

Trauma-Informed Victim Support and Reporting of Anti-Semitic Hate Crimes: Bridging Deradicalization, Justice, and Community Resilience

Nikolaos Petropoulos^{a1}, Eleni Fotou^b

^aCriminologist, VIA STOP; ^bPsychologist, VIA STOP

Abstract

Antisemitism remains a persistent and growing challenge across Europe and beyond, despite strengthened legal frameworks and national strategies aimed at combating hate and supporting Jewish communities. Recent evidence, including findings from the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), demonstrates that many Jewish individuals continue to experience harassment, discrimination, and hostility in both online and offline environments. These experiences often result in fear, concealment of identity, avoidance of Jewish spaces, and significant psychological distress. This paper examines antisemitic victimization through a trauma-informed lens, arguing that both overt hate crimes and cumulative forms of everyday prejudice can produce profound and lasting psychological harm. Drawing on trauma studies and victimization research, it explores common responses to antisemitic experiences, including avoidance, shame, anxiety, social withdrawal, and identification with the aggressor. The analysis further considers how historical trauma, competitive victimhood, conspiracy beliefs, institutional failures, and the politicization of antisemitism contribute to the persistence of anti-Jewish prejudice and hinder victim recovery and reporting. The article advocates for a trauma-informed, human rights-based approach to victim support that prioritizes safety, validation, empowerment, and access to justice. It identifies barriers to reporting, including fear of retaliation, lack of support, and low institutional trust, and highlights the importance of community engagement, trauma-informed policing, and accessible reporting mechanisms. Overall, the paper argues that victim-centered approaches can contribute not only to recovery and reporting outcomes but also to broader prevention efforts. Finally, practical recommendations are offered for policymakers, law enforcement agencies, judicial actors, educators, and civil society organizations.

Article History

Received April 15, 2026

Accepted May 10, 2026

Published Aug 28, 2026

Keywords: Antisemitism, Hate Crimes, Trauma-Informed Care, Victim Support, Deradicalization, Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism (P/CVE), Community Resilience, Community Policing

Introduction - Background and Context

FRA (2024) reports that antisemitism persists despite the solid legal framework in force and the commitment shown by the EU and its member states to combat antisemitism and support Jewish life, as reflected in their pledges, resolutions, declarations, conclusions, national strategies, action plans, and in the EU's own strategy on antisemitism. This represents a

¹ Corresponding Author Contact: Nikolaos Petropoulos, 117, Omonoias str., Kavala, Greece; Email: nickpetrop@yahoo.gr

global alarming trend, as the re-emergence of anti-Semitic language and actions in the United States and around the world is significantly rising (American University, 2024). There remains significant uncertainty about which historical, demographic, sociological, or ideological factors drive or mitigate antisemitism. Similarly, it is unclear whether specific responses by Jewish individuals or communities help to diminish antisemitism, unintentionally reinforce it, or have little effect at all (Safran, 2021).

According to Antoniou et al. (2020), Greece represents the European nation with the highest proportion of anti-Semites. Antisemitism in Greece manifests through hate speech, online threats, vandalism of cemeteries or synagogues, and interpersonal abuse. While official statistics remain scarce, incidents are underreported, and the actual number of victims is believed to be significantly higher than documented cases suggest. According to the Greek National Commission for Human Rights and reports by the Central Board of Jewish Communities in Greece, many victims choose not to report for fear of retaliation, disbelief by authorities, or social isolation (Greek National Commission for Human Rights, 2022; Central Board of Jewish Communities in Greece, 2023).

It is worth mentioning, however, that research on antisemitism in Europe often identifies countries with significant anti-Semitic incidents or attitudes, including France, Germany, Poland, Hungary, and the UK, alongside Greece. The extent varies by methodology and definition. For example, some studies focus on reported incidents, others on public opinion surveys about anti-Semitic attitudes.

1. Definition of Anti-Semitic Crimes

Anti-Semitism represents one of the most penetrating forms of prejudice (Antoniou et al, 2020). A prominent explanation of antisemitism associates it with national identities, specifically with national narratives centered on victimhood (Krzemiński, 1993, 2002; Bergmann, 2008). Members who strongly identify with such groups often reject the Holocaust and Jewish historical victimhood in order to safeguard the perceived uniqueness of their own group's suffering. In contemporary society, recognition as a historical victim has become highly valued (Bilewicz, 2013). Levine (2013) contends that a clear distinction should be

drawn between “old” antisemitism, rooted in hostility toward Jews as a people, and “new” antisemitism, which equates anti-Zionism or criticism of Israel with anti-Semitic sentiment.

Antisemitism may be conceptualized as hostility and animus directed toward Jews on the basis of their identity as Jews. Although its origins are frequently associated with religious disputes, over time it has evolved into a pervasive and deeply rooted prejudice that frames Jews not merely in theological terms but as a collective people subject to fear, suspicion, and hatred. This prejudice has historically manifested as a systematic and institutionalized phenomenon, sustained by political, social, and legal mechanisms of exclusion and marginalization (Chanes, 1995). Expressions of antisemitism span a continuum from overt acts of violence against individuals, communities, and institutions—culminating in genocidal projects such as the Holocaust—to more insidious forms such as linguistic stereotypes, derogatory humor, and other micro-aggressions embedded in ostensibly liberal societies. In contemporary Western contexts, anti-Semitic discourse often emerges in the guise of anti-Zionist rhetoric disseminated through digital platforms or is embedded within political commentary on the Middle East conflict (Chanes, 2000).

2. Modes of Anti-Semitic Acts

Lubin and Johnson (2012) discussed the modus operandi of anti-Semitic acts:

Private public Spheres: An anti-Semitic incident that goes unwitnessed often intensifies the victim’s sense of helplessness and isolation. The individual must then decide whether to disclose the experience, weighing concerns about their credibility against the perpetrator’s position of power (Chanes, 2000). When an attack occurs in a public setting, the absence of bystander support greatly increases the risk of deepened isolation. In fact, the bystander’s failure to stand with the victim can be as painful and damaging as, or at times even more than, the anti-Semitic act itself. Such silence conveys a latent complicity with the perpetrator’s behavior, thereby reinforcing the victim’s feelings of alienation and disconnection (Lubin and Johnson, 2007).

Emotional vs Physical: Humiliating or demeaning remarks directed at Jews—which are considered forms of emotional abuse—have effects that differ significantly from the

consequences of physical assaults or property damage. Negative portrayals of Jews generate tension between the victim's pride in their Jewish identity and the derogatory views imposed by the perpetrator (Lubin, 2015). For example, someone who feels proud of their charitable contributions may experience internal conflict when confronted with stereotypes of Jews as greedy or miserly. This incongruence creates a deep psychological strain, "eating away" at the individual from within. In contrast, physical attacks or acts of vandalism are overt, intrusive, and violent. Such assaults leave visible marks on the victim's body or belongings, resulting in feelings of being scarred, stained, ruined, or explicitly targeted.

Overtly vs. Covertly: An explicit anti-Semitic remark—such as being called "a dirty Jew"—is significantly different than being indirectly excluded from activities or groups due to one's Jewish faith, for instance, when a school event is scheduled on a Jewish holiday. At first glance, the overt insult may appear more severe (Lubin and Johnson, 2007). However, its directness often makes it easier to confront, challenge, or pursue through legal channels. By contrast, covert acts of exclusion, though seemingly less aggressive, are far harder to address. Perpetrators can deny any discriminatory intent and may even dismiss the victim as "overly sensitive." This leaves the victim not only harmed but also humiliated, and experiencing similar consequences to domestic violence victims who are being gaslit.

3. Antisemitism in Europe – The FRA report

The 2024 Fundamental Rights Agency Report on Antisemitism (FRA, 2024) reveals several alarming findings. A large majority (84%) of respondents' view antisemitism as a 'very big' or 'fairly big' issue in their country, while 80% believe it has grown worse over the past five years. Nearly all respondents (96%) reported encountering antisemitism in the year preceding the survey, with 64% of those affected stating that they experience it 'constantly'. In addition, 91% regard antisemitism on the internet and social media as a serious problem, yet only 18% consider their government's efforts to address antisemitism effective.

