

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

Antisemitism

Overview of data available
in the European Union 2008–2018

November 2019



EUROPEAN UNION AGENCY
FOR FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS



Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2019

Print	ISBN 978-92-9474-765-5	doi:10.2811/151463	TK-01-19-887-EN-C
PDF	ISBN 978-92-9474-766-2	doi:10.2811/129256	TK-01-19-887-EN-N

© European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2019

Reproduction is authorised, except for commercial purposes, provided the source is acknowledged.



Antisemitism

Overview of data available in the
European Union 2008–2018

November 2019

Country codes

Country code	EU Member State
AT	Austria
BE	Belgium
BG	Bulgaria
CY	Cyprus
CZ	Czechia
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.....	11
Data collection for this overview.....	14
Reports and evidence from international organisations.....	15
United Nations (UN)	15
European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI).....	18
OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR)	19
Use of IHRA working definition on antisemitism in the Member States	20
National data on antisemitism	21
Austria	24
Belgium	30
Bulgaria	35
Croatia	36
Cyprus.....	37
Czechia	38
Denmark.....	41
Estonia.....	44
Finland.....	45
France.....	46
Germany.....	50
Greece	55
Hungary.....	56
Ireland.....	58
Italy	59
Latvia	62
Lithuania.....	63
Luxembourg.....	64
Malta.....	65
The Netherlands.....	66
Poland.....	73
Portugal.....	76
Romania	77
Slovakia	79
Slovenia.....	80
Spain	81
Sweden	83
United Kingdom.....	86
Concluding remarks – persisting gaps in data collection.....	93

Introduction

Antisemitism can be expressed in the form of verbal and physical attacks, threats, harassment, discrimination and unequal treatment, property damage and graffiti or other forms of speech or text, including on the internet. Antisemitic incidents and hate crime violate fundamental rights, especially the right to human dignity, the right to equality of treatment and the freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

The present report provides an overview of data on antisemitism as recorded by international organisations and by official and unofficial sources in the 28 European Union (EU) Member States, based on their own definitions and categorisations. ‘Official data’ are understood here as those collected by law enforcement agencies, other 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 overview provides an update of the most recent figures on antisemitic incidents, covering the period 1 January 2008 – 31 December 2018, across the EU Member States, where data are available. It includes a section that presents evidence from international organisations. In addition, for the first time, it provides an overview of how Member States that have adopted or endorsed the [non-legally binding working definition of antisemitism](#) adopted by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) (2016) use or intend to use it.

This is the 15th edition of FRA’s report on the situation of data collection on antisemitism in the EU (including reports published by FRA’s predecessor, the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia).

Limited data collection on antisemitism

As already indicated in FRA’s 2018 overview on data on antisemitism, 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.¹ This is true despite the serious negative consequences of antisemitism for Jewish populations in particular, as FRA’s second survey on antisemitism showed,² as well as for society at large.³

The inadequate recording of hate crime incidents, including those of antisemitic nature, coupled with victims’ hesitance to report incidents to the authorities, contributes to the gross 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

¹ For example, FRA (2018), [Antisemitism - Overview of data available in the European Union 2007-2017](#), Luxembourg, Publications Office.

² FRA (2018), [Experiences and perceptions of antisemitism. Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU](#), Luxembourg, Publications Office.

³ Results of the 2018 CNN poll on antisemitism among more than 7,000 respondents from the general population in Austria, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Sweden and the United Kingdom are available on [CNN’s website](#). European Commission (2019), [Perceptions of antisemitism](#). Special Eurobarometer 484 – December 2018.

of action to combat antisemitism effectively and decisively, and to assess the effectiveness of existing policies. Incidents that are not reported are not investigated or prosecuted, allowing offenders to think that they can carry out such attacks with impunity. Victims who do not report their experiences to authorities may also not receive relevant information about available assistance.

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.

The EU's commitment to combating antisemitism and hate crime

In December 2015, the European Commission appointed a [coordinator on combating antisemitism](#). The coordinator, a contact point for the Jewish communities, works together with EU Member State authorities, the European Parliament and civil society to contribute to the European Commission's policymaking in the area of combating antisemitic hate crime, discrimination and hate speech online.

In June 2016, the European Commission launched [the High Level Group on combating Racism, Xenophobia and other forms of Intolerance](#) to step up cooperation and coordination between EU Member States and relevant stakeholders, such as international organisations and civil society, to better prevent and combat hate crime and hate speech online, including antisemitism.

Following the launch of the [Code of Conduct on countering illegal online hate speech](#) in May 2016 together with major IT companies, the European Commission carries out annual evaluations of the application of the Code of Conduct in practice by the IT companies through a [monitoring exercise](#). The trend results of the [progress reports](#) show the predominance of racist hatred, with antisemitism comprising around 10 % of the reported grounds of hatred each year (e.g. out of 4,392 notifications submitted in 2019 to the IT companies that have adopted the Code of Conduct).

Within the European Union High Level Group on combating Racism, Xenophobia and other forms of Intolerance, FRA coordinated a [Subgroup](#) on methodologies for recording and collecting data on hate crime (2016-2018) to assist Member States to improve hate crime recording and data collection. The group started its work by focusing on ways to improve the recording of hate crime by law enforcement officers. The Subgroup identified [key guiding principles on hate crime recording](#) which, if implemented, could lead to improved recording of hate crime. The principles are being implemented through FRA and the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) [country workshops](#), aiming to create systemic change in recording hate crime.

In 2019, the European Commission asked FRA to continue this assistance through a new expert group on hate crime recording, data collection and encouraging reporting. Besides the country workshops, the group will focus on identifying ways to encourage hate crime reporting by victims and third parties, and on models of cooperation between authorities and civil society organisations.

Policymakers and professionals from EU Member States, the European Commission, the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) and the Council of Europe's European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) are members of the working group.

On 29 November 2018, the [EU acquired Permanent International Partnership with the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance \(IHRA\)](#), allowing for closer cooperation on combating Holocaust denial and preventing racism and antisemitism.

On 6 December 2018, the Council of the EU unanimously adopted [a declaration on the fight against antisemitism and the development of a common security approach to better protect Jewish communities and institutions in Europe](#), which was welcomed by the [European Council](#) on 14 December 2018.

Following up on this, the European Commission set up a working group on the implementation of the Council Declaration on the fight against antisemitism. In line with the commitments of the declaration, the working group focuses on three themes: security of Jewish premises and communities; education on the Holocaust, Jewish life, antisemitism and Shoah remembrance; and data collection of incidents beyond hate crime, using the IHRA definition. The aim of the working group is to support Member States to adopt holistic strategies to prevent and fight all forms of antisemitism. The first meeting of the working group took place on 20 June 2019.

On 22 January 2019, the European Commission published the findings of a special Eurobarometer survey on [perceptions of antisemitism](#) in the 28 EU Member States. The survey findings show that half of Europeans consider antisemitism to be a problem in their country, and that more than two-thirds believe that antisemitism has increased in their country over the past five years.

The current state of official data collection is such that the present report can only provide an overview of the data available on antisemitism in EU Member States. No official data on reported antisemitic incidents in 2018 were available for six Member States by the time this report was compiled in September 2019.⁴ Due to 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 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 2018, only 16 EU Member States had in place operating national strategies or action plans to counter racism and xenophobia⁵ (15 Member States did so in 2017), with only a few that include measures to tackle antisemitism specifically. In 2018, only a few Member States had a dedicated action plan on antisemitism.

⁴ No official data on reported antisemitic incidents are available in Hungary, Ireland, Malta, and Portugal; data in Finland and Sweden are published at the end of the calendar year.

⁵ FRA (2019) [Fundamental Rights Report 2019](#), Luxembourg, Publications Office.

FRA's survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews

In 2018, FRA conducted the second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews. The survey covered 12 Member States, where over 96 % of EU's estimated Jewish population live: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The biggest survey of Jewish people ever conducted worldwide, it collected comparable data on experiences, perceptions and views of discrimination and hate crime victimisation of almost 16,500 individuals aged 16 and over, and who identify as being Jewish on the basis of their religion, ethnicity or any other reason. The survey findings point to rising levels of antisemitism.

For more information, see FRA (2018), [Experiences and perceptions of antisemitism. Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU](#), Luxembourg, Publications Office. The [summary of key findings](#) is available in the official EU languages and in Hebrew. The [country sheets](#) summarise the results for each of the Member States covered by the survey.

Young Jewish Europeans: perceptions and experiences of antisemitism

Based on FRA's second large-scale survey on experiences and perceptions of antisemitism, the report focuses on the perspectives of young Jewish Europeans (aged 16-34) living in 12 EU Member States. It first describes young Jewish Europeans and takes a look at defining antisemitism and understanding the place of Israel in it. The report then presents young Jewish Europeans' experiences and perceptions of antisemitism. Finally, it specifically looks at how safe young Jewish Europeans feel, and whether they believe governments are effectively combating antisemitism.


For more information, see EC, FRA, JPR (2019), [Young Jewish Europeans: perceptions and experiences of antisemitism](#), Luxembourg, Publications Office.

Selected key findings from FRA's Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

Experiences of harassment, physical violence and vandalism

- On average, over one third of all respondents (39 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. More than one quarter (28 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.
- Survey respondents identify antisemitic content on the internet as the most acute form of antisemitism. However, comments made in person, and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents – for example, 18 % and 16 %, respectively, said they were faced with these forms of harassment in the 12 months before the survey.
- In terms of the most serious incidents of antisemitic harassment experienced in the five years before the survey, during most of these incidents, antisemitic language was used. In addition, the harassment occurred in situations where it was possible for the perpetrators to identify the respondents as being Jewish. (On average, two in three respondents noted these two aspects when describing the respective incidents).
- When asked to describe the perpetrator of the most serious incident of antisemitic harassment experienced in the five years before the survey – to the extent possible and based on their perceptions – respondents in 31 % of the cases identified the perpetrator as someone they do not know, in 30 % as someone with Muslim extremist views, and in 21 % of cases as someone with left-wing political views.
- The overwhelming majority of respondents (79 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.
- Almost half (48 %) of the respondents who did not report the most serious incident to the police said that nothing would have changed had they done so. A similar proportion (43 %) of respondents did not consider the incident to be serious enough.
- Across the 12 countries surveyed, 3 % of all respondents personally experienced a physical attack because they are Jewish in the five years before the survey. In the 12 months before the survey, 2 % of all respondents experienced a physical attack because they are Jewish.
- Across the 12 countries surveyed, 4 % of all respondents say that their property was deliberately vandalised because they are Jewish in the five years before the survey; 2 % experienced this in the 12 months before the survey.

Figure 1: Experience of antisemitic harassment (at least one of the six forms of harassment identified), in the 12 months and in the five years before the survey, by EU Member State (%)^{a,b,c}




Notes: ^a Out of all respondents (n=16,395); country results are unweighted, 12 country average is weighted.

- ^b Questions: Co1. In the PAST five years in [COUNTRY] has somebody ever:
- Co3. In the PAST 12 MONTHS in [COUNTRY] has somebody:
- sent you emails or text messages that were offensive or threatening;
 - made offensive, threatening or silent phone calls to you;
 - loitered, waited for you or deliberately followed you in a threatening way;
 - made offensive or threatening comments to you in person;
 - made offensive gestures to you or stared at you inappropriately
 - posted offensive comments about you on the internet, including social media?
- Co4a. Did this happen BECAUSE you are Jewish?

^c The answers include those who have been harassed at least once in the 12 months and in the five years before the survey.

Source: FRA, 2018

Figure 2: Reporting of the most serious incident of antisemitic harassment to the police or to any other authority or organisation, in the five years before the survey, by EU Member State (%)^{a,b,c,d}



- Notes: ^a Out of respondents who experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey (n=6,486); 12-country averages are weighted.
^b Question: Co8. Did you or anyone else report this incident to the police or to any other organisation?
^c Some bars do not add up to 100 %; this is due to rounding of results.
^d Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Thus, results based on 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with fewer than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on fewer than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

Source: FRA, 2018

Legal framework

The rights to life, human dignity, equal treatment, and freedom of thought, conscience and religion are universal human rights recognised 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.

Treaty on European Union, Article 2

The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail.

Treaty on European Union, Article 3.1

The Union's aim is to promote peace, its values and the well-being of its peoples.

The Racial Equality Directive (2004/43/EC)⁶ prohibits discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin in employment and beyond, and the Employment Equality Directive (2000/78/EC)⁷ prohibits discrimination in employment on the ground of religion or belief, among others. The Victims' Rights Directive (2012/29/EU)⁸ establishes minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime. It refers explicitly to victims of hate crime, their protection and 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 law⁹ 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, and therefore, also antisemitism. The framework decision also applies in cases where the conduct is committed through information systems.

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 and also requires that national law treats racist motivation as an aggravating factor in other already established offences.

Under the terms of the framework decision, EU Member States are further required to punish the condoning, denying or gross trivialising of certain crimes¹⁰ 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 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.

⁶ 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.

⁷ Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, OJ 2000 L 303.

⁸ 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.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ 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.

The [Audiovisual Media Services Directive](#) (2010/13/EU) obliges EU Member States to ensure that audiovisual media services do not contain incitement to hatred based on race, religion, sex or nationality.¹¹ According to Article 6, “Member States shall ensure by appropriate means that audiovisual media services provided by media service providers under their jurisdiction do not contain any incitement to hatred based on race, sex, religion or nationality”.

