incidents in 2005-2015, the trend lines show a long-term decline in cases of assaults, an increase in threats, and an overall stable trend in damage and desecration incidents (Figure 28).

Figure 28: Antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom recorded by the CST, 2005-2015




Note: The dotted linear regression lines indicate the trends based on data for 2005-2015.

Source: CST

Abusive behaviour incidents account for the largest component of the total number of antisemitic incidents recorded by the CST; the trend line for this category, which has been plotted separately to highlight the different order of magnitude involved, is very similar to the aggregated trend line (Figure 29).

Figure 29: Antisemitic incidents – abusive behaviour in the United Kingdom recorded by the CST, 2005–2015



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2005–2015.

Source: CST

Physical descriptions were available for the perpetrators of 360 (39 %) of the 924 incidents reported by the CST in 2015: “192 offenders were described as ‘White – North European’ (53 %); 15 offenders were described as ‘White – South European’ (4 %); 46 offenders were described as ‘Black’ (13 %); 77 offenders were described as ‘South Asian’ (21 %); three offenders were described as ‘East or South East Asian’ (1 %); and 27 offenders were described as being ‘Arab or North African’ (8 %)”.⁷³

The gender of the perpetrator was identified for 513 incidents (56 %) of the 924 incidents recorded in 2015: 420 incidents were perpetrated by men (82 %), 77 by women (15 %) and 16 (3 %) by mixed groups of women and men.

The age of the perpetrators was identified in 326 cases (35 %): 224 (69 %) of these cases were perpetrated by adults, 101 (31 %) by minors, and the remaining one incident by a group of minors and adults. According to CST, 54 % of assault and extreme violence can be attributed to perpetrators who were minors.

The CST recorded 159 antisemitic incidents involving the use of internet-based social media in 2015 (17 % of the 924 incidents), compared with 234 in 2014. Of these 159 antisemitic incidents, 149 were in the category of ‘abusive behaviour’ and 10 were in the category of ‘threats’.

⁷³ CST (2016), [Antisemitic incidents report 2015](#).

Concluding remarks – persisting gaps in data collection

The phenomenon of antisemitism remains a concern that needs to be tackled through concerted efforts by governments and civil society at all levels. For example, as noted in the FRA report *Antisemitism – Summary overview of the situation in the EU 2001–2011*, the higher number of incidents recorded in 2009 compared with previous years corresponds to Israel’s Cast Lead military operation, which took place in the winter of 2008–2009. Furthermore, the reports consulted for this update show that, in 2014, the highest number of antisemitic incidents was recorded between July and September in several Member States, which corresponds to Israel’s Protective Edge military operation in Gaza.

To tackle antisemitism effectively, relevant stakeholders must be able to rely on robust data on antisemitic incidents to enable the more efficient targeting of interventions. This report shows, as indicated in Table 47, that there are large gaps in data collection on antisemitism in the EU, and that Member States collect different types of data. This prevents the meaningful comparison of officially collected data between Member States, and increases the relevance of, and need for, surveys on perceptions and experiences of antisemitism among self-identified Jews, such as those conducted by FRA.

Table 47: Official data on recorded antisemitic incidents in EU Member States, 2005–2015

Member State	Recorded data	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
AT	Antisemitic offences committed by right-wing extremists	8	8	15	23	12	27	16	27	37	58	41
BE	Cases of Holocaust denial and revisionism	–	1	4	9	11	2	2	7	8	5	7
CY	Antisemitic incidents	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
CZ	Criminal offences motivated by antisemitism	23	14	18	27	48	28	18	9	15	45	47
DE	Politically motivated crimes with an antisemitic motive	1,748	1,809	1,657	1,559	1,690	1,268	1,239	1,374	1,275	1,596	1,366
DK	Extremist crimes targeting Jews	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	15	10	–	–
EL	Prosecutions pertaining to antisemitism	–	–	–	–	–	5	3	1	0	2	0
ES	Antisemitic incidents	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	24	9
FI	Antisemitic crimes	–	–	–	1	10	4	6	8	11	7	–
FR	Antisemitic actions and threats	508	571	402	459	815	466	389	614	423	851	808
HR	Criminal acts motivated by antisemitism	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	0	0	2
IE	Antisemitic incidents	12	2	2	9	5	13	3	5	2	4	2
IT	Antisemitic criminal conduct	–	–	–	–	–	16	23	28	32	58	–
LV	Antisemitic incidents	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	10
LU	Antisemitic incidents	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0	0

Member State	Recorded data	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
NL	Criminal discriminatory antisemitic incidents	-	-	-	141	209	286	294	859*	717	358	-
PL	Antisemitic incidents	-	-	-	-	-	30	25	21	25	39	22
RO	Criminal cases pertaining to antisemitism	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	3	3	5	4
SE	Crimes with an antisemitic motive	111	134	118	159*	250	161	194	221	193	267	-
SI	Antisemitic incidents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0
SK	Persons sentenced for crimes motivated by antisemitism	0	0	2	5	2	3	1	4	2	1	0
UK -EN, NI, WA **	Hate crimes motivated by antisemitism	-	-	-	-	703	488	440	307	385*	318	629
UK -SCO **	Charges referring to derogatory conduct towards Judaism	-	-	-	-	-	16	14	27	9	25	-

Notes: Comparisons are not possible between Member States.