People are targeted on account of their religious beliefs, with the war in Gaza prompting rising antisemitism, alongside anti-Muslim hatred in the EU. The survey concluded prior to the Hamas attacks in October 2023 and Israel's subsequent military response in Gaza.

Nevertheless, the report incorporates additional data gathered from 12 Jewish umbrella organisations after these events, with some reporting a rise of 400% or more in anti-Semitic incidents since October 2023.

Offline, respondents reported facing antisemitism from people they know (56%), in public spaces (52%), through the media (51%), and at political events (49%) during the same period. The survey shows that 37% of Jews were harassed because of their identity in the year preceding the survey, with 86% of those experiencing repeated incidents. Four percent reported being physically attacked for being Jewish during the same period. Harassment and violence were most often reported in public places such as streets, parks, and shops.

There is still widespread apprehension about safety, as 53% of respondents worry about their own security and 60% about their families'. Moreover, 62% feel that the Arab–Israeli conflict influences their sense of safety, while 75% believe people in their country hold them collectively responsible for the actions of the Israeli government. As a result, 76% conceal their Jewish identity at least occasionally, and 34% avoid Jewish sites or events due to safety fears. Notably, 33% frequently hide their identity at work, and 41% do so at school or university.

Online antisemitism has also shaped behaviour and well-being. In the year preceding the survey, 90% of respondents encountered antisemitism online. Among those, 25% most recently experienced it on Facebook, followed by online news and media outlets (20%) and X (formerly Twitter) (19%). These figures reflect user activity rather than the prevalence of antisemitism on the platforms themselves. After encountering anti-Semitic content online, 24% of respondents avoided posting material that could identify them as Jewish, 23% reduced participation in online discussions, and 16% limited their use of certain platforms or services. Fifteen percent reported negative effects on their mental health. Meanwhile, 20% felt discriminated against for being Jewish in the past year, most often in education or work contexts.

Regrettably, reporting rates have remained low. While 49% experienced anti-Semitic violence, only 30% of them reported it to the police. Instead, some reported receiving support from Jewish community structures (11% from Jewish authority figures, 10% from Jewish communities). Regarding online antisemitism, 19% reported the content to platforms, and

overall, only 26% of respondents submitted any kind of report. Strikingly, just 1% of those who faced discrimination, online antisemitism, or harassment contacted an equality body or national human rights institution. The total reporting rate of anti-Semitic discrimination stood at 11%.

In addition, when comparing trends with the 2018 FRA survey on antisemitism, it can be deduced that while overall levels of antisemitism remain high, there are marginal signs of progress: in 2018, 88% of Jews felt antisemitism was rising in their country, compared with 81% in 2023. Importantly, the findings do not reflect the impact of the recent escalation of conflict in the Middle East.

4. Victims of antisemitism

Several researchers have surmised that the perception of Jews' ongoing suffering from past atrocities can result in an increase in anti-Semitism. This postulated secondary anti-Semitism is compatible with a number of psychological theories (Imhoff & Banse, 2009). Antisemitism is partly rooted in the legacy of the Holocaust, which serves as a central reference point for collective suffering. This status often generates competition over recognition as victims, leading to upward comparisons between Jewish victimhood and that of other marginalized groups. Such dynamics foster antagonistic perceptions of Jews and reinforce anti-Semitic prejudice (Antoniou et al., 2020).

4.1. Historical Trauma and Impact on Victims and Community

Paradoxically, victimhood has come to be viewed as a sought-after status, giving rise to competitive victimhood—where members of groups in conflict strive to demonstrate that their ingroup has endured greater suffering than the outgroup (Noor, Brown, & Prentice, 2008). Wohl and Branscombe (2008) demonstrated that awareness of historical victimization significantly influences how individuals perceive their group's responsibility for present-day wrongdoing. Specifically, participants who were reminded of their group's past suffering viewed their group's current actions—such as the U.S. involvement in the Iraq War or the role

of Jewish people in the Middle East conflict—more positively compared to those who were not exposed to reminders of historical victimhood (Bilewicz & Stefaniak, 2013)

Historical trauma events and their long-lasting repercussions can foster feelings of control deprivation within affected groups. Members of such groups may become more prone to adopting conspiracy beliefs—including anti-Semitic ones—as a way to explain their suffering and to re-establish a sense of control. These conspiracy narratives frequently depict Jews as holding disproportionate power and influence. Skrodzka et al. (2022) investigated how both the frequency of thoughts about historical trauma and the presence of trauma-related symptoms (behavioral, emotional, and depressive tendencies) are associated with three distinct forms of antisemitism: traditional antisemitism, secondary antisemitism, and belief in anti-Semitic conspiracy theories, and suggested that the impact of historical trauma on secondary antisemitism and conspiracy beliefs is partly mediated by behavioral manifestations of trauma.

Hate groups promote hostility or prejudice toward individuals or communities based on race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, or sexual orientation. These groups may organize public rallies to express their views and raise awareness of their causes. Such events are often volatile and carry a risk of escalating into violence, while simultaneously causing psychological harm and trauma to the communities targeted by these expressions of hate. Policing these rallies presents significant challenges, particularly when opposing groups with conflicting perspectives are present, requiring careful planning, risk assessment, and sensitive engagement to maintain public safety and protect vulnerable populations (Maguire, 2023).

The prevalence of interpersonal violence worldwide, together with the trauma it generates, indicates that a combined human rights–trauma-informed approach to violence prevention and intervention may be essential for advancing fundamental human rights. Such an approach can help safeguard individuals’ rights to protection, life, liberty, security, and health, promoting both immediate safety and long-term well-being on a global scale (Graves & Gay, 2020).

4.2. Trauma Informed Support

Within the field of trauma studies, ongoing debate concerns the spectrum of events that may be considered traumatic—ranging from overtly life-threatening experiences to subtler forms of adversity, such as neglect, persistent teasing or bullying, and experiences of social exclusion. Increasingly, clinical and empirical evidence indicates that even seemingly minor incidents, particularly when they occur repeatedly, over extended periods, or across multiple sources, can exert profound and enduring effects on victims' cognitions, behaviors, and sense of self (Herman, 1992; Van der Kolk, 1987). By analogy, the psychological consequences of anti-Semitic acts may vary widely, producing outcomes that extend from transient emotional distress to clinically significant psychopathology, contingent on the intensity, persistence, and qualitative features of the anti-Semitic experience (Lubin & Johnson, 2012). Lubin suggests that trauma overwhelms the person's capacity to respond to the event.

Traumatic experiences frequently elicit a state of freezing, in which the individual is rendered unable to respond, or provoke a state of shock and disbelief regarding the reality of the event. Trauma generates an overwhelming sense of helplessness and fear, and its impact may be manifested at physical, psychological, and emotional levels. Given the inherent power asymmetry between the perpetrator and the victim, the experience often engenders feelings of defeat and a loss of agency. The repercussions of trauma tend to reverberate across the life course, exerting long-term influence on functioning and well-being (Lubin & Johnson, 2007). In a comparable manner, encounters with antisemitism may evoke similar responses of helplessness, fear, disempowerment, or shock, leading to significant emotional injury. Survivors of anti-Semitic victimization frequently attest to the enduring and potent effects of such experiences, persisting years after the incidents themselves. These reactions are consistent with established patterns of traumatic response. Acknowledging these dynamics is crucial, as it facilitates a shift in responsibility away from the victim—who may otherwise internalize blame or perceive personal failure—and appropriately locates accountability with the perpetrator.

4.3. Frequent responses to trauma

Trauma elicits a range of predictable and broadly universal responses, which can similarly be anticipated when individuals are subjected to anti-Semitic victimization (Lubin and Johnson, 2007). In certain cases, these responses may consolidate into a clinical symptomatology consistent with recognized psychiatric disorders, such as post-traumatic stress disorder, depressive disorders, or various anxiety disorders. At the same time, particularly in relation to more covert or subtle manifestations of antisemitism, individuals may adopt coping strategies that involve minimization, denial, or the internalization of the stress engendered by these experiences.

Avoidance: Avoidance is a frequently observed coping strategy employed to mitigate the psychological impact of anti-Semitic victimization. Such avoidance may manifest through the withdrawal from contexts or activities associated with the anti-Semitic incident, including participation in religious services, observance of Jewish holidays, or engagement in social settings where Jewish identity could become visible. These avoidant behaviors are often rationalized with explanations ostensibly unrelated to fears of antisemitism. However, an unintended consequence of such strategies may be social withdrawal and isolation from supportive communal networks (Peterson, Prout, & Schwarz, 1991).