The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), in its 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*¹² and *Garudy v. France*,¹³ 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*,¹⁴ 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.

FRA paper: Unmasking bias motives in crimes: selected cases of the European Court of Human Rights

The paper discusses the evolution of European Court of Human Rights case law relating to hate crime, providing an update on the most recent rulings. Approaching hate crime from a fundamental rights perspective, it shows how the duty of the authorities of the Member State authorities’ effectively to investigate the bias motivation of crimes flows from key human rights instruments, such as the European Convention on Human Rights.

For more information, see FRA (201), [Unmasking bias motives in crimes: selected cases of the European Court of Human Rights](#), Luxembourg, Publications Office.

In 2015, the ECtHR confirmed this point of view in *M’Bala v. France*.¹⁵ The court held that, since the acts at issue were unmistakably negationist and antisemitic in nature, the humourist Dieudonné 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.

¹¹ Directive 2010/13/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2010 on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the provision of audiovisual media services (*Audiovisual Media Services Directive*).

¹² ECtHR, *Lehideux and Isorni v. France*, No. 24662/94, 23 September 1998.

¹³ ECtHR, *Garudy v. France*, No. 65831/01, 24 June 2003.

¹⁴ ECtHR, *Walendy v. Germany*, No. 21128/92, 11 January 1995.

¹⁵ ECtHR, *M’Bala v. France*, No. 25239/13, 20 October 2015.

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.¹⁶

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”¹⁷ as criminal offences under their domestic laws.

The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) obliges all State Parties to take measures to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms. 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”.¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ 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.²⁰ Furthermore, Article 20 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.²¹

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 European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) of the

¹⁶ Council of Europe (1995), [Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities](#).

¹⁷ Council of Europe (2003), [Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime, concerning the criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems](#), Art. 6.

¹⁸ United Nations (UN), Human Rights Committee (CCPR) (2011), [General Comment No. 34](#), UN Doc. CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 49.

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

²⁰ UN, CCPR (2011), [General Comment No. 34](#), UN Doc. CCPR/C/GC/34, para. 35–36.

²¹ ICCPR, Art. 20.

Council of Europe and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (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 system of national liaison officers at the disposal of FRA in each Member State.²² This step was taken to ensure that the latest available official data on antisemitism were taken into consideration when drafting this report. For the first time these requests included a question on how national, regional or local authorities use or intend to use the [non-legally binding working definition of antisemitism](#) adopted by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) in May 2016.
3. Data on antisemitism published by civil society organisations were consulted.²³
4. Findings from FRA's Second Survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU on experiences of antisemitic harassment and its reporting to the police or other institutions are included for relevant EU Member States.

Reports and evidence from international organisations

FRA, in close collaboration with the United Nations, the Council of Europe, as well as EU entities, is developing the EU Fundamental Rights Information System (EFRIS), an online tool. EFRIS will cover the most relevant of over 80 monitoring mechanisms related to human rights in the EU, and will also provide some analysis. It will be launched in 2019.

For more information, see [FRA's webpage on EFRIS](#).

United Nations (UN)

The issue of countering antisemitism is present in much of the work of the UN. Parties to the UN human rights treaties are obliged to submit regular reports on the implementation of the treaties for review by the respective expert committee, so called treaty bodies. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) examines each report and addresses concerns of and recommendations to the parties to the ICERD in the form of 'concluding observations'.²⁴ The concluding observations highlight, among others, the issue of antisemitism in the State Parties and provide related recommendations.

Similarly, in relation to the ICCPR, the Human Rights Committee (CCPR) monitors the implementation of the instrument.²⁵

²² See FRA's [list of national liaison officers](#).

²³ For more information on global trends on antisemitism, see Kantor Center for the Study of Contemporary European Jewry (2019), [Moshe Kantor Database for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism and Racism: Antisemitism Worldwide 2018](#); Anti-Defamation League (2015), [ADL Global 100: An index of anti-Semitism](#).

²⁴ UN, Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) (2019), [Concluding observations](#).

²⁵ UN, CCPR (2019), [Concluding observations](#).

Antisemitism is also addressed within the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), which supplements the expert assessments by the treaty bodies.²⁶ The UPR is a process under the auspices of the United Nations Human Rights Council, which reviews the human rights records of all UN member states. The review is based on a set of documents put together on the basis of reports submitted by the governments themselves as well as UN human rights mechanisms (treaty bodies and so-called special procedures), and National Human Rights Institutions, regional mechanisms (such as FRA) and non-governmental organisations. States are responsible for implementing the recommendations included in a final outcome report.

These processes occur in cycles and do not review every EU Member State every year. Table 1 summarises some of the relevant observations and recommendations that were published in 2018.²⁷

²⁶ UN, Human Rights Council (HRC) (2019), [Universal Periodic Review](#).

²⁷ For Observations and recommendations published between 2008 and 2017, see [Antisemitism – Overview of data available in the European Union 2007–2017](#).

Table 1: Observations and recommendations made to Member States of the European Union by the Human Rights Committee (CCPR), the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) and by UN member states through Universal Period Reviews (UPR) with regard to combating antisemitism, 2018

	Observations and recommendations	Source
DE	<p>155.86 Take the measures necessary to investigate acts of violence and discrimination in relation to anti-Semitism and Islamophobia and punish the perpetrators of such acts; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Argentina</p> <p>155.138 Continue efforts to safeguard interfaith relations and counteract anti-Semitism and other forms of racial discrimination; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Australia;</p> <p>155.65 Step up efforts to combat hate speech in the media and manifestations of ethnic and religious discrimination, and introduce criminal liability for the dissemination of racist and neo-Nazi ideology; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Russian Federation;</p> <p>155.106 Take further steps to prevent the recurrence of neo-Nazism and criminalize any acts that distort history and instigate racism and xenophobia; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Democratic People’s Republic of Korea</p>	<p>UPR A/HRC/39/9 (UPR, 2018)</p>
FR	<p>145.57 Make sure that recently introduced reforms, including several action plans in the field of the fight against racism and anti-Semitism, will translate into widespread practice; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Poland;</p> <p>145.58 Continue and further strengthen the efforts made under the National Action Plan to Combat Racism and Anti-Semitism 2015–2017 to fight racial discrimination and xenophobia; UPR Recommending State/Entity – India;</p> <p>145.59 Ensure that the dedicated national body completes its work on a new National Action Plan to Combat Racism and Anti-Semitism 2018–2020, based on a thorough evaluation of its predecessor; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Israel;</p> <p>145.60 Continue to refine and implement the 40 measures in the National Action Plan to Combat Racism and Anti-Semitism 2015–2017 until a new National Action Plan is introduced; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Singapore;</p> <p>145.67 Step up efforts against anti-Semitism and anti-Muslim violence and prosecute and punish perpetrators; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Central Africa Republic;</p> <p>145.82 Intensify efforts against discrimination, racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, prohibiting and punishing hate speech or any other action that could incite violent attacks for discriminatory reasons; UPR Recommending State/Entity – Uruguay.</p>	<p>UPR A/HRC/38/4 (UPR, 2018)</p>

	Observations and recommendations	Source
HU	18. The State party should regularly, publicly and effectively reaffirm that any advocacy of ethnic or racial hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence is prohibited by law and should act promptly to bring perpetrators of hate crimes to justice. It should take effective measures to improve the reporting, investigation, prosecution and punishment of hate crimes and criminal hate speech, in accordance with its obligations under the Covenant, and should strengthen its efforts to eradicate stereotyping and discrimination against migrants, refugees, Jews and Roma, among others, by conducting public awareness campaigns to promote tolerance and respect for diversity and to highlight the unacceptability of racial profiling. It should also ensure that State officials responsible for discriminatory behaviour towards Roma and other minority groups are held accountable in all instances.	CCPR CCPR/C/HUN/C/0/6 (CCPR, 2018)
LT	12. The State party should: (a) Strengthen its efforts to combat intolerance, stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination towards vulnerable and minority groups, including Roma, Jews, migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, by, inter alia, increasing training for law enforcement personnel, prosecutors and the judiciary and conducting awareness-raising campaigns promoting sensitivity and respect for diversity among the general public.	CCPR CCPR/C/LTU/C/0/4 (CCPR, 2018)

Source: FRA, 2018 (based on data extracted from the [Universal Human Rights Index](#) on 23 July 2019)

European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) – Council of Europe

Since its inception, ECRI has included the issue 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 authorities. All 28 EU Member States have been covered under ECRI’s country monitoring work.²⁹

In the Annual Report on ECRI’s Activities in 2018,³⁰ the following conclusions are drawn concerning antisemitism in the EU:

- *“Jewish people in Europe continue to be confronted with antisemitic hatred, including violence. Extremist groups, especially Neo-Nazis and Islamists, pose particular threats to the safety of Jewish communities and their members across the continent. Jewish institutions, such as synagogues, community centres and cemeteries, are often vandalised, also in reaction to events in the Middle East. The*

²⁸ European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) (2018), [Country monitoring work](#).

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

³⁰ European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) (2018), [Annual Report on ECRI’s Activities](#) covering the period from 1 January to 31 December 2018.

view that attacks on Jewish persons and property could be considered as justifiable reactions to policies or actions of the Israeli government is, regrettably, widespread and not only held by members of extremist groups. Such condoning of antisemitic acts needs to be more strongly rejected, in particular by persons holding public office, in order to reassure Jewish people in Europe that they are an integral part of the societies they live in and are protected by the law.

- *In order to combat antisemitism more effectively, a growing number of member states have adopted the IHRA (International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance) Working Definition of Antisemitism. Close cooperation between Jewish communities and national authorities has shown to be an effective tool to counter antisemitism in its various shapes and forms. Government support for inter-religious dialogue has also yielded some positive results”.*

OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR)

ODIHR’s online hate crime reporting database covers all 28 EU Member States and includes nine ‘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:

“Hate crimes are criminal acts motivated by bias or prejudice towards particular groups of people. To be considered a hate crime, the offence must meet two criteria: first, the act must constitute an offence under criminal law; second, the act must have been motivated by bias.

Bias motivations can be broadly defined as preconceived negative opinions, stereotypical assumptions, intolerance or hatred directed to a particular group that shares a common characteristic, such as race, ethnicity, language, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, gender or any other fundamental characteristic. People with disabilities may also be victims of hate crimes.

Hate crimes can include threats, property damage, assault, murder or any other criminal offence committed with a bias motivation. Hate crimes don't only affect individuals from specific groups. People or property merely associated with – or even perceived to be a member of – a group that shares a protected characteristic, such as human rights defenders, community centres or places of worship, can also be targets of hate crimes.”³¹

At the time of writing, the latest available data in ODIHR’s online hate crime reporting database covered the year 2017. Twelve EU Member States (Austria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia, Spain and the United Kingdom) provided ODIHR with data on antisemitic crimes for the purposes of the database, as can be seen in Table 2.

³¹ Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) (2019), [What is hate crime](#).

Table 2: Antisemitic hate crimes in the OSCE region in 2017, official data submitted by EU Member States

EU Member State	Number of antisemitic hate crimes recorded	National points of contact for hate crime
AT	39	Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs; Austrian Federal Chancellery; Federal Ministry of the Interior; Federal Agency for State Protection and Counter Terrorism
CZ	27	Ministry of the Interior, Security Policy Department
DE	233	Federal Ministry of the Interior
DK	38	Danish National Police
EL	4	Prosecutor of Court of First Instance of Athens
ES	6	Observatory for Racism and Xenophobia in Spain
FI	9	National Police Board
FR	311	Ministry of Justice, the National Institution for Human Rights, the police and the Gendarmerie
NL	432	Ministry of Security and Justice
PL	78	Ministry of the Interior, Department of Control, Complaints and Petitions
SK	1	Ministry of Interior
UK	672	In England, Wales and Northern Ireland - Association of Chief Police Officers, the Crown Prosecution Service and the Home Office In Scotland - Procurator Fiscal

Source: [ODIHR online hate crime reporting database](#), data current as of October 2019

Use of IHRA working definition on antisemitism in the Member States

For this update, FRA for the first time collected information from EU Member States on how national, regional or local authorities use or intend to use the [non-legally binding working definition of antisemitism](#) adopted by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) in May 2016. FRA addressed the 14 Member States that had adopted or endorsed the definition by the time of writing this report: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden and the United Kingdom.³² FRA received replies from 11 Member States to the question of if – and how – the national, regional or local authorities use (or intend to use) the IHRA definition.

In 2017, the governments of Austria, Romania, Germany and Bulgaria adopted or endorsed the IHRA definition. FRA received information indicating that, in Austria, the

³² See the IHRA's [webpage on working definitions and charters](#).

IHRA working definition will be used and applied in the context of education and law-enforcement training purposes. It is also employed by the security services.

In 2018, based on the IHRA working definition of antisemitism, Romania adopted a law that prohibits the promotion of antisemitic ideas, the distribution and dissemination of antisemitic material, as well as the initiation and creation of organisations with an antisemitic character. The judicial authorities currently employ the IHRA working definition in identifying and dealing with hate crimes relating to antisemitism. The definition has already been used in training sessions for public servants, including law-enforcement personnel.