'-' denotes that no data are available at Member State level, either because these data were not collected, communicated or published at the time of writing or because they do not cover the entire year.

* Data not comparable with the previous year.

** Fiscal year (1 April–31 March).

EN: England; NI: Northern Ireland; SCO: Scotland; WAL: Wales.

Source: FRA desk research (2016)

Another issue of concern is that, in many EU Member States, the number of officially recorded incidents is so low that it is difficult to assess the long-term trends. Low numbers of recorded incidents should not, however, be taken as an indication that antisemitism is not an issue of concern in these EU Member States.

Likewise, it cannot be assumed that antisemitism is necessarily more of a problem in Member States where the highest numbers of incidents are recorded than in those where relatively few incidents are recorded. In addition to the size of the Jewish population in any given Member State, a number of other factors affect how many incidents are recorded, including the willingness and ability of victims and witnesses to report such incidents, and to trust that the authorities can deal with such incidents accordingly.

Not only do victims and witnesses need to be encouraged to report antisemitic incidents, but the authorities need to have systems in place that enable the recording of such incidents. 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"⁷⁴.

Policy actors at both EU and Member State level need to share this commitment if antisemitism is to be countered effectively. If data on the characteristics of incidents,

⁷⁴ True Vision, ACPO (2012), [Total of recorded hate crime from police forces in England, Wales and Northern Ireland during the calendar year 2011](#).

victims and perpetrators are missing, policy responses can often only be very general. More comprehensive and accurate data on the victims of antisemitic incidents, but also on perpetrators – disaggregated by ethnic origin and religion – would allow interventions to be targeted at those who hold antisemitic views or have undertaken antisemitic acts. FRA's [Compendium of practices for combating hate crime](#) includes the practices of Member States on the recording of hate crimes.

When it comes to countering phenomena 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 such complexity. Therefore, sustained efforts are needed at the national and international levels to improve data collection on antisemitism and other forms of hatred and prejudice, in order to enable EU Member States to combat such phenomena more effectively. These efforts must concentrate on official and unofficial data collection alike, so as to provide a more complete and accurate picture of the situation of antisemitism in the EU.

Given the lack of data on the manifestations of antisemitism, EU Member States could also encourage repeated victimisation surveys that include questions on the experiences of Jewish people of hate crime and discrimination. Such surveys could provide insights into the different forms and impacts of antisemitic hate crimes, as well as the effectiveness of measures taken to combat antisemitism. For example, in response to the high number of reported antisemitic incidents in the summer of 2014, the Scottish Government provided funding to the Scottish Council of Jewish Communities to repeat a small-scale inquiry into the experiences of Jewish people in Scotland from 2012.⁷⁵ Three hundred respondents took part in the research, among which 32 % spontaneously spoke about a heightened level of anxiety, discomfort or vulnerability, and 17 % stated that they had started to keep their Jewish identity secret. However, victimisation surveys were still rarely available in the EU in 2015. In addition to victimisation studies, general population attitude surveys can also be a useful tool for mapping out the prevalence of antisemitic prejudices and stereotypes within a population.

For example, in Germany, since 2002, the University of Leipzig has carried out a representative study every two years on antisemitic feelings and attitudes among the general population.⁷⁶ The results of the survey show that antisemitic attitudes persist in the population. For example, 11 % of the respondents believe that the influence of Jewish people is too large and about 10 % of the respondents believe that "Jews have simply something special and peculiar about themselves and not really fit in our society". The findings show that the overall trend in antisemitic attitudes among the general population has decreased since 2002 (9.3 %), to 4.8 % in 2016.

⁷⁵ Scottish Council of Jewish Communities (2016), [What changed about being Jewish in Scotland](#).

⁷⁶ Decker, O., Kiess, J. and Brähler, E., Kompetenzzentrum für Rechtsextremismus- und Demokratieforschung (2016), [Die enthemmte Mitte: Autoritäre und rechtsextreme Einstellung in Deutschland](#), Die „Mitte-Studien“ der Universität Leipzig, Leipzig, University of Leipzig, p. 43.

Another example was found in Hungary, where TEV commissioned a representative survey on antisemitism in Hungarian society.⁷⁷ The findings suggest that the level of antisemitism increased during 2015, and, according to the authors, prejudices against Jews are closely related to xenophobia in general. For example, in 2003, 9 % of respondents felt antipathy towards Jews, as compared with 2015, when 26 % respondents felt this antipathy. The authors of the study concluded that the data show that about one in three Hungarians hold antisemitic views.

Antisemitic and intolerant attitudes can lead to behaviour that is punishable by law, but antisemitism needs to be countered beyond the criminal justice system. Two thirds of respondents to FRA's survey on Jewish people's experiences and perceptions of antisemitism consider antisemitism to be a problem in their country, and 76 % believe that antisemitism has increased in their country over the last five years. Education is essential to prevent intolerant attitudes. Through education that fosters socialisation, tolerance, universal values and encourages critical thinking, children and young people can bring change to their families and communities, and ultimately to the broader society.

⁷⁷ Hann, E. and Róna, D. (2016), [*Anti-Semitic prejudice in contemporary Hungarian society: Research report*](#), Action and Protection Foundation.



Publications Office

ISBN: 978-92-9491-365-4
doi: 10.2811/898840



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