Shame and humiliation: Beyond avoidance and anxiety, individuals who are targeted often describe experiencing shame and humiliation, accompanied by feelings of inadequacy, self-blame, and guilt (McCann & Pearlman, 1990; Everly & Lating, 1995). Several factors contribute to these emotional responses. Being singled out and demeaned can generate a sense of shame. Because the initial reaction to such incidents is typically shock and disbelief, many victims believe they failed to respond appropriately and thus hold themselves responsible. The profound helplessness felt during an anti-Semitic incident may also foster distorted self-perceptions, such as “I am weak.” Moreover, exposure to negative or demeaning portrayals of Jews can cause individuals to internalize these harmful messages, shifting the distress of the anti-Semitic experience onto their own Jewish identity. This pattern is especially evident in children who encounter antisemitism at school or in other social and public contexts.

Sense of Inadequacy: Anti-Semitic language and stereotypes are inherently dehumanizing, objectifying, and demonizing, and can become internalized as feelings of

inadequacy. In the moment of encountering antisemitism, one's sense of self-worth and pride is often overshadowed by hateful remarks and negative portrayals (Whine, 2017). The inability to maintain this sense of self during the incident fosters a perception of personal inadequacy (McCann & Pearlman, 1990). Consequently, victims may become self-critical, questioning their reactions and mistakenly concluding that they are responsible for the event. These dynamic shifts blame away from the perpetrator and onto the victim. Broader society can also reinforce this harmful shift—when it silences injustices, blames the victim, or rationalizes the perpetrator's actions, it effectively becomes complicit in sustaining prejudice.

Anxiety: Experiencing antisemitism often provokes intense anxiety, which tends to resurface when avoidance strategies fail (McCann & Pearlman, 1990; Everly & Lating, 1995). It is understandable that an unprovoked and unjustified attack would heighten feelings of anxiety. Many individuals respond by denying or downplaying the impact of the anti-Semitic incident as a way to reduce the distress linked to remembering it. As trauma research shows, this anxiety is fueled by fear, avoidance, loss of control, and the anticipation of recurrence. These same processes maintain the fear that anti-Semitic incidents may happen again, which further strengthens the avoidance of confronting the original experience. This often leads to silence—such as not reporting the incident to authorities, withholding it from family and friends, minimizing its harmful effects, or even concealing one's Jewish identity.

Identifying with the Perpetrator: One of the most severe, yet not uncommon, responses to antisemitism is the victim's partial identification with the perpetrator, which may manifest in privately held beliefs that Jews themselves are, at least in part, responsible for the hostility directed toward them. Victims may distance themselves from Jewish culture and traditions, adopt highly critical views of Israel, or avoid identifying as Jewish in public or when meeting new people. Among Jews living outside Israel, this identification with the aggressor can appear as a divided loyalty: on the one hand, maintaining support for Jewish people, while on the other, attempting to demonstrate “objectivity” by condemning the State of Israel—a stance also promoted by certain anti-Semitic groups (Lubin, 2015).

5. Challenges in Victim Support

Fear of retribution

Usually, anti-Semitic incidents place the perpetrator in a position of power, and it is natural for the victim to fear retaliation (McCann & Pearlman, 1990). This fear often drives the avoidance that follows such events, which not only isolates the victim but also reinforces the perpetrator's dominance. What helps to protect the victim is openly acknowledging the incident and involving both authorities and community support (Lubin, 2015). These forms of backing reduce the likelihood of retaliation and weaken the perpetrator's control. While caution is always necessary, distinguishing between constructive preparation and paralyzing fear enhances safety for everyone.

Lack of support

Unfortunately, victims cannot always rely on immediate support, either due to a lack of specialized resources, unavailability of support at the time of the offense, or lack of knowledge of available resources. Still, through increased efforts in awareness and support policies and programs, this deficiency can be combatted. Anti-Semitic incidents are often witnessed by bystanders who either fear the perpetrator themselves or fail to recognize the behavior as antisemitism (Everly, 1995). Teaching people to identify such acts equips them with more options to respond effectively in the moment. Emphasizing the importance of allyship—whether during or after an incident—strengthens the support available to victims. When bystanders remain passive or institutions, such as schools, fail to act decisively, they unintentionally side with the perpetrator. In such cases, the institution itself becomes a proxy for antisemitism.

Subthreshold events - micro-aggressions

When anti-Semitic acts are extreme, they tend to provoke clear and decisive responses, as the harm is more visible (Lubin, 2015). More often, however, antisemitism is experienced as a series of subtle and cumulative incidents—innuendo, dismissive gestures, or “jokes.” These microaggressions build up over time until the victim eventually reacts with strong emotion, which may then be dismissed as oversensitivity. Victims themselves often question

whether their reaction is excessive, which creates conditions that excuse or minimize the anti-Semitic behavior. This dynamic fosters passivity among victims and society at large, which, in turn, emboldens perpetrators and paves the way for further harm (Levine, 2013).

Excusing perpetrators

Such lower-level incidents are also often rationalized or redirected by both victims and society (McCann & Pearlman, 1990). One common strategy is to explain the perpetrator's behavior through the cycle of violence argument, noting that many perpetrators were once victims themselves. While this information can be valuable for education and rehabilitation, it cannot be used to excuse harmful actions. Holding perpetrators accountable is essential for reparation and healing. If society excuses anti-Semitic behavior because of past victimization, it fails twice—both by neglecting the present victim and by reinforcing the cycle of violence. Breaking this cycle requires accountability combined with appropriate support for perpetrators in addressing their own histories of victimization. Victims themselves must also resist perpetuating this cycle by avoiding the role of perpetrator.

Politicization

Another way subthreshold anti-Semitic acts are disguised is by reframing them as “political opinions.” This is particularly visible in anti-Israel sentiment when it functions as a form of antisemitism (Levine, B, 2013). Of course, criticism of Israeli policy has a legitimate place within civil debate on Middle Eastern politics. However, when such criticism masks anti-Semitic or anti-Zionist attitudes, the mechanism of identification with the aggressor becomes evident. Because Jews have historically been victims, Israel's exercise of military or political power is sometimes mischaracterized as aggression, even when it is a response to violence against its citizens. Israel, as the comparatively stronger party, is thus portrayed as the perpetrator, while its defensive measures are labeled “overreactions.” This role reversal blurs the distinction between political debate and ethnic hatred, making it extremely difficult to disentangle the two—a strategy that often serves the anti-Semitic agenda effectively.

The table below summarizes the challenges and mitigation measures that pertain to victim support:

Table 1. Challenges and Mitigation Measures

Fear of retribution	Victims fear retaliation from perpetrators, which fuels avoidance and reinforces the power imbalance.	Encourage victims to acknowledge the event rather than stay silent. - Involve authorities early to reduce risks of retaliation. - Provide strong community backing and legal support. - Distinguish between healthy caution and paralyzing fear to enhance safety.
Lack of support	Bystanders may fear the perpetrator or fail to recognize antisemitism, while institutions sometimes fail to act decisively, leaving victims isolated.	Educate the public on recognizing anti-Semitic behaviors. - Train bystanders on allyship and intervention strategies. - Hold institutions accountable for responding decisively. - Promote awareness campaigns emphasizing that passivity enables perpetrators.

Subthreshold (microaggressive) events	Subtle, cumulative incidents (innuendo, jokes, gestures) build up, often dismissed as oversensitivity when victims react emotionally.	- Raise awareness of microaggressions and their cumulative harm. - Normalize victim reactions as valid responses to ongoing discrimination. - Encourage early reporting and discussion of small incidents. - Develop institutional policies addressing subtle forms of prejudice.
Excusing perpetrators (cycle of violence)	Anti-Semitic behavior is sometimes excused because perpetrators may themselves have been past victims. This perpetuates the cycle of violence.	- Acknowledge perpetrators' past trauma without excusing harmful actions. - Hold perpetrators accountable while offering rehabilitation programs. - Educate society about the dangers of excusing antisemitism. - Discourage victims from perpetuating harm by becoming perpetrators themselves.