In Bulgaria and Germany, the working definition provides the foundation for the work of the appointed national coordinators on combating antisemitism. The Ministry of Justice in Bulgaria sees the definition as an important tool for criminal justice and as useful guidance for law-enforcement authorities in their efforts to identify and investigate antisemitic incidents more efficiently and effectively.

In 2018, the IHRA definition was adopted or endorsed by the governments of Lithuania, the Netherlands, Slovakia, and Belgium. The Prosecutor General's Office, the Police Department, and the State Security Department of Lithuania indicated to FRA that they rely on a definition of antisemitism that essentially corresponds to the IHRA definition. Slovakia reports on the potential application of the definition in training and education activities. Belgium is currently assessing the possible use of the definition.

In 2019, at the time of writing, the governments of Czechia, France and Hungary, and the Ministry of Education of Greece, adopted or endorsed the IHRA definition. Czechia reports on the potential application of the definition in the work of law-enforcement authorities to improve the fight against antisemitism. In France, the working definition is used in training for law-enforcement personnel (police officers, judges and prosecutors) and potentially will be used in the area of education. In Hungary, the Ministry of Interior foresees including the definition in the training system for the law-enforcement sector. The definition will be also applied in the area of education, including in the national curriculum as of 2020.

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. At the time of writing, seven Member States had established cooperation mechanisms with civil society organisations (Belgium, Czechia, Greece, France, Hungary, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom). These include signing an agreement on data sharing and establishing a regular contact framework and communication channels with the authorities.

For the Member States that were covered by FRA's *Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU*, selected findings on experiences of antisemitic harassment and its reporting to the police or other institutions are presented.

How to read the national data

For each Member State, the available data are presented based on the national definitions and classifications. A change in a Member State's statistical data indicates that the number of recorded antisemitic incidents has changed, but does not necessarily mean that there has been an increase or decrease in the number of such incidents.

The number of recorded antisemitic incidents does not characterise the prevalence or nature of antisemitism in any given EU Member State. For example, the higher numbers of antisemitic incidents recorded can demonstrate considerable efforts by a state to make antisemitic incidents visible in their recording and reporting of crime data. High numbers can also reflect improvement and efficiency of the recording system set in place, increased willingness and ability of victims and witnesses to report such incidents, or improved capacity of different organisations or authorities to deal with such incidents accordingly. Specific discrepancies in the annual data (e.g. summing to different totals if breakdowns are applied, etc. by types of incidents) can be determined by a complexity of the recorded incidents or frequency of the update of the recordings.

Official data collection mechanisms alone do not capture the situation on the ground. The antisemitic incidents recorded by the civil society organisations contribute significantly to the full picture. Different channels used to report the antisemitic incidents might refer to varying victims' awareness of organisations to which incidents can be reported, or the degree of trust victims feel in the authorities or organisations to deal with such incidents appropriately.

Even in countries with relatively high numbers of police recorded antisemitic incidents, there is significant underreporting by victims. The evidence from FRA's second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews shows that the majority of experienced antisemitic incidents remain unreported, either to the police or to any other institution or organisation.

Measuring trends in recorded incidents of antisemitism

It is not possible to compare the number of recorded incidents of antisemitism between EU Member States, as the official statistics collected 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 the next, 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 period 2008–2018;
- 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 for which data has been collected without major changes to the recording system or definitions used – this varies from 10 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 graphical trend analysis, but these data are presented in the text and tables in the relevant sections of this report. If the number of recorded incidents is low (in this case, under 20 cases per year in all or most of the years between 2008 and 2018, resulting in a mid-point of the trend line falling under 20 cases), 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 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 24), for other countries, such as France (Figure 11), the data show a high degree of variability (fluctuations) between consecutive years, which might limit the explanatory value of a linear regression model.

It should also be emphasised that ascending or descending trend lines should not be interpreted as actual 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 could be developed for 11 Member States (Austria, Belgium, Czechia, Denmark, Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Sweden and the United Kingdom). Trend lines based on unofficial data could be developed for seven Member States (Belgium, 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 Regional Agencies for State Protection (*Landesämter für Verfassungsschutz*, LVT). These data are published annually in a report on the protection of the constitution (*Verfassungsschutzbericht*), which pertains to right-wing extremism, left-wing extremism, Islamist extremism and terrorism, espionage, and weapons proliferation.³³ 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, 2008–2018


	Recorded antisemitic offences
2008	23
2009	12
2010	27
2011	16
2012	27
2013	37
2014	58
2015	41
2016	41
2017	39
2018	49

Sources: Federal Ministry of the Interior, BVT, 2008–2018

As Figure 3 shows, the 2008–2018 overall trend for recorded antisemitic offences motivated by right-wing extremism in Austria is steadily increasing. The number of incidents remained stable for several years (2015–2017), with 39 cases recorded in 2017, and 49 cases reached in 2018. Recorded antisemitic offences reached their peak in 2014, with 58 cases recorded.

³³ Federal Ministry of the Interior (*Bundesministerium für Inneres*) (2018), [Verfassungsschutzbericht](#).

Figure 3: Recorded antisemitic offences motivated by right-wing extremism in Austria, 2008–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2018.

Sources: Federal Ministry of the Interior, BVT, 2008–2018

The Federal Ministry of the Interior (*Bundesministerium für Inneres*) communicated data to FRA on the nature of these recorded offences, covering the period 2009–2018 (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.

Table 4: Nature of recorded antisemitic offences in Austria, 2009–2018

	Verbal expressions (including on the internet) or damage to property	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
2016	41	0	41
2017	39	0	39
2018	45	4	49

Source: Federal Ministry of the Interior, BVT, 2009–2018

Unofficial data

Non-governmental organisation Civil Courage and Anti-Racism Work (*Zivilcourage und Anti-Rassismus-Arbeit*, ZARA) publishes an annual Racism Report. In its annual reports on racism in Austria until 2017, ZARA included data on the number of racist graffiti reported to it in the preceding calendar year.³⁴ These data are not available in ZARA's Racism Report. Eighty-nine such reports were made to ZARA in 2017; out of these, 47 reports (53 %) involved swastikas or antisemitic graffiti (Table 5).


Table 5: Unofficial data on antisemitic incidents in Austria, ZARA, 2008–2018

	Reported swastikas or antisemitic graffiti
2008	33
2009	86
2010	78
2011	33
2012	22
2013	29
2014	31
2015	33
2016	27
2017	47
2018	n.a.

Source: ZARA, *Racism reports 2008–2018*

The 2008–2017 overall trend was a decrease in the number of reported depictions of swastikas and antisemitic graffiti. After a peak in 2009, when 86 incidents were recorded, a sharp decline followed. However, the number of reported incidents started increasing again after the year 2012, with 47 incidents recorded in the year 2017, which is the highest number of reported depictions of swastikas and antisemitic graffiti in the past five years.

³⁴ Civil Courage and Anti-Racism Work (*Zivilcourage und Anti-Rassismus-Arbeit*, ZARA) (2019), [Rassismus Report 2018](#).

Figure 4: Recorded swastikas or antisemitic graffiti in Austria, ZARA, 2008–2017

Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2017.

Source: ZARA, *Racism reports 2008–2017*

ZARA's Racism Report 2018 includes an inventory of individual case reports on racist attacks in Austria. The examples included provide evidence of antisemitic attacks in the public sphere, the internet and in politics and the (offline) media, which are the spheres of life where most of the racist incidents were reported.

The Forum Against Antisemitism (*Forum gegen Antisemitismus*, FGA) reports annually on antisemitic incidents through its own data collection.³⁵ This includes antisemitic incidents reported to it through emails, phone calls or in person, and through media monitoring. The number of recorded antisemitic incidents has been increasing since 2012, reaching its peak in 2017 with 503 recorded incidents (Table 6). The report for 2018 was not available at the time the data for this overview were compiled.


Table 6: Unofficial data on antisemitic incidents in Austria, FGA, 2008–2018

	FGA: recorded antisemitic incidents
2008	46
2009	200
2010	70
2011	71
2012	135
2013	137
2014	255
2015	465
2016	477
2017	503
2018	n.a.

Source: FGA, 2008–2018

³⁵ Forum Against Antisemitism (*Forum gegen Antisemitismus*, FGA) (2018), [Reports 2013–2017](#).

Figure 5: Unofficial data on antisemitic incidents in Austria, FGA, 2008–2017



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2017.

Source: FGA, 2008–2017

Table 7: Nature of antisemitic incidents recorded in Austria, FGA, 2008–2018

	Insults/ threats	Internet	Letters and calls	Vandalism	Attacks	Other
2008	7	n.a.	n.a.	28	1	n.a.
2009	33	n.a.	n.a.	47	7	n.a.
2010	19	n.a.	n.a.	23	4	n.a.
2011	18	n.a.	n.a.	20	4	n.a.
2012	26	18	38	34	6	13
2013	21	0	52	54	7	3
2014	21	83	85	57	9	n.a.
2015	18	205	185	50	2	5
2016	24	153	198	68	7	27
2017	28	171	203	51	5	45
2018	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: n.a.: not available. From 2008 to 2011 some of the categories used when reporting the data were different than the categories used from 2012 onwards.

Source: FGA, 2008–2018

Findings from FRA's Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

In Austria, 526 respondents filled in the online survey in 2018.

Over one third of the respondents in Austria (38 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. More than one quarter (28 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

Comments made in person, and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents: 19 % and 14 %, respectively, of the respondents in Austria said they were faced with these forms of harassment in the 12 months before the survey. Meanwhile, 10 % said that offensive antisemitic comments concerning them were posted on the internet.

However, the majority of respondents in Austria (71 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.

For comparative findings across all 12 survey countries, please see Figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of this overview.

Belgium

Official data

The Federal Police records and publishes data on Holocaust denial and revisionism, which are reproduced in Table 8.³⁶ The 12 cases recorded in 2017 represent the highest number of cases in 2008–2018.

Table 8: Cases of Holocaust denial and revisionism recorded by the Belgian Federal Police, 2008–2018

	Holocaust denial or trivialisation	Approving of or justifying the Holocaust	Not specified	Total
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	4	4	0	8
2016	1	3	1	5
2017	3	9	0	12
2018	4	6	0	10

Source: Federal Police, 2008–2018

The national equality body in Belgium (Unia, formerly the Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities) has a mandate to receive and handle complaints from members of the public pertaining to discrimination on many grounds. In 2018, it recorded 101 cases related to antisemitism, a significant increase compared with 2017, when it dealt with 56 cases relating to antisemitism (Table 9).³⁷

³⁶ Belgium, Federal Police (2018), [Statistiques policières de criminalité, Belgique 2000–2017 \(French\)](#); [Politiele Criminaliteitsstatistieken \(Dutch\)](#).

³⁷ Unia (2018), [Unia's numbers](#).


Table 9: Complaints of antisemitism received by the national equality body (Unia), 2008–2018

	Complaints of antisemitism
2008	66
2009	109
2010	57
2011	62
2012	88
2013	69
2014	133
2015	51
2016	82
2017	56
2018	101

Source: *Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities and Unia, annual report*

After the sharp increase in the number of complaints of antisemitism filed in 2014, the numbers decreased again in 2015 and 2017, but reached 101 complaints in 2018 (Figure 6). The overall trend of reported complaints of antisemitism for the period 2008-2018 is a regular fluctuation.

Figure 6: Complaints of antisemitism received by the national equality body (Unia), 2008–2018



Note: *The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2018.*

Source: *Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities and Unia, annual report*

In 2018, the national equality body received significantly more complaints in relation to antisemitic verbal aggression and threats (8 complaints in 2017, and 20 in 2018), antisemitic incidents related to the internet (22 and 52, respectively), incidents related to Holocaust denial (21 and 31, respectively), and vandalism (7 and 10, respectively). The number of complaints in other categories (for example, letters or articles, media, violence) remained relatively stable compared with 2017.

Table 10: Complaints of antisemitism received by the national equality body (Unia), 2008–2018

	Verbal aggression and threats	Letters, articles	Media	Internet	Violence	Vandalism	Holocaust denial	Edu-cation	Others
2008	16	3	5	26	0	7	8	n.a.	1
2009	24	1	1	35	10	18	11	n.a.	9
2010	8	3	2	31	7	5	1	n.a.	0
2011	9	6	0	32	6	2	4	n.a.	3
2012	15	5	5	28	4	11	13	n.a.	7
2013	15	9	0	28	5	2	21	1	6
2014	18	8	1	62	7	6	34	6	19
2015	2	5	1	23	3	2	11	1	7
2016	8	4	2	47	4	4	20	4	6
2017	8	3	3	22	1	7	21	1	5
2018	20	3	1	52	0	10	31	3	8

Source: Unia (formerly, Interfederal Centre for Equal Opportunities), 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 line, online contact form and email address, and through regular contact with the national equality body. 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.be³⁸ show that 35 incidents were recorded in 2017, compared to 64 incidents in 2016 (Table 11). The report for 2018 is not available; however, the online archive of the registered incidents for 2018³⁹ include much higher numbers compared with 2017.

³⁸ Antisemitisme.be, [Reports \(French\)](#); [Reports \(Dutch\)](#).

³⁹ [Antisemitisme.be, online archive](#).