Politicization of antisemitism	Anti-Semitic attitudes are disguised as political opinions, especially through anti-Israel rhetoric framed as legitimate criticism.	- Distinguish between valid political critique and anti-Semitic /anti-Zionist rhetoric. - Educate on the mechanism of identification with the aggressor. - Train educators, policymakers, and media to recognize when debate masks prejudice. - Promote respectful civic dialogue that avoids ethnic scapegoating.
---------------------------------------	--	---

6. Best Practices and Successful Models for Enhancing Crime Reporting

In most interpersonal crimes, the perpetrator's primary aim is to isolate the victim and enforce silence, as the victim's silence strengthens the perpetrator's power (Lubin & Johnson, 2007). Breaking that silence—through reporting, sharing, or speaking openly about the incident—undermines both the perpetrator's position and the impact of their actions. Engaging formal systems and authorities helps to neutralize the harm, while discussing the experience with friends and family provides crucial support that buffers against the toxic effects of antisemitism. Victims are therefore encouraged to resist avoidance, as avoidance intensifies the negative consequences of the event (Levine, B, 2013). Confronting the perpetrator's behavior—whether directly when safe or indirectly through reporting—restores the victim's sense of control and shifts power away from the aggressor. Witnesses to anti-Semitic incidents also carry a responsibility: by reporting and intervening, they transform themselves from passive bystanders into active allies in combating antisemitism (McCann & Pearlman, 1990).

The New York Police Department (NYPD) Hate Crime Task Force can be credited with specialized best practices for enhancing crime reporting in hate crime cases, due to the long-standing dedication of its personnel and several tangible structural and procedural factors that have enhanced its capacity to respond effectively to hate crimes. These include, among others:

- a) The establishment of a highly placed and well-funded specialized unit with full authority over investigations.
- b) Clearly defined investigative and response protocols for all officers are mandated within the Patrol Guide and enforced through the chain of command.
- c) Targeted in-service and academy training programs.
- d) Efficient intake and data collection procedures that integrate reports from other agencies, districts, and private investigation groups.
- e) Regular coordination and information-sharing with other agencies and community organizations.
- f) Media accessibility of commanding officers to support investigations and counter misinformation.
- g) Strong legislative frameworks enabling the imposition of significant penalties for bias-motivated crimes.
- h) The strategic use of detectives to pursue and apprehend perpetrators.
- i) Provision of victim services in multiple languages to meet the needs of diverse communities (Levin & Amster, 2007, pp. 319, 338).

6.1. Trauma-Informed Policing

Applying a trauma-informed perspective to the effects of antisemitism and other forms of prejudice helps clarify common reactions to bigotry, sheds light on the interactions among perpetrators, victims, bystanders, and allies, and offers guidance on effective responses to hatred (Everly, 1995). Trauma can be understood as a cancer of the psyche—aggressive, invasive, and at times fatal. In a similar way, prejudice such as antisemitism functions as a cancer within society: it penetrates and disrupts the social fabric, erodes vitality, and must be confronted through decisive and active measures (Lubin, 2012).

Trauma-informed policing is an emerging approach that integrates an understanding of trauma's impact into law enforcement practices. Recognizing that trauma affects victims, witnesses, and even officers themselves, this approach seeks to improve police interactions by prioritizing empathy, safety, and support. Further, the implementation of trauma-informed practices within policing, while paying particular attention to sensitive cases such as hate crimes (Birch, 2024), and by exploring key principles—including safety, trustworthiness, cultural competence, and empowerment—trauma-informed care can be incorporated into police work to enhance the well-being of all involved. Case studies, such as incidents of vandalism at a mosque and verbal harassment based on race, illustrate the practical application of these principles. Trauma-informed practices can strengthen trust between law enforcement and communities, reduce re-traumatization of victims, and improve the mental health outcomes of police officers.

6.2. Community Policing

Collaboration is a vital component of the police response to hate crimes. Two central elements of a successful partnership are police officers' professional expertise and their engagement with victims. Building long-term relationships between minority communities and the police fosters mutual trust and strengthens the police's commitment to addressing local hate crime issues. Such cooperation encourages ongoing dialogue, enhances community confidence, and ensures that valuable community intelligence reaches the police. Transparency and openness enable a deeper understanding of how hate crimes impact communities and clarify the legal limitations that sometimes restrict police actions and prosecutions (Mäkinen, 2020).

Moreover, collaboration promotes shared responsibility for both challenges and solutions, allowing all parties to take part in the achievements of hate crime initiatives and motivating continued joint efforts. (College of Policing 2004, 64–65) Consistent consultation between Jewish communities and law enforcement—particularly at the local level—ensures that policing strategies remain transparent and that communities are fully informed about ongoing plans and developments. This collaboration may also involve sharing relevant threat assessments with Jewish communities. Such consultations give communities the opportunity

to provide feedback and help shape more effective government responses to hate crimes. (Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights 2017, 24)

6.3. Social Support Guidelines

While social work literature has developed a strong foundation in anti-racist theory and practice, it has largely neglected the issue of antisemitism (Levine, B, 2013). Social workers can play an important role in addressing spiritual microaggressions directed at members of the Jewish community. In doing so, they may work to foster a culture that upholds religious freedom as a fundamental human right while also advocating for equitable and accurate portrayals of Jewish people and perspectives across diverse media platforms. Particular attention is needed for Orthodox Jewish communities, who are disproportionately targeted by anti-Semitic attitudes and behaviors (Hodge & Boddie, 2021).

7. Linking Trauma-Informed Victim Support to Deradicalization and P/CVE

7.1. Bridging Trauma-Informed Victim Support and Deradicalization

Comparative research on radicalization and resilience across diverse national contexts indicates that radicalization processes are embedded within broader socio-political environments and cannot be reduced to individual-level factors alone. Case studies show that the escalation of religiously motivated extremism is often intertwined with governance dynamics, identity-based tensions, and polarized public discourses. At the same time, these studies highlight the role of resilience-building initiatives—particularly those involving coordinated action between state institutions and civil society—in mitigating radicalization risks. Such approaches underscore the importance of context-sensitive, community-based strategies and suggest that prevention efforts are most effective when they integrate institutional responses with local support mechanisms. These findings reinforce the argument that victim-centered and trauma-informed approaches can be embedded within wider prevention ecosystems aimed at strengthening societal resilience against extremism (Sealy & Modood, 2020).

While deradicalization efforts have traditionally focused on perpetrators, growing evidence suggests that effective prevention ecosystems must also account for the experiences

of victims and affected communities. Trauma-informed victim support can play a critical, though often overlooked, role in preventing radicalization and facilitating disengagement processes. By embracing a comprehensive and inclusive approach, societies can address the underlying drivers of radicalization, foster stronger intergroup cohesion, and reinforce collective resilience against violent ideologies (Abror & Wahrudin, 2025).

First, community trust and legitimacy are foundational to P/CVE efforts. When victims of anti-Semitic hate crimes experience institutional neglect, dismissal, or secondary victimization, trust in authorities erodes. This distrust creates conditions in which extremist narratives—often framed around injustice, conspiracy, or institutional failure—can flourish. Conversely, trauma-informed responses that prioritize validation, safety, and accountability strengthen institutional legitimacy, thereby reducing the social conditions that allow extremist ideologies to gain traction. Religious intolerance refers to prejudicial attitudes and actions targeting individuals or groups because of their religious identity. It rarely exists in isolation, often intersecting with other forms of discrimination—such as racism, misogyny, and xenophobia—that arise from shared underlying social and psychological dynamics. (Antepli, A., Sager, R., & Kadayifci-Orellana, 2025). Protective influences operate at both the societal and community levels. Research emphasizes the importance of positive role models within local environments, particularly in schools and community settings. These may include teachers, youth workers, sports coaches, or religious leaders who engage regularly with individuals and foster supportive relationships. Their role becomes especially significant when an individual's home environment lacks stability or support (Palmgren, et al., 2019).