Table 11: Antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be, 2008–2018

	Reported antisemitic incidents
2008	73
2009	109
2010	52
2011	65
2012	80
2013	64
2014	109
2015	70
2016	64
2017	35
2018	n.a.

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

As Table 12 shows, there is a great degree of variance in the types of antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be. Following the shooting on 24 May 2014 at the Jewish Museum of Belgium, where 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 have accounted for the largest proportions of reported incidents in most years. In 2017, there was an increase in recorded antisemitic incidents in two categories: ‘threats’ and ‘desecration/property damage’.


Table 12: Types of antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be, 2009–2018

	Violence	Threats	Desecration/ Property damage	Ideological	Internet	Attack
2009	11	13	22	29	34	n.a.
2010	7	3	5	12	25	n.a.
2011	7	5	3	23	27	n.a.
2012	5	6	13	26	30	n.a.
2013	6	4	5	28	21	n.a.
2014	6	11	11	33	36	1
2015	3	11	3	24	29	0
2016	7	2	7	25	23	0
2017	1	6	8	13	7	0
2018	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Note: *n.a.: not available.*

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

Figure 7: Antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be, 2008–2017



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2017.

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

The number of incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be in the observed period (Figure 7) decreased nearly by half from 2016 to 2017. The highest figures were reported in 2009 and 2014 (both 109 incidents).

Findings from FRA’s Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

In Belgium, 785 respondents filled in the online survey in 2018.

Half of the respondents in Belgium (51 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. More than one third (39 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

Comments made in person, and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents: 25 % and 26 %, respectively, of the respondents in Belgium said they faced these forms of harassment in the 12 months before the survey. Meanwhile, 12 % said that offensive antisemitic comments concerning them were posted on the internet.

However, the majority of respondents in Belgium (81 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.

For comparative findings across all 12 survey countries, please see Figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of this overview.

Bulgaria

Official data

In Bulgaria, the Supreme Cassation Prosecutors' Office reported no cases of persons convicted of antisemitic crimes in 2018. The office did report two case investigations for antisemitism for the year 2018: (1) vandalism on the Synagogue building in Sofia (art. 164, para 2, Criminal Code); and (2) vandalism on a memorial sign indicating the location of a concentration camp near the town of Pleven (art. 162, para 1, Criminal Code). Criminal proceedings were initiated against unknown perpetrators. The investigations were suspended because the perpetrators were not found.

The Bulgarian government has informed FRA that, in 2017, one person was convicted of an antisemitic crime (Table 13).

Table 13: Persons convicted of antisemitic crimes, Ministry of Justice, 2008–2018

	Persons convicted of antisemitic crimes
2008	n.a.
2009	1
2010	0
2011	0
2012	0
2013	1
2014	1
2015	2
2016	1
2017	1
2018	0

Note: n.a.: not available.

Source: Computing Center to the Chief Directorate of Implementation of Penal Sanctions at the Ministry of Justice

Unofficial data

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

Croatia

Official data

In 2018, Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Croatia recorded eight criminal offences motivated by antisemitism. This is the highest number of offences since 2012.

Of these eight criminal offences motivated by antisemitism, seven were committed by one offender. This individual wrote antisemitic messages on the doors of public service buildings. Another criminal offence committed was the publication of antisemitic messages on Facebook.

Table 14: Criminal offences motivated by antisemitism recorded by the Ministry of the Interior, 2012–2018

	Recorded criminal offences motivated by antisemitism
2012	1
2013	0
2014	0
2015	2
2016	2
2017	0
2018	8

Source: Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Croatia, 2012–2018

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 with Racial Motive". According to data collected between 2015 and 2018, no antisemitic incidents were recorded by the police in 2018, 2017, 2016 or 2015.

Unofficial data

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

Czechia

Official data

Every year, the Ministry of the Interior publishes a report on the issue of extremism in Czechia, as part of the government’s strategy on combating extremism.⁴⁰ These reports also provide data on the number of recorded criminal offences motivated by antisemitism (Table 15).⁴¹


Table 15: Recorded criminal offences motivated by antisemitism in Czechia, 2008–2018

Year	Recorded criminal offences
2008	27
2009	48
2010	28
2011	18
2012	9
2013	15
2014	45
2015	47
2016	28
2017	27
2018	15

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

After recording more than 40 antisemitic offences for two consecutive years (2014–2015), the number of recorded offences decreased to the high 20s in 2016–2017, and again decreased – to 15 offences – in 2018 (Figure 8).

Figure 8: Recorded criminal offences motivated by antisemitism in Czechia, 2008–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2018.

Source: Ministry of the Interior, 2008–2018

⁴⁰ Czechia, Ministry of the Interior (2019), [Výroční zprávy o extremismu a koncepcie boje proti extremismu](#).

⁴¹ Czechia, Ministry of the Interior (2019), [Zpráva o extremismu na území České republiky v roce 2018](#).

Unofficial data

The Federation of the Jewish Communities in the Czech Republic (*Federace židovských obcí v ČR*) reports annually on antisemitic incidents in Czechia.⁴² This includes incidents reported to it by members of the public, as well as incidents the Federation of the Jewish Communities in the Czech Republic identifies itself through its own data collection. In 2018, the Federation launched its [online reporting form](#). The Federation uses the [International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance \(IHRA\) working definition of antisemitism](#). It published a report on antisemitic incidents in 2018, but no data has been made available for 2016 and 2017.

In 2018, 347 antisemitic incidents were registered by the Federation of the Jewish Communities in the Czech Republic, the highest number since 2008. The number of antisemitic incidents in relation to the media or web (i.e. public manifestations of antisemitism not addressed to a specific individual, institution or Jewish property) has significantly increased – 333 incidents were recorded in 2018, compared with around 200 incidents in 2014–2015. The overall trend for the period 2008–2018 shows an increase in antisemitic incidents in Czechia (Table 16, Figure 9).

⁴² 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 2018](#), available also in English: [Annual Report on Manifestations of Antisemitism in the Czech Republic in 2018](#).

Table 16: Numbers and types of antisemitic incidents recorded in Czechia, 2008–2018

	Attacks		Threats, insults and harassment*	Harassment	Media/web	Total
	Physical	Property				
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
2016	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
2017	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
2018	2	3	9**	n.a.	333	347


Note: n.a.: not available.

* The category 'Threats, insults and harassment' was created only in 2018. Until 2015, the data included in this category only concerned 'threats'; 'harassment' was treated as a separate category.

** Not comparable to previous years due to changes in categorisation.

Sources: Forum Against Antisemitism, 2006–2010; Jewish Community of Prague, 2011–2018; Federation of the Jewish Communities in the Czech Republic, 2018

Figure 9: Antisemitic incidents recorded by Federation of the Jewish Communities in the Czech Republic, 2008–2018



Note: Data for 2016 and 2017 are not available.

Sources: Federation of the Jewish Communities in the Czech Republic, 2008–2018

Denmark

Official data

As of 1 January 2015, the overall responsibility for hate crime data collection was transferred from the Danish Security and Intelligence Service (*Politiets Efterretningstjeneste*, PET) to the Danish National Police. Due to this change and a number of changes in the method used to identify and record hate crimes in the system, the data before and after 2015 are not fully comparable. In 2018, the Danish National Police recorded 26 crimes motivated by antisemitism; in 2017, it recorded 38 crimes; and in 2016 - 21 crimes.⁴³

Table 17: Extremist crimes targeting Jews recorded by PET, 2011–2013, and crimes motivated by antisemitism recorded by the Danish National Police, 2015–2018

	Recorded crimes
2011	5
2012	15
2013	10
2014	n.a.
2015	13*
2016	21
2017	38
2018	26

Notes: n.a.: not available.

* Not comparable to previous years due to changes in methodology.

Sources: PET, 2011–2013; Danish National Police, 2015–2018

Unofficial data

Unofficial data on antisemitism in Denmark are available from the Mosaic Religious Community (*Det Mosaiske Trossamfund*, MT). The most recent report available concerns incidents recorded in 2017, when MT recorded 30 antisemitic incidents, compared with 22 incidents in 2016 (Table 18).⁴⁴ The Mosaic Religious Community informed FRA that, in 2018, 45 antisemitic incidents were registered.

⁴³ Denmark, Danish Security and Intelligence Service (*Politiets Efterretningstjeneste*, PET) (2015), [Kriminelle forhold i 2013 med mulig ekstremistisk baggrund](#); Danish National Police (2018), [Statistik](#).

⁴⁴ Denmark, Mosaic Religious Community (*Det Mosaiske Trossamfund*, MT) (2018), [Rapport om antisemitiske hændelser i Danmark 2017](#).

Table 18: Antisemitic incidents recorded by the Mosaic Religious Community, 2008–2018


	Recorded incidents
2008	4
2009	22
2010	n.a.
2011	n.a.
2012	40
2013	44
2014	54
2015	26
2016	22
2017	30
2018	45

Note: n.a.: not available

Source: Mosaic Religious Community, 2008–2018

After the number of recorded antisemitic incidents dropped to 22 incidents in 2016, there was an increase in reported antisemitic incidents, with 30 cases reported in 2017. However, the overall trend line seems to be decreasing, regardless of the increase in incidents for the years 2017 and 2018. The year 2014 still represents the year with the highest number of reported antisemitic incidents, with 54 recorded (Figure 10).

Figure 10: Antisemitic incidents recorded in Denmark by the Mosaic Religious Community, 2012–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2012–2018.

Source: Mosaic Religious Community, 2012–2018

Findings from FRA's Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

In Denmark, 592 respondents filled in the online survey in 2018.

Almost half of the respondents in Denmark (41 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. Almost a third (29 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

Comments made in person, and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents: 19 % and 15 %, respectively, of the respondents in Denmark said they faced these forms of harassment in the 12 months before the survey. Meanwhile, 9 % said that offensive antisemitic comments concerning them were posted on the internet.

However, the majority of respondents in Denmark (80 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.

For comparative findings across all 12 survey countries, please see Figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of this overview.

Estonia

Official data

The Estonian government informed FRA that there have been no reported antisemitic incidents or crimes in 2018, 2017, 2016 and 2015.

Since 2016, the Ministry of Justice of Estonia has been publishing an annual report (as a separate chapter in its *Crime in Estonia* crime statistics yearbook)⁴⁵ on suspected hate crimes reported to the police. The data for this publication are based, among other methods, on keyword searches of police reports enabling the identification of hate crimes.

Unofficial data

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

⁴⁵ The reports are available [online](#).

Finland

Official data

Every year, the Police University College of Finland (*Poliisiammattikorkeakoulu*) publishes a report on suspected hate crimes reported to the police.⁴⁶ The data for this publication are based on crimes classified as hate crimes at the recording stage, specific crime categories, as well as keyword searches of police reports enabling the identification of hate crimes. Since 2008, the report has covered religiously motivated hate crimes, including antisemitic crimes (Table 19). Data for 2018 were not yet published at the time of writing this report.

Table 19: Numbers and types of antisemitic crimes reported to the police, 2008–2018

	Verbal insult, threat, harassment	Physical assault (unilateral)	Property crime	Physical assault (mutual)	Crime after verbal provocation	Discrimination	Homicide	Total
2008	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1
2009	4	3	1	1	1	0	n.a.	10
2010	2	1	1	0	0	0	n.a.	4
2011	0	4	2	0	0	0	n.a.	6
2012	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
2013	6	1	3	1	0	0	0	11
2014	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	7
2015	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	8
2016	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	10
2017	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	9
2018	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Note: n.a.: not available.

Source: Police University College of Finland, 2008–2018

Unofficial data

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

⁴⁶ Finland, Police University College of Finland (*Poliisiammattikorkeakoulu*) (2018), [Poliisin tietoon tullut viharikollisuus Suomessa 2017](#).

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. The report gathers official data on racist and antisemitic acts, submitted by the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Justice.⁴⁷ In addition, it includes verified information broadcasted in the media.

This report covers antisemitic actions and threats (Table 20). 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 recorded number of antisemitic actions and threats in France in 2014 (851), the number dropped sharply to 335 in 2016. The decreasing trend continued until 2017, when 311 antisemitic actions and threats were recorded.⁴⁸ According to CNCDH, this decrease is partly due to the protective measures that were put in place by the public authorities within the framework of France's security system Plan Vigipirate. However, the number of recorded actions and threats increased significantly in 2018 (541) compared with the two previous years (Figure 9).

Table 20: Antisemitic actions and threats recorded in France, 2008–2018


	Antisemitic actions and threats
2008	459
2009	815
2010	466
2011	389
2012	614
2013	423
2014	851
2015	808
2016	335
2017	311
2018	541

Source: CNCDH annual reports; for 2018 data: Ministry of Interior

⁴⁷ France, National Consultative Commission on Human Rights (*Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme*, CNCDH) (2018), [Racism reports](#).

⁴⁸ France, CNCDH (2018), [La Lutte contre le Racisme, l'Antisémitisme et la Xénophobie: les Essentiels](#).

Figure 11: Antisemitic actions and threats recorded in France, 2008–2018




Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2018.

Source: CNCDH, 2008–2018

A separate trend analysis for actions and threats over the 2010–2018 period shows that threats (214 in 2017 and 358 in 2018) are consistently reported in higher numbers than actions (97 in 2017 and 183 in 2018). The total number of antisemitic actions increased by 74 % in 2018 compared with 2017 (Figure 11, Tables 21 and 22).

Figure 12: Antisemitic actions and threats recorded in France, 2010–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression lines indicate the trends based on data for 2010–2018.

Source: CNCDH, 2010–2018

No data for a further breakdown of antisemitic threats by category are available for 2018. Instead of the five categories used in other years for statistics on antisemitic actions, the 2018 statistics by the CNCDH combine some categories, as shown in Table 21.

Table 21: Types of antisemitic actions recorded in France, 2010–2018

	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
2016	2	40	0	0	35	77
2017	1	29	0	3	64	97
2018		81		102		183

Source: CNCDH, 2010–2018

Table 22: Types of antisemitic threats recorded in France, 2010–2018

	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
2016	136	36	86	258
2017	94	34	86	214
2018	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	358

Source: CNCDH, 2010–2018

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 cooperates with the Ministry of the Interior in an effort to paint a more accurate picture of the situation of antisemitism in France. In its annual report on antisemitism, the SPCJ replicates the data from the CNCDH presented above.⁴⁹ The latest report available is for 2017; it provides a breakdown by geographical area of the incidents and lists illustrative examples of antisemitic acts and threats.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ For more information on the Service for the Protection of the Jewish Community (SPCJ), see [the website of Antisémitisme en France](#).

⁵⁰ France, Service for the Protection of the Jewish Community (*Service de Protection de la Communauté Juive*, SPCJ) (2019), [Report on Antisemitism in France in 2017](#).

Findings from FRA's Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

In France, 3,869 respondents filled in the online survey in 2018.

Over one third of the respondents in France (37 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. Over one quarter (27 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

Comments made in person, and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents: 15 % and 16 %, respectively, of the respondents in France said they faced these forms of harassment in the 12 months before the survey. Meanwhile, 10 % said that offensive antisemitic comments concerning them were posted on the internet.

The majority of respondents in France (80 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.

For comparative findings across all 12 survey countries, please see Figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of this overview.

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 23) and on the number of antisemitic acts of violence (Table 24) are collected under the separate subheading “antisemitism” of the main topic “hate crime”. The data are also subdivided into right-wing crime, left-wing crime, crime based on foreign ideology, religious ideology and ‘not attributable’, to get a multi-dimensional view on the motivation and background of the perpetrators. These five categories are in place since January 2017. Until December 2016, the separate category religiously motivated crime did not exist. The respective crimes were until then part of the category “foreign ideology”.

In 2018, 1,799 politically motivated crimes with an antisemitic motive (Table 23) were recorded, the highest number recorded in 2008–2018.

Table 23: Number of politically motivated crimes with a presumed antisemitic motive by category of perpetrator recorded in Germany, 2008–2018

	Right-wing	Left-wing	Foreign ideology	Religious ideology*	Not attributable	Total
2008	1,496	5	41	n.a.	17	1,559
2009	1,520	4	101	n.a.	65	1,690
2010	1,192	1	53	n.a.	22	1,268
2011	1,188	6	24	n.a.	21	1,239
2012	1,314	3	38	n.a.	19	1,374
2013	1,218	0	31	n.a.	26	1,275
2014	1,342	7	176	n.a.	71	1,596
2015	1,246	5	78	n.a.	37	1,366
2016	1,381	2	48	n.a.	37	1,468
2017	1,412	1	71*	30	20	1,504
2018	1,603	14	102	52	28	1,799


Note: n.a.: not available.

* The categories were changed in 2017. Before this, ‘religious ideology’ was included in the category ‘foreign ideology’.

Source: KPMD PMK, 2008–2018

In last year’s overview of data on antisemitism, the number of recorded politically motivated antisemitic crimes in Germany was observed to follow a decreasing trend. However, following the highest number of crimes ever being recorded in 2018 (1,799), the direction of the trend has changed course and now suggests an overall increasing trend between 2008–2018 (Figure 13).

Figure 13: Politically motivated crimes with an antisemitic motive recorded in Germany, 2008–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2018.

Source: KMPD PMK, 2008–2018

Table 24: Number of politically motivated acts of violence with a presumed antisemitic motive by category of perpetrator recorded in Germany, 2008–2018

	Right-wing	Left-wing	Foreign ideology	Religious ideology*	Not attributable	Total
2008	44	2	1	n.a.	0	47
2009	31	0	9	n.a.	1	41
2010	31	0	6	n.a.	0	37
2011	26	1	2	n.a.	0	29
2012	37	0	4	n.a.	0	41
2013	46	0	4	n.a.	1	51
2014	32	1	12	n.a.	0	45
2015	30	1	4	n.a.	1	36
2016	32	0	1	n.a.	1	34
2017	29	0	6*	1	2	37
2018	49	3	10	4	3	69


Note: n.a.: not available.

* The categories were changed in 2017. Before, 'religious ideology' was counted as 'foreign ideology'.

Source: KMPD PMK, 2008–2018

The overall trend in recorded antisemitic acts of violence tended to decline or stabilise for the period 2008–2017. Again, in 2018, the highest number ever was recorded (69), which had an impact on the trend (Figure 14).

Figure 14: Politically motivated acts of violence with an antisemitic motive recorded in Germany, 2008–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2018.

Source: KMPD PMK, 2008–2018

Unofficial data

The Department for Research and Information on Antisemitism (RIAS) operates a network consisting of Jewish organisations and civil society organisations for reporting antisemitic incidents. RIAS collects the data from its reporting website www.report-antisemitism.de, via phone and social media, from Jewish communities and other CSOs, and from the Anti-discrimination commissioner in the Berlin Senate Department for Education, Youth and Family. RIAS has regular meetings with the Berlin state police and their statistics department to discuss individual incidents and receives police data on a quarterly basis. Relevant incidents are also included in RIAS database.

In 2018, RIAS recorded 1,083 antisemitic incidents in Berlin. These include 46 attacks against the person, 46 threats, 43 incidents of property damage, 831 cases of abusive behaviour (of which 442 online) and 117 incidents of antisemitic propaganda (e.g. emails).⁵¹ RIAS communicated to FRA that, across Germany in 2018, it had further recorded 64 incidents of physical violence, 72 threats or threatening behaviour, 14 incidents of damages to property, 255 incidents of vandalism, nine grave desecrations and 11 raids on places of worship.

The Amadeu Antonio Foundation in Germany has been collecting data on antisemitic incidents from the German press and from projects and initiatives concerned with antisemitism since 2002. These data are presented as a chronology, which is updated on a continual basis.⁵² 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.

⁵¹ RIAS (2019), [Antisemitische Vorfälle 2018](#).

⁵² Antonio Amadeu Foundation, [Chronik antisemitischer Vorfälle](#).

Table 26 shows a great degree of fluctuation in the number of antisemitic incidents recorded by the Amadeu Antonio Foundation between 2008 and 2017. In 2017, the highest number of incidents (257) was recorded since 2008. In 2018, 210 antisemitic incidents were recorded.


Table 26: Antisemitic incidents in Germany recorded by the Antonio Amadeu Foundation, 2008–2018

	Recorded antisemitic incidents
2008	89
2009	59
2010	87
2011	47
2012	32
2013	66
2014	178
2015	105
2016	176
2017	257
2018	210

Source: Amadeu Antonio Foundation, 2008–2018

Despite the great range in numbers of recorded antisemitic incidents between 2008–2017, the peak number of incidents recorded in 2017 adds to an overall increasing trend in the period of 2008–2018 (Figure 15).

Figure 15: Antisemitic incidents in Germany recorded by the Antonio Amadeu Foundation, 2008–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2018.

Source: Amadeu Antonio Foundation, 2008–2018.

Findings from FRA's Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

In Germany, 1,233 respondents filled in the online survey in 2018.

More than half of the respondents in Germany (52 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. More than a third (41 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

Comments made in person, and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents: 29 % and 24 %, respectively, of the respondents in Germany said they faced these forms of harassment in the 12 months before the survey. Meanwhile, 15 % said that offensive antisemitic comments were posted on the internet.

The majority of respondents in Germany (79 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.

For comparative findings across all 12 survey countries, please see Figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of this overview.

Greece

Official data

The Directorate of State Security informed FRA that the Hellenic police services recorded and referred to the Ministry of Justice ten incidents motivated by antisemitism in 2018, seven in 2017, three in 2016 and one in 2015. The cases concern antisemitism online, putting up an antisemitic sign at the workplace, daubing antisemitic slogans on a Holocaust remembrance monument, desecration of a Jewish cemetery, and hate speech during a public meeting. In 2018, criminal prosecutions for five of these cases had been initiated.

Table 27: Number of incidents motivated by antisemitism recorded by police and number of prosecuted cases pertaining to antisemitism in Greece, 2010–2018

	Incidents motivated by antisemitism	Prosecuted cases
2010	5	5
2011	3	3
2012	1	1
2013	0	0
2014	4	2
2015	1	1
2016	3	1
2017	7	4
2018	10	5

Source: *Hellenic Police Headquarters; District Attorneys' Offices to the Ministry of Justice, Transparency and Human Rights, 2010–2018*

Unofficial data

In 2018, the Racist Violence Recording Network (RVRN) recorded nine antisemitic incidents, which targeted Jewish sacred or symbolic places and the Jewish community.⁵³ By comparison, it recorded 12 antisemitic incidents in 2017. RVRN was created by the Greek office of UNHCR and the National Commission for Human Rights to monitor and record hate crime in Greece. It consists of 42 civil society organisations.

⁵³ Racist Violence Recording Network (2019), [Annual report 2018](#).

Hungary

Official data

No official data on antisemitism are recorded in Hungary.

Unofficial data

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

In 2018, TEV recorded 32 antisemitic incidents. Among these, three incidents were categorised as assault, 10 incidents were property damage, and 19 were identified as hate speech.⁵⁴

Table 28: Number of recorded antisemitic hate crimes in Hungary, TEV, 2013–2018


	Recorded antisemitic incidents
2013	61*
2014	37
2015	52
2016	48
2017	37
2018	32

Notes: * Between May 2013 and December 2013.

Source: TEV, 2013–2018

When looking at the 2013–2018 period, the number of recorded antisemitic incidents has been dropping. This results in an overall decreasing trend (Figure 16). Most of these incidents involve hate speech, followed by vandalism (Table 29).

⁵⁴ Action and Protection Foundation (TEV) (2019), [Annual reports](#).

Figure 16: Recorded antisemitic incidents in Hungary, TEV, 2013–2018

Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2013–2018.

Source: TEV, 2013–2018

Table 29: Numbers and types of antisemitic incidents recorded in Hungary, TEV, 2014–2018

	Attack	Threats	Vandalism	Hate speech	Discrimination
2014	1	2	2	32	0
2015	2	2	5	43	0
2016	0	1	10	37	0
2017	0	0	13	24	0
2018	3	0	10	19	0

Source: TEV, 2014–2018

Findings from FRA's Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

In Hungary, 590 respondents filled in the online survey in 2018.

One third of the respondents in Hungary (35 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. A quarter (23 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

Comments made in person, and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents: 17 % and 11 %, respectively, of the respondents in Hungary said they faced these forms of harassment in the 12 months before the survey. Meanwhile, 7 % said that offensive antisemitic comments concerning them were posted on the internet.

The majority of respondents in Hungary (88 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.

For comparative findings across all 12 survey countries, please see Figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of this overview.

Ireland

Official data

The Central Statistics Office (CSO) in Ireland published the number of antisemitic incidents reported to the police between 2007 and 2015. No data were available for 2018, 2017 or 2016 at the time this report was compiled.

Unofficial data

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

Italy

Official data

The Division for General Investigations and Special Operations (DIGOS) collects data on antisemitic criminal conduct, which the Ministry of the Interior communicated to FRA. Table 30 shows the number of incidents of antisemitic criminal conduct recorded in Italy. In 2018, the number of incidents recorded increased (56) compared with 2016–2017 (around 30 incidents).

Table 30: Recorded incidents of antisemitic criminal conduct in Italy, 2010–2018

	Cases total
2010	16
2011	23
2012	28
2013	50
2014	68
2015	50
2016	35
2017	32
2018	56

Source: DIGOS, 2010–2018


Table 31: Cited persons and arrested persons in connection with antisemitic criminal conduct in Italy, 2010–2018

	Cited persons	Arrested persons
2010	9	0
2011	1	1
2012	20	6
2013	43	0
2014	25	0
2015	23	0
2016	27	0
2017	19	0
2018	19	0

Source: DIGOS, 2010–2018

After several consecutive years of increases, the number of recorded incidents of antisemitic criminal conduct decreased slightly in 2015–2017. However, the higher number of recorded incidents in 2018 contributes to an overall increasing trend (Figure 17).

Figure 17: Recorded incidents of antisemitic criminal conduct in Italy, 2010–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2010–2018.

Source: DIGOS, 2010–2018

Unofficial data

The Observatory of Contemporary Anti-Jewish Prejudice (*Osservatorio sul pregiudizio antiebraico contemporaneo*) records incidents of antisemitism in Italy, with a particular focus on the internet.⁵⁵ As Table 32 shows, the number of antisemitic incidents recorded in 2018 (181) is the highest number recorded between 2008 and 2018.