Second, acknowledgment of harm and victim visibility can contribute to prevention by countering denial, minimization, and justification of anti-Semitic narratives. Incorporating victim perspectives into educational and prevention initiatives may disrupt processes of moral disengagement among at-risk individuals. In this sense, victim narratives can function as a form of counter-narrative, humanizing the consequences of hate and challenging dehumanizing ideologies. Emerging research further indicates that contemporary extremist ideologies often intersect with broader forms of exclusionary and discriminatory belief systems, including anti-feminism and gender-based hostility. These narratives frequently reinforce one another, contributing to the normalization of hate and the construction of

perceived threats against social or cultural identity. Despite this, P/CVE frameworks have been criticized for insufficiently addressing the gendered dimensions of radicalization, particularly within far-right milieus. This gap is significant, as it highlights the need for more comprehensive approaches that account for intersecting forms of prejudice—including antisemitism, misogyny, and xenophobia—and their cumulative impact on both radicalization processes and victimization patterns. (Agius, et al., 2023)

Third, trauma-informed frameworks may inform rehabilitation and disengagement interventions. Research in deradicalization highlights the importance of addressing grievances, identity, and emotional drivers of extremist behavior. Understanding the impact of anti-Semitic harm can support the development of interventions that confront offenders with the real-world consequences of their actions, for example through restorative justice practices or structured victim–offender dialogue where appropriate and safe (Heath-Kelly & Shanaah, 2025).

Fourth, integrating victim support into P/CVE ecosystems enhances multi-agency collaboration. Effective prevention increasingly relies on cooperation between law enforcement, social services, mental health professionals, and community organizations. Embedding trauma-informed principles within these networks ensures that responses to hate crimes do not operate in isolation but contribute to broader prevention goals (Mutsaers et al., 2019).

Taken together, these mechanisms suggest that trauma-informed victim support is not only a response to harm but also a preventive tool that can strengthen resilience, reduce polarization, and indirectly support deradicalization efforts.

8. Policy and Advocacy Strategies

8.1. Recommendations for Improvement

As occurs with trauma recovery more broadly, the healing process for victims of antisemitism centers on fostering empowerment (Herman, 1992). Trauma robs individuals of their sense of agency, making the restoration of power essential to recovery. Empowerment

can take many forms, including reporting incidents, accessing education, engaging in advocacy, and receiving supportive interventions.

The 2024 Fundamental Rights Agency Report on Antisemitism recommended the following strategies to enhance reporting:

Monitoring and funding strategies: Thirteen EU countries still lack national antisemitism strategies or action plans. Governments should adopt these, appoint coordinators or envoys, collect systematic data, and conduct regular surveys. Adequate human, financial, and technical resources are essential for implementation.

Securing Jewish communities: States must meet the protection needs of Jewish schools, synagogues, and community centres, working in close partnership with Jewish communities. Sharing information and best practices between countries could further strengthen protection.

Addressing online antisemitism: Full use of the Digital Services Act (European Parliament & Council of the European Union, 2022) is needed to remove anti-Semitic content. Authorities should strengthen investigations and prosecutions of anti-Semitic hate crimes. Online platforms must monitor risks and improve notice-and-action mechanisms, while the European Commission and national regulators should oversee compliance.

Improving reporting: Authorities should raise awareness of rights, encourage reporting, and expand data collection. Facilitating third-party and anonymous reporting may also help increase reporting rates.

8.2. Role of Community and Civil Society

During an anti-Semitic incident, the imbalance of power is stark: the perpetrator dominates while the victim is left powerless. This imbalance can shift when the victim takes on the role of advocate. By helping others grasp what it means to be targeted, the victim reclaims agency and assumes the role of educator (Chanes, 1995). Advocacy, whether through raising awareness or assisting others in coping with antisemitism, actively counters the corrosive impact of hatred and bigotry. Sharing testimonies of anti-Semitic experiences provides a powerful antidote to such acts, while also contributing to a healthier, more

inclusive social environment. When members of society support advocacy initiatives and listen to victims' testimonies, they too become participants in dismantling prejudice.

Although anti-Semitic acts may occur privately or in public, the healing process must take place within a social context. Antisemitism affects not only the individual but the whole community, making collective responsibility essential (Lubin & Johnson, 2007; Figley, 1986). Offering support during an incident—by standing as an ally rather than remaining a passive bystander—constitutes an act of resistance against prejudice. Support after the incident is equally important, as it validates the victim's suffering and helps share the burden of the experience. It is also vital that victims allow allies to provide this support, since both sides benefit: the victim finds relief from pain, while the ally gains the opportunity to act ethically. When attempts to educate the perpetrator are unsuccessful, maintaining distance can safeguard one's well-being. Additional resources and guidance are available through organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League (2008), which offers educational programs and support. Ultimately, only through collective action can society mitigate the devastating effects of hatred and prejudice.

8.3. Training and Education for Support Providers

Knowledge serves as a powerful tool not only for dispelling ignorance but also for recognizing where responsibility lies—with the perpetrator. Holding perpetrators accountable is the first step toward reparation and a means of countering the destructive impact of injustice (Chanes, 1995). Gaining insight into the effects of antisemitism and the common reactions it provokes helps reveal its universal nature. Framing these consequences within the broader human condition normalizes such responses and thereby supports recovery from painful experiences. Educating perpetrators is especially crucial, as some anti-Semitic behaviors stem from misinformation or a lack of awareness. In this sense, both the victim and the perpetrator can benefit from the transformative power of knowledge. Education, as a process of deepened understanding, is thus essential for healing society from prejudice (Figley, 1986).

8.4 Operational Implications for P/CVE Practice

Radicalized individuals and groups can act as catalysts, shaping wider societal dynamics. Gradual socio-political shifts may further weaken social cohesion, increasing vulnerability to polarization. In response, the strengthening of societal resilience and the promotion of more constructive and responsible public discourse is instrumental (Herschinger, et al, 2025).

Also, integrating victim support services into local P/CVE coordination mechanisms could be achieved using a number of techniques, such as:

- Developing referral pathways between hate crime units and prevention practitioners
- Using anonymized victim narratives in prevention and educational programs
- Training P/CVE practitioners in trauma-informed engagement
- Exploring restorative justice models where appropriate and ethically viable

Furthermore, drawing from existing literature and case-studies from Europe and the US, we could highlight the following examples that provide a clear and comprehensive link between victim support and deradicalization:

- a) **Victim-Perpetrator Dialogue Models:** According to the approach, authorities implement restorative justice processes where victim narratives inform offender accountability and rehabilitation, fostering empathy and reducing recidivism. For example, the Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA) model used in Canada and the UK brings together offenders and victims in a controlled environment to facilitate dialogue and promote offender reintegration while supporting victims' healing (Strang, 2002; Sherman & Strang, 2007).
- b) **Institutional Collaboration Frameworks:** In this case, the focus is on the development of coordinated partnerships among victim support services, law enforcement, mental health providers, and P/CVE practitioners. An example is the New York Police Department's Hate Crime Task Force, which integrates victim services with law enforcement and community organizations, enhancing reporting and response through multi-agency coordination (Levin & Amster, 2007).

- c) **Community Dialogue Initiatives:** These efforts focus on the facilitation of trauma-informed community forums that build trust, empower survivors, and create collective resilience against extremist narratives. For instance, community resilience workshops in Finland have brought together minority groups, local authorities, and civil society actors to foster mutual understanding and counteract hate-driven polarization (Mäkinen, 2020; Norris et al., 2008).
- d) **Training and Capacity Building:** In this case, it is important to equip prevention actors with trauma-informed knowledge and skills to engage sensitively with victims and communities. The UK's Prevent program includes specialized training modules for frontline workers on trauma-informed engagement, improving their ability to support victims while identifying early signs of radicalization (Braddock & Horgan, 2016).
- e) **Policy Integration:** Last but not least, it is essential at a policy level to aggressively advocate for embedding trauma-informed principles within P/CVE policies and program design. A good example is the European Union's Digital Services Act which serves as a policy framework encouraging online platforms to monitor and remove hate content, complemented by victim-centered reporting mechanisms that align with trauma-informed approaches (European Parliament & Council of the European Union, 2022).

9. Guide for Police Officers and the Judicial Sector

For police to respond effectively to hate crimes, it is essential that citizens both trust and feel able to rely on law enforcement. Building this trust requires strengthening relationships between the police and the diverse communities they serve. According to the research *Preventing and Combating Hate Crimes: Modern Approach*, Jelena Groma argues that the development of a carefully verified action plan against hate crime—supported not only by law enforcement agencies but also by society and government—can ensure long-term effectiveness in addressing such crimes (Groma, 2018, pp. 4–5). Developing effective police responses requires the collection of reliable data on hate crimes. Expanding knowledge about

such crimes, improving victim reporting, and ensuring systematic hate crime recording are essential steps to reveal the full scale of the issue and to help policymakers design appropriate countermeasures (Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2019, p. 3).

A major challenge in policing violence rooted in discrimination and intolerance lies in its diffuse nature. Such violence is not always carried out by members of identifiable extremist groups but often manifests in everyday harassment and intimidation perpetrated by individuals without a conscious extremist ideology (James, 2005, p. 104). Moreover, the classification of religion-related hate crimes is complicated by their frequent overlap with ethnic, racial, or immigrant biases. This challenge is further compounded by the tendency of police agencies to categorize incidents under a single bias motivation, which risks obscuring the multi-layered nature of anti-Semitic victimization (Scheitle & Hansman, 2016, p. 862).

The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) emphasizes that member states must ensure hate crime victims can report their experiences without fearing that police officers might share the same prejudices as the offender. To achieve this, governments must implement measures that prevent and eliminate discriminatory attitudes within law enforcement, including efforts to transform the broader police culture. (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights 2016, 59.):

9.1. Key areas for Policing Anti-Semitic Hate Crimes

Research suggests that five key areas can be identified as playing a central role in combating anti-Semitic hate crimes and hate crimes more broadly. This categorization—developed here as a theoretical framework—serves as the basis for comparing the approaches of Sweden, Finland, and Great Britain (Mäkinen, J. (2020).

Policing is a critical component in addressing anti-Semitic hate crimes within society. For police to be successful in preventing and investigating such crimes, minority groups must have confidence in them. Trust is not automatically given; it must be built and continually maintained. Once trust exists, victims are more likely to report crimes.

When reports are made, the police must be able to accurately define antisemitism and recognize it as a component of the crime.

To achieve this, officers require both appropriate education and clear departmental policies. One effective way to ensure the necessary expertise is to establish specialized hate crime units dedicated to investigating these cases.

If victims report crimes and the police correctly classify bias motivations and conduct effective initial investigations, perpetrators can be prosecuted, and statistics will become more accurate. An increase in reliable data not only raises awareness but also enables stronger research. Further research, in turn, deepens understanding and allows the development of more refined strategies for countering anti-Semitic hate crimes.

When such strategies are translated into actionable steps in policy documents and subsequently implemented, tangible results are achieved: crimes are prevented, understanding is expanded, perpetrators are held accountable, and victims gain confidence that their experiences are being taken seriously. This, in turn, reinforces trust in the police and motivates further reporting, thereby creating a positive, self-reinforcing cycle.

Research has shown that official crime statistics significantly understate the actual extent of hate crimes, as many victims choose not to report their experiences to the police for a variety of reasons (Iganski 2007, 236). For this reason, it is essential that police forces prioritize building trust with minority groups (Wigerfelt B., Wigerfelt A. & Kiiskinen, 2014, 9). In the fight against anti-Semitic hate crimes, victim reporting is a cornerstone: without these reports, it is highly unlikely that the situation will improve on its own.

9.2. Guidelines for Judges and Prosecutors

Racial justice is the proactive reinforcement of policies, practices, attitudes, and actions that lead to equal access to opportunities for all (Elósegui et al., 2017). Antisemitism, as defined by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) (International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance [IHRA], n.d.), constitutes a perception of Jews which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. It frequently manifests through rhetoric, discriminatory acts, or criminal offenses directed at individuals, property, or institutions associated with Jewish identity.

Since 1945, Greece has largely remained an unexplored area in the study of antisemitism. This gap is not merely academic; it also has implications for the contemporary

Greek judiciary. In 2009 and 2010, during the highly controversial trial of Konstantinos A. Plevris—considered an intellectual figurehead of modern Greek neo-Nazism—the courts classified Holocaust denial, racial superiority theories rooted in Ariosophy, and public calls for the extermination of European Jewry as falling within the scope of “freedom of the arts, science, and research (Blümel, 2020).” Among the key historical sources, the Greek courts deemed sufficiently credible to substantiate claims of alleged “Jew-Zionist” ambitions for global domination were passages from the writings of a radical nineteenth-century proponent of the blood libel in Russia, as well as the infamous anti-Semitic forgery *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

In Greece, anti-Semitic crimes pose a direct threat to the principles of equality, dignity, and democratic values guaranteed by the Constitution and international law. These guidelines aim to provide judges and prosecutors with practical tools for the effective investigation, prosecution, and adjudication of anti-Semitic crimes in accordance with national legislation and European Union obligations. Ensuring consistency and sensitivity in the application of the law is essential to prevent impunity and safeguard the rule of law.

Moreover, accurate identification of anti-Semitic crimes is critical to ensuring accountability and preventing secondary victimization. According to ODIHR, anti-Semitic hate incidents often target Jews on both religious and ethnic grounds, including acts such as attempted arson, graffiti on synagogues, assaults on individuals wearing religious attire, desecration of cemeteries, and even murder. Civil society organizations report spikes in such incidents around the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Holocaust remembrance days, and anniversaries associated with Nazism.

Judicial actors should refer to OSCE ODIHR’s hate crime indicators to assess context and establish bias motivation. It is essential to distinguish between hate speech—which may fall under freedom of expression if it does not incite violence—and criminal acts inciting hatred or violence against Jewish individuals or communities, such as:

- a) Use of anti-Semitic language or slurs during the commission of the offense.
- b) References to Nazi ideology, Holocaust denial, or conspiracy theories.
- c) Targeting of synagogues, Jewish cemeteries, community centers, or businesses owned by Jewish individuals.

- d) Online activity or social media posts expressing anti-Semitic views linked to the offender.

9.3. Prosecutorial Guidelines

Prosecutors play a central role in ensuring that anti-Semitic motives are detected and prosecuted effectively. As with the police, there are 5 considerations that should be accounted for in anti-Semitic crimes (Sussman & Huberman, 2025).

a) Early Recognition

Bias indicators should be identified from the outset of an investigation. Failure to acknowledge motive may result in misclassification and inadequate sentencing.

b) Evidence Collection

Secure digital evidence, including social media content and encrypted communications.

Document statements made during the offense or prior threats demonstrating anti-Semitic intent.

Record contextual factors, such as dates of Jewish holidays or attacks on symbolic locations.

c) Charging Decisions

When sufficient indicators of bias exist, prosecutors should apply Article 81A of the Penal Code and explicitly include bias motivation in the indictment. This ensures aggravating circumstances are considered during sentencing.

d) Victim Support

Under Directive 2012/29/EU (Victims' Rights Directive), prosecutors must ensure victims receive information, protection, and referral to official victim support services. Sensitivity in communication and procedural fairness are essential to avoid re-traumatization.

e) Timely Prosecution

Swift proceedings demonstrate the Hellenic State's commitment to combating hate crimes and help restore victims' trust in the justice system.

9.4. Judicial Guidelines

Finally, when a crime of antisemitism is brought before the law, judges have a constitutional and ethical obligation to adjudicate anti-Semitic crimes impartially, ensuring justice and the protection of fundamental rights. The following guidelines are recommended for judges presiding over cases involving anti-Semitic crimes.

f) Impartiality and Fair Trial:

Judicial decisions should be free from prejudice and demonstrate awareness of the gravity of hate-motivated crimes.

g) Assessment of Bias Motivation:

Bias need not be the sole motive; even partial motivation based on antisemitism warrants application of aggravating circumstances. Courts should give significant weight to the offender's context, language, and behavior.

h) Sentencing:

Greek law requires aggravating circumstances for crimes motivated by bias. Courts should clearly articulate the anti-Semitic motive in their judgments to reinforce deterrence and public trust.

i) Freedom of Expression vs. Hate Speech:

While Article 14 of the ECHR safeguards expression, ECtHR jurisprudence (e.g., *Perinçek v. Switzerland*) clarifies that speech denying the Holocaust or glorifying Nazi crimes falls outside legitimate protection. Judges should apply these principles rigorously.

j) Victim Participation:

Ensure victims can exercise their rights during proceedings, including access to interpretation, information, and reparations where applicable. Safeguard measures should prevent secondary victimization.

k) Continuous Training:

Judges should participate in specialized training on hate crimes and antisemitism provided by the National School of Judges and international bodies.