Table 32: Recorded antisemitic incidents in Italy, 2008–2018


	Recorded incidents
2008	35
2009	47
2010	31
2011	58
2012	87
2013	49
2014	86
2015	61
2016	130
2017	111
2018	181

Source: Observatory of Contemporary Anti-Jewish Prejudice, 2008–2018

⁵⁵ Osservatorio antisemitismo, [Episodi di antisemitismo in Italia](#).

Following several years of alternately increasing and decreasing numbers, the recorded antisemitic incidents in the year 2018 mark the peak in the reference period. The overall trend of the period 2008–2018 shows an increase in antisemitic incidents in Italy (Figure 18).

Figure 18: Recorded antisemitic incidents in Italy, 2008–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2018.

Source: Observatory of Contemporary Anti-Jewish Prejudice, 2008–2018

Findings from FRA's Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

In Italy, 682 respondents filled in the online survey in 2018.

More than one third of the respondents in Italy (36 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. A quarter of the respondents (25 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

Comments made in person, and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents: 13 % and 11 %, respectively, of the respondents in Italy said they faced these forms of harassment in the 12 months before the survey. Meanwhile, 12 % said that offensive antisemitic comments concerning them were posted on the internet.

However, the majority of respondents in Italy (77 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.

For comparative findings across all 12 survey countries, please see Figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of this overview.

Latvia

Official data

The Latvian government informed FRA that no antisemitic crimes were recorded in 2018 and 2017. In 2016, one case related to the desecration of Jewish graves was successfully prosecuted. No antisemitic crimes were recorded in 2015.

Unofficial data

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

Lithuania

Official data

In 2018, the Lithuanian State Security Department (*Valstybės saugumo departamentas*) recorded one antisemitic incident (against an object related to the Jewish community). According to the data from the Prosecutor General's Office, one pre-trial investigation was initiated in 2018 under Article 169 of the Criminal Code alleging discrimination of a person on the grounds of their Jewish ethnicity; it was discontinued in the absence of a criminal act.

In 2014–2017, three pre-trial investigations under Article 312 (2) of the Criminal Code were initiated – these concerned incidents where places of public respect had been desecrated for antisemitic reasons. All of these pre-trial investigations were discontinued because the offenders liable for the criminal offence were not identified.⁵⁶

The Lithuanian State Security Department recorded two antisemitic incidents in 2009, and one incident between January and July 2010.

The Prosecutor General's Office reports on pre-trial investigations initiated under Article 170 of the Criminal Code (incitement against any national, racial, religious or other group); in 2008, 12 cases were initiated. In 2009, 20 % of pre-trial investigations under Article 170 involved an antisemitic motive, but the report does not provide the number of cases.⁵⁷

Unofficial data

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

⁵⁶ UN CERD (2018), [CERD/C/LTU/9-10, 23/5/2018](#), paras. 37-51.

⁵⁷ Lithuania (2011), [Collegiate Council of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Lithuania](#).

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 2018. Two cases pertaining to antisemitism (negationism) were recorded by the police in 2016, and the judgments were issued in 2017. No cases pertaining to antisemitism were dealt with by the criminal justice system, and no antisemitism incidents were recorded by the police, in 2015.

Unofficial data

In 2018, the Activity Report by the organisation Research and Information on Antisemitism in Luxembourg (*Recherche et Information sur l'Antisémitisme au Luxembourg*, RIAL)⁵⁸ recorded 26 antisemitic incidents, consisting of revisionism, harassment, and written and oral hate speech. The data are collected through reporting to the organisation's online database, from social networks and media. The incidents are then validated and analysed. In 2017, RIAL recorded 13 antisemitic incidents.

As Table 33 shows, among the recorded incidents, written hate speech is the most prevalent type of antisemitic incident in Luxembourg.

Table 33: Number of recorded antisemitic incidents in Luxembourg, RIAL, 2017–2018

	Revisionism	Harassment	Written hate speech	Oral hate speech	Acts of violence
2017	1	3	7	1	1
2018	2	2	20	2	0

Source: *Research and Information on Antisemitism, 2017-2019*

⁵⁸ Organisation 'Research and Information on Antisemitism in Luxembourg' (*Recherche et Information sur l'Antisémitisme au Luxembourg* – RIAL), Activity Report 2018.

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*), currently outsourced to the Verwey-Jonker Institute by the 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 34 summarises the data on antisemitism published in *Poldis* between 2008 and 2018.⁵⁹ The number of antisemitic incidents recorded in the Netherlands in 2012 is not comparable with that of previous years due to 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’.”⁶⁰ According to *Poldis*, this change led to fewer antisemitic incidents being recorded under the generic categories of ‘race’, ‘religion’ or ‘belief’, with a commensurate increase of incidents reported under the subcategory ‘Jewish’.

⁵⁹ See Rijksoverheid (2011), [Poldis 2010: Criminaliteitsbeeld discriminatie](#); Rijksoverheid (2012), [Poldis rapportage 2011](#); Tierhof, B., Hermens, N., Drost, L. and van der Vos, L. (2013), [Poldis rapportage 2012 – Met themarapportage antisemitisme](#); Tierhof, B., Hermens, N., Drost, L. and Scheffelaar, A. (2014), [Poldis rapportage 2013 – Met themarapportage moslimdiscriminatie](#); Tierhof, B., Hermens, N. and Drost, L. (2015), [Discriminatiecijfers Politie 2014](#); Art. 1 (2016), [Discriminatiecijfers in 2015: Landelijk overzicht van klachten en meldingen over discriminatie](#).

⁶⁰ Tierhof, B., Hermens, N., Drost, L. and van der Vos, L. (2013), [Poldis rapportage 2012 – Met themarapportage antisemitisme](#), p. 12.

Table 34: Number of reported criminal discriminatory antisemitic incidents in the Netherlands, 2008–2018


	Antisemitic incidents	As a % of all criminal discriminatory incidents
2008	141	6
2009	209	9
2010	286	11
2011	294	13
2012	859*	26*
2013	717	21
2014	358**	6**
2015	428	8
2016	335	8
2017	284	8
2018	275	8

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

** Not comparable with previous years due to a change in the recording procedure, from regional to national data collection.

Source: LECD-Police and Verwey-Jonker Institute, 2008–2018

Figure 19: Number of reported criminal discriminatory antisemitic incidents in the Netherlands, 2014–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2014–2018.

Source: Police’s National Expertise Centre on Diversity – Criminaliteitsbeeld discriminatie, 2014–2018

In 2018, the police recorded 275 incidents with antisemitic connotations, compared to 284 incidents recorded in 2017. There were some changes in data collection between 2014 and 2015. However, according to the authors of the *Poldis* report, the numbers could still be compared to give a sense of the evolution of the phenomenon of discrimination that is recorded. As Figure 16 shows, in the period between 2014 and 2018, the overall trend is decreasing, while the peak number was recorded in 2015 with 428 incidents with antisemitic connotations.⁶¹

As Table 35 shows, there is fluctuation in the number of incidents of antisemitic discrimination reported to anti-discrimination bureaux in the Netherlands.⁶²

Table 35: Number of incidents of antisemitic discrimination reported to anti-discrimination bureaux in the Netherlands, 2008–2018

	Number of incidents of antisemitic discrimination
2008	123
2009	129
2010	124
2011	134
2012	91*
2013	66*
2014	147
2015	104
2016	122
2017	67
2018	48


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

Source: Art.1, 2008–2018

⁶¹ Art.1 (2016), [Discriminatiecijfers in 2015: Landelijk overzicht van klachten en meldingen over discriminatie](#), p. 62.

⁶² Art.1 (2016), [Kerncijfers 2015: Landelijk overzicht van klachten en meldingen over discriminatie](#).

Figure 20: Number of incidents of antisemitic discrimination reported to anti-discrimination bureaus in the Netherlands, 2013–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2013–2018.

Source: National organisation of anti-discrimination bureaus, *Landelijke Brancheorganisatie van Antidiscriminatiebureaus, 2013–2018*

In 2018, the police recorded 48 incidents of antisemitic discrimination reported to anti-discrimination bureaus in the Netherlands, compared to 67 incidents recorded in 2017. There were some changes in the data collection practices in 2013 and therefore figures for earlier years (available in Table 35) have been left out of the trend analysis. As Figure 19 shows, between 2013 and 2018, the overall trend is decreasing. The peak number was recorded in 2014, with 147 incidents of antisemitic discrimination.

The Netherlands Public Prosecution Service (*Openbaar Ministerie*) publishes annual data on punishable discriminatory offences.⁶³ In 2018, 83 offences were registered with the public prosecutor (Table 36). Out of these 83 specific discrimination cases, antisemitism was the second largest category for discrimination (19 %), after the category ‘race, skin colour or ethnic descent of the victim’, which accounts for 51 % of the cases. It should be noted that in 2018 there was a substantial decrease in the number of discrimination cases during or in relation to sports events (from 42 % in 2017 to 7 % in 2018). This is due to the fact that the 2017 figure relates to one specific sporting event that resulted in a large number of prosecutable offences.

⁶³ Openbaar Ministerie (2018), [Bijlage 5 Strafbare discriminatie in beeld 2017](#).

Table 36: Number of prosecuted discriminatory antisemitic offences in the Netherlands, 2013–2018

	Antisemitic offences	As a % of all criminal discriminatory offences
2013	34	39 %
2014	43	30 %
2015	40	28 %
2016	36	22 %
2017	59*	41 %
2018	15	19 %

Notes: * Not comparable with previous years due to a change in the recording procedure – the increase in 2017 is due to police and the Public Prosecution Service in Rotterdam dealing with discrimination cases immediately (on the spot) during events around football matches. It should be noted that this figure does not mean that more people are discriminated against in the Netherlands, or more specifically in the Rotterdam-area than in previous years.

Source: Openbaar Ministerie (2018), [Strafbare Discriminatie in Beeld 2017](#)

Following an increase between 2013 and 2014, the data for 2015, 2016 and 2018 dropped again, with the overall trend of prosecuted discriminatory antisemitic offences decreasing.

Unofficial data

In addition to the Anne Frank Foundation, which replicates data from the police in its periodic reporting on racist, antisemitic and extremist violence in the Netherlands,⁶⁴ the Information and Documentation Centre Israel (*Centrum Informatie en Documentatie Israël*, CIDI) monitors and collects data on antisemitic incidents.

Every year, CIDI publishes data on the number of antisemitic incidents reported to it through hotlines it operates throughout the Netherlands.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ Anne Frank Foundation (2018), [Vijfde rapportage racisme, antisemitisme en extreemrechts geweld](#).

⁶⁵ Information and Documentation Centre Israel (*Centrum Informatie en Documentatie Israël*, CIDI) (2019), [Antisemitismerrapporten](#).


Table 37: Data on antisemitic incidents collected by CIDI in the Netherlands, 2008–2018

	Reported incidents
2008	108
2009	167
2010	124
2011	112
2012	96
2013	100
2014	171
2015	126
2016	109
2017	113*
2018	135

Notes: *Excluding internet.

Sources: CIDI, 2008–2018

Figure 21: Data on antisemitic incidents collected by CIDI in the Netherlands, 2008–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2018–2018.

Source: Information and Documentation Centre Israel (CIDI), 2008–2018

In the year 2018, there were 135 antisemitic incidents reported by the Information and Documentation Centre Israel (CIDI) in the Netherlands, compared to 113 cases recorded in year 2017. The year 2014 marks the peak, with 171 recorded cases of reported antisemitic incidents.

Findings from FRA's Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

In the Netherlands, 1,202 respondents filled in the online survey in 2018.

Almost half of the respondents in the Netherlands (47 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. More than a third (35 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

Comments made in person, and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents: 26 % and 17 %, respectively, of the respondents in the Netherlands said they faced these forms of harassment in the 12 months before the survey. Meanwhile, 15 % said that offensive antisemitic comments concerning them were posted on the internet.

The majority of respondents in the Netherlands (74 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.

For comparative findings across all 12 survey countries, please see Figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of this overview.

Poland

Official data

The Ministry of the Interior and Administration collects data on racist incidents brought to its attention, including antisemitic incidents. Up until October 2016, the unit responsible for these tasks in the Ministry was the Human Rights Protection Team. Since November 2016, the responsibility lies with the Unit for European Migration Network and Combating Human Trafficking of the Department for Migration Analyses and Policy.

In 2015, a new hate crime recording system was introduced, with the aim of ensuring that the Ministry of the Interior and Administration has the complete picture of hate crime cases in Poland and is able to produce detailed and diverse analyses. The new system refers all hate crime investigations in Poland led by the police to the Ministry of the Interior and Administration.


In 2018, 179 of such cases were registered in the database, compared with 73 cases in 2017. Out of 179 cases, 164 concerned various forms of hate speech, including graffiti and inscriptions, posters, articles and leaflets. Of these, 99 were committed via the Internet; eight cases involved direct insults; five were unlawful threats against a person of Jewish origin; two involved damage to property; and one involved disruption of a religious meeting.

Table 38: Number of antisemitic incidents in Poland, 2010–2018

	Number of antisemitic incidents
2010	30
2011	25
2012	21
2013	25
2014	39
2015	167*
2016	101
2017	73
2018	179

Note: * Not comparable to previous years due to changes in data collection methodology.

Source: Ministry of the Interior and Administration, 2010–2018

Figure 22: Poland: number of antisemitic incidents, 2015-2018

Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2015–2018.

Source: Ministry of Interior and Administration, 2015–2018

As Figure 22 shows, the trend for the 2015–2017 period marked a decrease in the number of antisemitic incidents. However, in 2018, 179 incidents were recorded, the highest number ever collected.

Unofficial data

The Foundation for the Preservation of the Jewish Heritage in Poland (FODZ) informs annually on antisemitic incidents it reports to prosecution services, the police or other authorities. Information available on the incidents reported in 2016 – the latest data point available – concerned vandalism (Table 39).⁶⁶

Table 39: Antisemitic incidents reported by the Foundation for the Preservation of Jewish Heritage in Poland to prosecution services, police or other authorities, 2008–2018

	Incidents reported to the authorities
2008	7
2009	13
2010	11
2011	7
2012	5
2013	10
2014	5
2015	3
2016	3
2017	n.a.
2018	n.a.

Note: n.a.: not available.

Source: Foundation for the Preservation of the Jewish Heritage in Poland, 2008–2018

⁶⁶ Foundation for the Preservation of the Jewish Heritage in Poland (FODZ) (2018), [Monitoring of Antisemitism in Poland](#)

Findings from FRA's Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

In Poland, 422 respondents filled in the online survey in 2018.

Almost half of the respondents in Poland (45 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. Almost a third (32 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

Comments made in person, and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents: 21 % and 15 %, respectively, of the respondents in Poland said they faced these forms of harassment in the 12 months before the survey. Meanwhile, 20 % said that offensive antisemitic comments concerning them were posted on the internet.

The majority of respondents in Poland (79 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.

For comparative findings across all 12 survey countries, please see Figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of this overview.

Portugal

Official data

No official data pertaining to antisemitism are available in Portugal.

Unofficial data

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

Romania

Official data

Since 2018, the General Prosecutor's Office in Romania collects statistical data that reflect the bias motivation.

The General Prosecutor's Office indicated that 13 antisemitic incidents were registered by the prosecutor's office and the police in 2018, compared with 22 in 2017.

Table 40: Number of incidents pertaining to antisemitism in Romania, 2008–2018

	Antisemitic incidents
2008	6
2009	4
2010	7
2011	6
2012	6
2013	9
2014	12
2015	13
2016	14
2017	22
2018	13

Source: Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice, 2008–2018

According to data provided by the Directorate of Criminal Investigations of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, there were seven cases concerning antisemitic bias in 2018.

As reported by the Superior Council of Magistracy, in 2018, a total number of 76 files with an "antisemitism motive" and "first instance case" as their procedural stage, were registered in the courts' files. Of these, 55 cases were solved and 34 persons were sentenced. In 2017, a total number of 41 files with the "antisemitism attribute" were registered in the courts' files.

The National Council for Combating Discrimination (NCCD) monitors, investigates and sanctions cases of discrimination based on antisemitism, with data on cases available from 2008 onwards (Table 41). Most of the discrimination cases concern the use or the intent to use fascist symbols.

Table 41: Number of discrimination cases based on antisemitic behaviour in Romania, 2008–2018

	Number of filed cases	Outcome			Cases closed during the year	Ongoing cases
		Discrimination proved	Discrimination not proved	NCCD did not have competence		
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	4	4	0	0	4	0
2016	1	0	0	1	0	0
2017	6	1	1	1	1	2
2018	4	2	1	1	4	0

Source: *National Council for Combating Discrimination of Romania, 2008–2018*

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 42). These data are based on information submitted by judges who indicate bias motivation when rendering their sentences. In 2018, seven persons were sentenced for crimes motivated by antisemitism, the highest number ever recorded.

Table 42: Number of persons sentenced for crimes motivated by antisemitism, 2008–2018

	Number of sentenced persons
2008	5
2009	2
2010	3
2011	1
2012	4
2013	2
2014	1
2015	0
2016	2
2017	1
2018	7

Source: Ministry of Justice, 2008–2018

Unofficial data

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

Slovenia

Official data

FRA was informed by the Slovenian government that the Slovenian police did not record any antisemitic incidents with elements of an offence or a crime in 2018, 2017, 2016 or 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. The database recorded nine antisemitic incidents in 2018, six in 2017, seven in 2016, nine in 2015, 24 in 2014 and three in 2013 (Table 43). The increase in 2014 was the result of improvements made to the recording system that is part of the Spanish approach to combating hate crime.⁶⁷

Table 43: Number of antisemitic incidents recorded in the Spanish Crime Statistics System, 2013–2018

	Recorded antisemitic incidents
2013	3
2014	24
2015	9
2016	7
2017	6
2018	9

Source: Ministry of the Interior, 2013–2018

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.⁶⁸ This chronology covers a number of categories, including antisemitic events related to the internet and the media, attacks against property, attacks against persons, trivialisation of the Holocaust, delegitimising Israel, incidents (such as property damages or graffiti) and instigation of antisemitism (Table 44).

⁶⁷ See Ministry of the Interior (*Ministerio del Interior*) (2018), [Informe sobre incidentos relacionados con los delitos de odio en España](#).

⁶⁸ For more information, see the website of the [Observatory on Antisemitism in Spain](#).

Table 44: Antisemitic events in Spain recorded by the Observatory of Antisemitism in Spain, 2009–2018

	Internet	Media	Attacks on property	Attacks on persons	Trivialisation of the Holocaust	Delegitimising Israel	Incidents [Incidentes]	Instigation of antisemitism
2009	0	10	4	5	0	0	0	0
2010	1	3	1	4	1	0	1	1
2011	2	7	2	2	3	5	1	2
2012	3	6	9	4	4	7	4	4
2013	2	0	3	0	4	0	2	3
2014	2	3	2	0	1	0	1	1
2015	0	3	3	0	0	0	1	3
2016	1	3	0	1	1	1	3	3
2017	3	1	4	0	3	0	4	2
2018	2	2	2	1	5	2	1	3

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

Source: Observatory on Antisemitism in Spain, 2009–2018

Findings from FRA's Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

In Spain, 570 respondents filled in the online survey in 2018.

Nearly half of the respondents in Spain (46 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. A third (32 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

Comments made in person (mentioned by 18 % of respondents), and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring (18 %) are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents in the 12 months before the survey. Meanwhile, 13 % said that offensive antisemitic comments concerning them were posted on the internet.

The majority of respondents in Spain (85 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.

For comparative findings across all 12 survey countries, please see Figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of this overview.

Sweden

Official data

The National Council for Crime Prevention (*Brottsförebyggande rådet*, Brå) publishes a report that includes statistics on police reports in which Brå has identified crimes motivated by ethnicity, religion or faith, sexual orientation and gender identity.⁶⁹ Brå is an agency of the Ministry of Justice and acts as a centre for research and development within the judicial system.

After a change in the way data are recorded, there was a sharp increase between 2008 and 2009 in the number of police reports with an identified antisemitic motive.

This was followed by a sharp decline between 2009 and 2010, before increasing again and reaching a new peak in 2015. Data for 2016 showed a decrease in the number of police reports with an identified antisemitic motive (182 reports with an antisemitic motive were identified, representing a 34 % decrease compared to 2015).⁷⁰ However, the general trend was still increasing (Table 45, Figure 23). Data for 2017 and 2018 were not yet published at the time of writing this report.

Table 45: Police reports of criminal acts with an identified antisemitic motive, 2008–2018

	Crimes reported to the police
2008	159
2009	250
2010	161
2011	194
2012	221
2013	193
2014	267
2015	277
2016	182
2017	n.a.
2018	n.a.


Notes: n.a.: not available.

Source: Brå, 2008–2018

It should be noted that from 2012 onwards, numbers are estimated based on a sample taken from all cases recorded in the police database, without affecting the comparability of the data.

⁶⁹ Sweden, National Council for Crime Prevention (*Brottsförebyggande rådet*, Brå) (2017), [Annual Reports](#).

⁷⁰ Brå (2017), [Hatbrott 2016: Statistik över självrporterad utsatthet för hatbrott och polisanmälningar med identifierade hatbrottsmotiv](#).

Figure 23: Police reports of criminal acts with an identified antisemitic motive in Sweden, 2008–2016


Notes: The dotted linear regression lines indicate the trends based on data for 2008–2016.

Source: Brå, 2008–2016

As Table 46 shows, most crimes with an antisemitic motive targeted persons as opposed to property.

Table 46: Police reports of criminal acts with an identified antisemitic motive classified by principal offence, 2008–2018

	Violent crime	Unlawful threat and non-sexual molestation	Defamation	Criminal damage /graffiti	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	8	127	16	14	102	10	277
2016	10	90	10	18	50	4	182
2017	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
2018	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: n.a.: not available.

* The sum of types of crimes with antisemitic motive is 192; however, Brå reports a total of 193 crimes with antisemitic motive. As the figures have been extrapolated based on a sample of cases, the sum of the categories may differ slightly from the total, which is due to rounding error.

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

Source: Brå, 2008–2018

Unofficial data

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

Findings from FRA's Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

In Sweden, 1,193 respondents filled in the online survey in 2018.

Fewer than half of the respondents in Sweden (40 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. About one third (30 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

Comments made in person, and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents: 19 % and 17 %, respectively, of the respondents in Sweden said they faced these forms of harassment in the 12 months before the survey. Meanwhile, 13 % said that offensive antisemitic comments concerning them were posted on the internet.

The majority of respondents in Sweden (81 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.

For comparative findings across all 12 survey countries, please see Figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of this overview.

United Kingdom

Official data

England, Wales and Northern Ireland

In April 2016, the Home Office began collecting information from the police on the perceived religion of victims of religious hate (perceived refers to the religion targeted by the offender). While in the majority of offences the perceived and actual religion of the victim will be the same, in some cases this will differ. The collection of these data in 2016/17 was on a voluntary basis and became mandatory in 2017/18.

All police forces in England and Wales, with the exception of two (the Metropolitan Police and Lancashire), have sent data on the perceived religion of the victims of religious hate crimes. The Home Office data do not record hate crime in Northern Ireland.

According to the Home Office, in 2017/2018, there were 672 recorded hate crime offences with an antisemitic motive.

Additionally, the National Police Chiefs' 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.⁷¹ The data published by the 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.⁷²

As Table 47 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."⁷³ The data recorded in 2014/2015 (629) and 2017/2018 (672) present a two-fold increase compared to 2013/2014. The 786 antisemitic hate crimes recorded in 2015/2016 present the peak number recorded since 2009.

⁷¹ UK, National Police Chief's Council (NPCC), [Hate crime data](#).

⁷² NPCC, [definitions in collecting these data](#).

⁷³ True Vision, ACPO (2013), [Total of recorded hate crime in England, Wales and Northern Ireland by police force area, 2012/2013](#).

Table 47: Recorded hate crimes motivated by antisemitism in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, 2009–2018

	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
1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016	786
1 April 2016 – 31 March 2017	n.a
1 April 2017 – 31 March 2018	672**

Notes: n.a.: not available.

* Data not comparable with the previous year.


** Data published as part of National Hate Crime Statistics.

Source: NPCC, 2009–2018

2017/18 data from Hate Crime, England and Wales, [2017/18 Statistical Bulletin 20/18](#)

A change in the recording methodology in England, Wales and Northern Ireland limits the extent to which trend analysis is feasible (Figure 24). Following a decrease between 2013 and 2014, the data for 2016 continued the sharp increase already observed in 2015 in the number of antisemitic incidents, whereas the number of incidents recorded 2018 is somewhat lower than in 2016.

Figure 24: Recorded antisemitic crimes under Home Office counting rules in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, 2009–2018 (fiscal years)



Notes: The dotted linear regression lines indicate the trends based on data for 2009–2018. The dotted vertical line indicates a change in the recording methodology. The gap in the series between 2016 and 2018 does not involve changes that would have affected the comparability of the data.

Data for 2017 are not available.

Source: NPCC, 2009–2018

The Scottish Government has reported the number of charges for religiously aggravated offences for the financial years from 2010-2011 to 2017-2018 (Table 48).⁷⁴ “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.”⁷⁵ The majority of recorded religiously aggravated offences targeted Roman Catholics and Protestants.

Table 48: Number of charges for religiously aggravated offences related to Judaism in Scotland, 2010–2018

	Number of charges	As a percentage of all religiously aggravated charges
2010–2011	16	2
2011–2012	14	1
2012–2013	27	4
2013–2014	9	2
2014–2015	25	4
2015–2016	18	3
2016–2017	23	3
2017–2018	21	3

Note: Fiscal year (1 April–31 March).

Source: Scottish Government, 2010–2018

Unofficial data

The Community Security Trust (CST) is a charity that works at the national level in the United Kingdom to provide advice and to 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 information sharing agreement with the National Police Chiefs’ Council [...], that allows for the systematic sharing of antisemitic incident reports between CST and the Police, so that both agencies have sight of incidents that had not otherwise been reported to them.”⁷⁶

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”.⁷⁷ The data it collects are published annually in a report on antisemitic incidents.⁷⁸

⁷⁴ Scottish Government (2018), [Religiously aggravated offending in Scotland 2017-18](#).

⁷⁵ Scottish Government (2013), [Religiously aggravated offending in Scotland 2012-13](#), p. 14.