10. Limitations

This paper presents a conceptual analysis aimed at bridging trauma-informed victim support with deradicalization and prevention frameworks. As such, it relies primarily on interdisciplinary literature synthesis and theoretical integration rather than empirical data collection or original field research. While the proposed frameworks and mechanisms are grounded in established scholarship, their practical applicability and effectiveness require empirical validation through future studies. The absence of primary data limits the ability to assess the real-world impact of trauma-informed approaches within deradicalization and P/CVE programs. Further research employing qualitative and quantitative methods is necessary to test, refine, and operationalize the conceptual linkages outlined here, ensuring that recommendations are evidence-based and contextually appropriate.

11. Conclusion

The analysis presented in this paper provides evidence that antisemitism is not only a persistent social problem but also a deeply traumatic experience with profound psychological, communal, and societal consequences mainly for its victims. As the FRA 2024 report highlights, “nearly all respondents (96%) reported encountering antisemitism in the year preceding the survey,” a finding that makes it clear that addressing both overt violence and the cumulative harm of microaggressions should become a priority. The trauma responses described—avoidance, shame, anxiety, and even identification with the perpetrator—demonstrate that antisemitism functions as a form of psychological injury that has a long-lasting effect that stretches far beyond the moment of the incident. That said, recognizing these effects is essential for shifting responsibility away from victims and toward the systems and actors that perpetuate prejudice.

At the same time, the paper highlights the structural and institutional challenges that pose a challenge to effective reporting and response. These include fear of retaliation, lack of support, and the politicization of anti-Jewish sentiment; all these factors contribute to chronic underreporting, so it comes as no surprise that only “30% of victims of anti-Semitic violence” seek assistance from the police. Our article highlights that trauma-informed, human-rights-based approaches offer a path forward by prioritizing safety, validation, and empowerment of the victims. Furthermore, when integrated into policing, judicial practice, community work, and education, these approaches can reduce re-traumatization, strengthen trust, and improve the accuracy of hate-crime data—an essential step toward meaningful policy reform and accountability.

Last but not least, combating antisemitism requires a coordinated effort that bridges trauma-informed victim support, deradicalization strategies, and robust reporting mechanisms. To ensure effectiveness of this approach, communities, authorities, and civil society must work together to create environments where victims feel safe to speak, where institutions respond decisively, and where prejudice is neither minimized nor excused. As the paper emphasizes, breaking the cycle of silence and isolation is both an act of justice and a foundation for resilience. Ultimately, centering the lived experiences of victims and fostering collective responsibility, societies can move toward a future in which antisemitism is confronted with clarity, compassion, and unwavering commitment from both the society and the relevant State’s authorities.

Importantly, the findings of this paper suggest that trauma-informed victim support should not be viewed solely as a reactive measure, but as a component of broader prevention and deradicalization ecosystems. By reinforcing trust in institutions, addressing the social and psychological consequences of hate crimes, and incorporating victim perspectives into prevention strategies, such approaches can help counter the conditions under which extremist ideologies thrive. This expands the scope of P/CVE beyond perpetrator-focused interventions toward a more holistic, ecosystem-based model.

References

- Abror, S., & Wahrudin, B. (2025). Countering religious extremism: Innovative deradicalization strategies for building inclusive communities. *MUNIF: International Journal of Religion Moderation*, 1(1), 57-76. <https://doi.org/10.71305/munif.v1i1.448>
- Agius, C., Edney-Browne, A., Nicholas, L., & Cook, K. (2023). Anti-feminism, gender and the far-right gap in C/PVE measures. In *Gender and the governance of terrorism and violent extremism* (pp. 181-205). Routledge.
- American University. (2024, January 13). *Antisemitism at a new all-time high in the U.S.* <https://www.american.edu/cas/news/antisemitism-at-new-all-time-high-in-us.cfm>
- Anidjar, G. (2017). Antisemitism and its critics. In J. Renton & B. Gidley (Eds.), *Antisemitism and Islamophobia in Europe* (pp. 121-136). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-41302-4_8
- Antepli, A., Sager, R., & Kadayifci-Orellana, S. A. (2025). *Combating antisemitism and Islamophobia: Best practices in challenging times*.
- Antoniou, G., Dinas, E., & Kosmidis, S. (2020). Collective victimhood and social prejudice: A post-Holocaust theory of anti-Semitism. *Political Psychology*, 41(5), 861-886. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12654>
- Bateson, K., McManus, M., & Johnson, G. (2020). Understanding the use, and misuse, of adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) in trauma-informed policing. *Police Journal*, 93(2), 131-145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032258X19841409>
- Beck, A. F., Solomon, B. S., Mogilner, L. N., Dreyer, B. P., Florin, T. A., Lax, Y., & Klein, M. D. (2025). Standing up to antisemitism, together. *Academic Pediatrics*, 25(1).
- Birch, P. (2024). Trauma-informed policing: Enhancing law enforcement practices through empathy and sensitivity. *Abuse: An International Impact Journal*, 5(2), 1-21.
- Bilewicz, M., & Stefaniak, A. (2013). Can a victim be responsible? Anti-Semitic consequences of victimhood-based identity and competitive victimhood in Poland. In B. Bokus (Ed.), *Responsibility: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 69-77). Studio Lexem.
- Bleich, E. (2007). Hate crime policy in Western Europe: Responding to racist violence in Britain, Germany, and France. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(2), 149-165. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764207306047>
- Blümel, T. (2020). Antisemitism as political theology in Greece and its impact on Greek Jewry, 1967-1979. In *Jewish life in Southeast Europe* (pp. 26-47). Routledge.

Chanes, J. A. (Ed.). (1995). *Antisemitism in America today: Outspoken experts explode the myths*. Carol Publishing Group.

Chanes, J. A. (2000). *A dark side of history: Antisemitism through the ages*. Anti-Defamation League.

College of Policing. (2004). *Hate crime operational guidance*. https://www.report-it.org.uk/files/hate_crime_operational_guidance.pdf

College of Policing. (2014). *National policing hate crime strategy*. https://www.report-it.org.uk/files/national_policing_hate_crime_strategy.pdf

Elósegui, M., & Hermida, C. (Eds.). (2017). *Racial justice, policies and courts' legal reasoning in Europe*. Springer.

European Commission. (2018, December 10). *Commission presents its response to antisemitism and a survey showing antisemitism is on the rise in the EU*. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_18_6724

European Commission. (2019). *Special Eurobarometer 484: Perceptions of antisemitism*. https://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/S2220_90_4_484_ENG

European Commission against Racism and Intolerance. (2004). *ECRI general policy recommendation No. 9 on the fight against antisemitism*. Council of Europe. <https://rm.coe.int/ecri-general-policy-recommendation-no-9-on-the-fight-against-antisemit/16808b5ac8>

European Jewish Congress. (2019). *Action plan for combating antisemitism in Europe*. <https://eurojewcong.org/ejc-in-action/statements/jewish-organisations-announce-joint-action-plan-for-combatting-antisemitism-in-europe/>

European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2022). *Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 on a single market for digital services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC (Digital Services Act)*. *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 277, 1-102. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/2065/oj>

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2016). *Ensuring justice for hate crime victims: Professional perspectives*. Publications Office of the European Union.

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2019). *Antisemitism: Overview of data available in the European Union 2008-2018*. Publications Office of the European Union.

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2024a). *Jewish people's experiences and perceptions of antisemitism: Third survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU*. Publications Office of the European Union.

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2024/experiences-and-perceptions-antisemitism-third-survey>

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2024b). *Stepping up the response to victims of crime: FRA's findings on challenges and solutions*. Publications Office of the European Union.

Everly, G. S. (1995). An integrative two-factor model of post-traumatic stress. In G. S. Everly & J. M. Lating (Eds.), *Psychotraumatology: Key papers and core concepts in post-traumatic stress*.

Feldman, D., Gidley, B., & McGeever, B. (2025). *Facing antisemitism: The struggle for safety and solidarity*.

Figley, C. R. (Ed.). (1986). *Trauma and its wake: Vol. II. Traumatic stress: Theory, research, and intervention*. Brunner/Mazel.