⁷⁶ Community Security Trust (CST) (2019), [Antisemitic incidents report 2018](#).

⁷⁷ CST, [Definitions of Antisemitic Incidents](#), p. 2.

⁷⁸ CST, [CST Publications](#).

CST registered 1,652 antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom in 2018, the highest ever total in a single calendar year. This is an increase compared with 1,420 in 2017, which was the previous record annual total. Abusive behaviour – verbal and written antisemitic abuse – accounts for the largest share (79 %) of the total incidents in 2018.


Table 49: Antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom recorded by the Community Security Trust, 2008–2018

	Recorded antisemitic incidents
2008	546
2009	931
2010	646
2011	609
2012	650
2013	535
2014	1,182
2015	960
2016	1,375
2017	1,420
2018	1,652

Source: CST, 2008–2018

The numbers of incidents recorded in 2016, 2017 and 2018 represent a sustained pattern of increasing antisemitic incident totals, which is reflected in the overall increasing trend (Figure 25).

Figure 25: Antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom recorded by the Community Security Trust, 2008–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2018.

Source: CST, 2008–2018

The CST also publishes data on the category of recorded incidents, as Table 49 shows. The most common types of antisemitic incidents consist of abusive behaviour, followed by assault, threats, damage and desecration, and literature.

In 2018, the most common incidents involved verbal abuse directed at random Jewish people in public (483), out of which at least 224 were visibly Jewish individuals (compared with 356 and 283 in 2017, respectively). In 221 incidents, the victims were Jewish community organisations, communal events, commercial premises or high-profile individuals, compared to 141 such incidents in 2017. 66 antisemitic incidents in 2018 targeted synagogues, and a further 30 incidents targeted synagogue congregants on their way to or from prayers, compared to 76 and 45 incidents respectively in 2017.

In addition, 96 antisemitic incidents in 2018 took place at schools or involved Jewish schoolchildren or teaching staff. Of these, 40 incidents took place at Jewish schools, 46 affected Jewish schoolchildren on their journeys to and from school and 10 involved Jewish children or teachers at non-faith schools.

In 2018, not only was the highest ever number of social media incidents recorded, but there was also an increase in terms of the percentage of social media incidents out of the total number of incidents. In 2018, 384 recorded antisemitic incidents took place on social media, compared with 249 similar incidents in 2017. The share of social media incidents of the overall total has increased from 18 % in 2017 to 23 % in 2018. In 2016, social media incidents comprised 21 % of the overall total.

Table 50: Types of antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom recorded by the Community Security Trust, 2008–2018


	Extreme violence	Assault	Damage and desecration	Threats	Abusive behaviour	Literature
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	899	30
2015	4	83	65	79	717	12
2016	0	108	81	107	1,039	19
2017	0	149	93	98	1,065	15
2018	1	122	78	109	1,300	42

Source: CST, 2008–2018

Four of the six incident categories in Table 50 saw an increase in 2018, compared with the previous year. Separately examining the various incident types shows that the number of incidents of threats, abusive behaviour and those involving literature increased in 2018. The peak values were recorded in 2018 for both threats and abusive

behaviour. Based on the recorded incidents in 2008–2018, the trend lines show a relatively stable trend in the case of damage and desecration incidents, and an increase in assaults and threats (Figure 26).

Figure 26: Antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom by category recorded by the Community Security Trust, 2008–2018




Note: The dotted linear regression lines indicate the trends based on data for 2008–2018.

Source: CST, 2008–2018

Abusive behaviour incidents are the largest component in the total number of antisemitic incidents recorded by CST and therefore the 2008–2018 trend in abusive behaviour incidents resembles closely the overall trend in antisemitic incidents in the same period (Figure 27). There is an increasing trend in the number of abusive behaviour incidents in 2008–2018.

Figure 27: Antisemitic incidents – abusive behaviour in the United Kingdom recorded by the Community Security Trust, 2008–2018



Note: The dotted linear regression line indicates the trend based on data for 2008–2018.

Source: CST, 2008–2018

Concerning perpetrators, physical descriptions were available for 502 (30 %) of the 1,652 incidents reported by the CST in 2018: “300 offenders (60 %) were described as ‘White – North European’; 18 offenders (4 %) were described as ‘White – South European’; 73 offenders (15 %) were described as ‘Black’; 64 offenders (13 %) were described as ‘South Asian’; three offenders (0.5 %) were described as ‘Far East or South East Asian’; and 44 offenders (9 %) were described as ‘Arab or North African’.

The gender of the perpetrator could be identified in 840 incidents (51 %) of the 1,652 incidents. The incidents are broken down as follows: 706 incidents were perpetrated by men (84 %), 115 by women (14 %) and 19 (2 %) by mixed groups of men and women.

The age of the perpetrators could be estimated in 648 antisemitic incidents (39 % of all incidents), with 545 (84 %) of the perpetrators described as adults, 101 (16 %) as minors, and one incident consisting of groups of minors and adults together. Minors were responsible for 35 % of the assault incidents recorded by CST in 2018, 58 % of damage and desecration incidents, and for only 12 % of the incidents related to abusive behaviour.

Findings from FRA’s Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU

In the United Kingdom, 4,731 respondents filled in the online survey in 2018.

More than one third of the respondents in the United Kingdom (34 %) experienced some form of antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey. A quarter of the respondents (25 %) encountered such harassment in the 12 months before the survey.

Comments made in person, and offensive gestures or inappropriate staring, are the most common forms of antisemitic harassment personally experienced by respondents: 16 % and 13 %, respectively, of the respondents in the United Kingdom said they faced these forms of harassment in the 12 months before the survey. Meanwhile, 8 % said that offensive antisemitic comments concerning them were posted on the internet.

The majority of respondents in the United Kingdom (76 %) who experienced antisemitic harassment in the five years before the survey did not report the most serious incident to the police or to any other organisation.

For comparative findings across all 12 survey countries, please see Figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of this overview.

Concluding remarks – persisting gaps in data collection

The phenomenon of antisemitism remains a concern that needs to be tackled through concerted efforts by government and civil society at all levels. To tackle antisemitism effectively, relevant stakeholders need to 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 51, 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 the surveys conducted by FRA. Table 51 excludes three EU Member States that have no official data available on antisemitism.

Table 51: Official data on recorded antisemitic incidents in EU Member States, 2008–2018

	Recorded data	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
AT	Antisemitic offences committed by right-wing extremists	23	12	27	16	27	37	58	41	41	39	49
BE	Cases of Holocaust denial and revisionism	9	11	2	2	7	8	5	8	5	12	10
BG	Convictions of antisemitic crimes	-	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	0
CY	Antisemitic incidents	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CZ	Criminal offences motivated by antisemitism	27	48	28	18	9	15	45	47	28	27	15
DE	Politically motivated crimes with an antisemitic motive	1,559	1,690	1,268	1,239	1,374	1,275	1,596	1,366	1,468	1,504	1,799
DK	Extremist crimes targeting Jews	-	-	-	5	15	10	-	13*	21	38	26
EE	Antisemitic crimes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0
EL	Incidents motivated by antisemitism	-	-	5	3	1	0	4	1	3	7	10
ES	Antisemitic incidents	-	-	-	-	-	3	24	9	7	-	6
FI	Antisemitic crimes	1	10	4	6	8	11	7	8	10	9	-
FR	Antisemitic actions and threats	459	815	466	389	614	423	851	808	335	311	541
HR	Criminal acts motivated by antisemitism	-	-	-	-	1	0	0	2	2	0	8
IE	Antisemitic incidents	9	5	13	3	5	2	4	2	-	-	-
IT	Antisemitic criminal conduct	-	-	16	23	28	50	68	50	35	32	56
LT	Antisemitic incidents	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
LV	Antisemitic incidents	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0	0	0	0
LU	Antisemitic incidents	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	2	0	0
NL	Criminal discriminatory antisemitic incidents	141	209	286	294	859*	717	358*	428	335	284	275
PL	Antisemitic incidents	-	-	30	25	21	25	39	167*	101	73	179
RO	Incidents pertaining	6	4	7	6	6	9	12	13	14	22	13

	Recorded data	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
	to antisemitism											
SE	Crimes with an antisemitic motive	159*	250	161	194	221	193	267	277	182	-	-
SI	Antisemitic incidents	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0
SK	Persons sentenced for crimes motivated by antisemitism	5	2	3	1	4	2	1	0	2	1	7
UK – EN, NI, WAL **	Hate crimes motivated by antisemitism	-	703	488	440	385*	318	629	786	-	-	672
UK – SCO **	Charges referring to conduct derogatory towards Judaism	-	-	16	14	27	9	25	18	23	-	21

Notes: Comparisons are not possible between Member States.

"-" denotes where no data are available at Member State level, either because these data were not collected, not communicated, not published at the time of writing or not covering the entire year.

* Data not comparable with the previous year.

** Fiscal year (1 April – 31 March). EN: England; NI: Northern Ireland; WAL: Wales; SCO: Scotland.

Source: FRA, 2019

In order to properly appreciate the present report, it is essential to recall 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 is not a reliable indicator that antisemitism is not an issue of concern in these EU Member States. The evidence from FRA's second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews shows that the overwhelming majority of the antisemitic incidents remain unreported, either to the police or any other authority, institution or organisation.

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. The higher numbers of incidents recorded could also reflect improvements to, and the efficiency of, the recording system set in place.

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 and comparison of such incidents. 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, 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, would allow measures 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. FRA also coordinates a dedicated subgroup of professionals on assisting Member States in improving the recording and data collection of hate crime, within the European Union High Level Group on combating Racism, Xenophobia and other forms of Intolerance.

FRA's report: [Hate crime recording and data collection practice across the EU](#)

The proper recording of hate crime by law enforcement authorities can lead to a better understanding of the nature and prevalence of the phenomenon, and of its impact on victims and their communities. This, in turn, can assist the authorities in developing and monitoring policies and measures they put in place to combat prejudice and to offer support to victims of hate crime.

This report aims to assist police investigators, managers, hate crime officers and policymakers working on hate crime by providing rich and detailed information on hate crime recording and data collection practices in the EU. It helps to identify gaps and inconsistencies, and provides illustrative practices from other Member States. A detailed look at the practices, including step-by-step descriptions, offers insights to help identify which elements could be adapted for use in national contexts. [FRA and ODIHR workshops](#) in the EU Member States can also support national authorities when conducting these assessments.



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, 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 (high-quality) data on the manifestations of antisemitism, EU Member States could also conduct regular victimisation surveys that include questions on the experiences of Jewish people of hate crime, hate speech and discrimination. Such surveys could provide insights into the impact of antisemitism on Jewish populations, as well as into the effectiveness of measures taken to combat antisemitism. New methods, data sources and data processing techniques could be considered to better measure the incidence and impact of antisemitism.

Addressing Anti-Semitism through Education: Guidelines for Policymakers

In 2018, ODIHR and UNESCO co-published a practical guide [Addressing Anti-Semitism through Education: Guidelines for Policymakers](#) on what should be done by policymakers and educational leaders, so that education is effective in countering contemporary antisemitism. The guide builds on and complements the broader human rights and global citizenship education framework. It provides policymakers with tools and guidance to ensure that education systems build the resilience of young people to antisemitic ideas and ideologies, violent extremism and all forms of intolerance and discrimination, through critical thinking and respect for others.

A large majority of Jewish respondents (85 %) in FRA's second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews consider antisemitism to be a problem in their country; 89 % believe that antisemitism has increased in their country over the past five years. The findings of the EU-wide special Eurobarometer survey 'Perceptions of antisemitism'⁷⁹ show that half (50 %) of the respondents from the general population in the 28 EU Member States consider antisemitism to be a problem in their country. In six EU Member States, a majority of respondents think that antisemitism is a problem in their country: Sweden (81 %), France (72 %), Germany (66 %), the Netherlands (65 %), the United Kingdom (62 %) and Italy (58 %). Around a third of the survey respondents (36 %) believe that antisemitism has increased in their country over the past five years. This is the majority view in four EU Member States: Sweden (73 %), Germany (61 %), the Netherlands (55 %) and France (51 %).

[Special Eurobarometer 484: Perceptions of antisemitism](#)

A Special Eurobarometer survey was carried out between 4 and 20 December 2018 in the 28 EU Member States. In this survey, 27,643 respondents from the general population samples were asked about their perception of antisemitism in general, and nine of its possible manifestations as a problem in their country, and whether they perceived antisemitism as having increased or decreased in their country over the past five years.

The survey also asked about respondents' knowledge of and education about Jewish communities and antisemitism, and in particular on the extent of information about the history, customs and practices of European Jewish people.

Additional questions addressed respondents' awareness of the legislation combating antisemitism, and adequacy of education about the Holocaust provided by schools in their country, as well as perceptions about the influence of conflicts in the Middle East on the way European Jewish people.

⁷⁹ European Commission (2019), [Perceptions of antisemitism](#). Special Eurobarometer 484 – December 2018.

Antisemitic and intolerant attitudes can lead to behaviour that is punishable by law, but antisemitism needs to be countered beyond the criminal justice system. Education is essential to prevent intolerant attitudes. Through education that fosters socialisation, tolerance, and universal values, and encourages critical thinking, children and young people can bring change to their families and communities, and ultimately to the broader society.



Publications Office
of the European Union



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