Graves, K., & Gay, Y. (2020). Examining interpersonal violence from a trauma-informed and human rights perspective. In R. Geffner, J. W. White, L. K. Hamberger, A. Rosenbaum, V. Vaughan-Eden, & V. I. Vieth (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal violence and abuse across the lifespan*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62122-7_204-1

Groma, J. (2018). Preventing and combating hate crimes: Modern approach. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 51, Article 01009. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185101009>

Heath-Kelly, C., & Shanaah, S. (2025). *The politics of preventing violent extremism: Liberal democracy, civil society, and countering radicalization*. Oxford University Press.

Herman, J. L. (1992). *Trauma and recovery*. Basic Books.

Herschinger, E., Bozay, K., von Drachenfels, M., Decker, O., & Joppke, C. (2020). A threat to open societies? Conceptualizing the radicalization of society. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 14, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.4119/ijcv-3807>

Hodge, D. R., & Boddie, S. C. (2021). Anti-semitism in the United States: An overview and strategies to create a more socially just society. *Social Work*, 66(2), 128-138. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swab001>

Iganski, P. (2007). Too few Jews to count? Police monitoring of hate crime against Jews in the United Kingdom. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(2), 232-245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764207306055>

Iganski, P., Kielinger, V., & Paterson, S. (2005). *Hate crimes against London's Jews: An analysis of incidents recorded by the Metropolitan Police Service 2001-2004*. Institute for Jewish Policy Research. <https://archive.jpr.org.uk/download?id=1480>

Imhoff, R., & Banse, R. (2009). Ongoing victim suffering increases prejudice: The case of secondary anti-Semitism. *Psychological Science*, 20(12), 1443-1447.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02457.x>

International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance. (n.d.). *Working definition of antisemitism*.
<https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/working-definition-antisemitism>

Kielinger, V., & Paterson, S. (2007). Policing hate crime in London. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(2), 196-204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764207306051>

Levine, B. (2013). Antisemitism and anti-racist social work. In M. Lavalette & L. Penketh (Eds.), *Race, racism and social work: Contemporary issues and debates* (pp. 89-104). Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.1332/policypress/9781447307082.003.0006>

Lubin, H. (2015). Trauma in disguise: The effects of antisemitism. In C. A. Small (Ed.), *The Yale papers: Antisemitism in comparative perspective* (pp. 329-348). Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy (ISGAP).

Lubin, H., & Johnson, D. R. (2012). *Trauma-centered group psychotherapy for women: A clinician's manual*. Routledge.

Maguire, E. R. (2023). Policing hate rallies. In M. S. Staller, S. Koerner, & B. Zaiser (Eds.), *Police conflict management* (Vol. 1). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-41096-3_14

Mäkinen, J. (2020). *The police counteracting antisemitic hate crimes in Finland: Comparison with Sweden and Great Britain* (Master's thesis, Åbo Akademi University). Doria Repository. <https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fe2020120899840>

Martin, S. E. (1999). Police and the production of hate crimes: Continuity and change in one jurisdiction. *Police Quarterly*, 2(4), 417-437. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109861119900200402>

McCann, I. L., & Pearlman, L. A. (1990). *Psychological trauma and the adult survivor: Theory, therapy, and transformation*. Brunner/Mazel.

Mutsaers, P., Demir, S., & Meijeren, M. (2019). *Preventing radicalization and polarization: A literature review of policies, priorities, programs, and partnerships for youth at risk*. Platform JEP.

Neumann, P. R. (2017). *Countering violent extremism and radicalisation that lead to terrorism: Ideas, recommendations, and good practices from the OSCE region*. International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation (ICSR), King's College London.
<https://www.osce.org/chairmanship/346841>

Noor, M., Brown, R., & Prentice, G. (2008). Prospects for intergroup reconciliation: Social-psychological predictors of intergroup forgiveness and reparation in Northern Ireland and Chile.

Palmgren, C., Meyer, H., & Örell, R. (2024). *HE/SHE might be an extremist: How to identify, prevent and respond to involvement in violent extremism*. R2COM Project / TRANSFORM.

Perry, B. (2010). Policing hate crime in a multicultural society: Observations from Canada. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 38(3), 120-140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcrj.2010.10.004>

Peterson, K. C., Prout, M. F., & Schwarz, R. A. (2013). *Post-traumatic stress disorder: A clinician's guide*. Springer.

Rich, K. (2019). Trauma-informed police responses to rape victims. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 28(4), 463-480. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2018.1540448>

Safran, W. (2021). Problems of perceiving and reacting to antisemitism: Reflections of a survivor. In *Antisemitism in the contemporary world* (pp. 273-287). Routledge.

Sealy, T., & Modood, T. (2020). *Radicalisation and resilience case study: The United Kingdom*. European University Institute.

Skrodzka, M., Kende, A., Faragó, L., & Bilewicz, M. (2022). "Remember that we suffered!" The effects of historical trauma on anti-Semitic prejudice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 52(5), 341-350. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12839>

Sussman, S., & Huberman, C. (2025). Exploring the intersectionality of antisemitism and the law: A case study of the Crown Heights riots and aftermath. *FIU Law Review*, 19(3), 958-989. <https://doi.org/10.25148/lawrev.19.3.17>

Vallis, M. (2013). Behaviour change counselling: How do I know if I am doing it well? The development of the Behaviour Change Counselling Scale (BCCS). *Canadian Journal of Diabetes*, 37(1), 18-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcjd.2013.01.005>

van der Kolk, B. A. (1987). *Psychological trauma*. American Psychiatric Press.

Lalić, V., & Đurić, S. (2018). Policing hate crimes in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Policing and Society*, 28(9), 1065-1083. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2017.1281275>

Walfield, S. M., Socia, K. M., & Powers, R. A. (2017). Religiously motivated hate crimes: Reporting to law enforcement and case outcomes. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(1), 148-169. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-016-9349-3>

Whine, M. (2014). Combating antisemitism in Europe. *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs*, 8(1), 81-94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23739770.2014.11446629>

Whine, M. (2017). Can the European agencies combat antisemitism effectively? *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs*, 11(3), 371-381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23739770.2017.1382043>

Wohl, M. J. A., & Branscombe, N. R. (2008). Remembering historical victimization: Collective guilt for current ingroup transgressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(6), 988-1006.

About the JD Journal for Deradicalization

The JD Journal for Deradicalization is the world's only peer reviewed periodical for the theory and practice of deradicalization with a wide international audience. Named an ["essential journal of our times"](#) (Cheryl LaGuardia, Harvard University) the JD's editorial board of expert advisors includes some of the most renowned scholars in the field of deradicalization studies, such as Prof. Dr. John G. Horgan (Georgia State University); Prof. Dr. Tore Bjørgo (Norwegian Police University College); Prof. Dr. Mark Dechesne (Leiden University); Prof. Dr. Cynthia Miller-Idriss (American University Washington D.C.); Prof. Dr. Julie Chernov Hwang (Goucher College); Prof. Dr. Marco Lombardi, (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore Milano); Dr. Paul Jackson (University of Northampton); Professor Michael Freeden, (University of Nottingham); Professor Hamed El-Sa'id (Manchester Metropolitan University); Prof. Sadeq Rahimi (University of Saskatchewan, Harvard Medical School), Dr. Omar Ashour (University of Exeter), Prof. Neil Ferguson (Liverpool Hope University), Prof. Sarah Marsden (Lancaster University), Prof. Maura Conway (Dublin City University), Dr. Kurt Braddock (American University Washington D.C.), Dr. Michael J. Williams (The Science of P/CVE), Dr. Mary Beth Altier (New York University) and Dr. Aaron Y. Zelin (Washington Institute for Near East Policy), Prof. Dr. Adrian Cherney (University of Queensland), Dr. Wesley S. McCann (RTI International), and Dr. Daren Fisher (Hampton University), Prof. Dr. Maria Moulin-Stożek (Jan Długosz University).

For more information please see: www.journal-derad.com

Twitter: @JD_JournalDerad

Facebook: www.facebook.com/deradicalisation

The JD Journal for Deradicalization is a proud member of the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ).

ISSN: 2363-9849

This Special Issue of the Journal for Deradicalization was guest edited by: Arie Kruglanski and Sophia Moskalenko