CST recorded 299 antisemitic incidents across the United Kingdom in the first six months of 2012.

This is an increase of 2 per cent from the 294 antisemitic incidents recorded in the first six months of 2011. CST recorded 325 antisemitic incidents in the first half of 2010, and 628 in the first half of 2009 – a record high, due to antisemitic reactions to the conflict in Gaza in January of that year.

The small increase in the number of antisemitic incidents recorded in the first half of 2012 compared to the same period in 2011 masks two opposing trends: a large increase in recorded incidents in London; and a similarly large fall in the number of recorded antisemitic incidents in Greater Manchester.

CST recorded 148 antisemitic incidents in London in the first half of 2012, a 48 per cent increase on the 100 incidents recorded in London in the first six months of 2011. Of the 148 incidents recorded, 48 were reported to CST as part of an ‘incident exchange programme’ which began in January 2012 whereby CST and the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) share antisemitic incident reports, fully anonymised to comply with data protection requirements, so that both agencies have as full a picture as possible of the number and type of reported incidents. This arrangement is based on a successful model which has operated in Manchester since the beginning of 2011. Without these 48 ‘police-reported’ incidents, the number of antisemitic incidents reported to CST in London in the first six months of 2012 remained constant when compared to the same period in 2011.

In Manchester, CST recorded 78 antisemitic incidents in the first half of 2012, a 38 per cent fall from the 125 antisemitic incidents recorded in the same period in 2011. CST and Greater Manchester Police (GMP) have operated an incident exchange programme since the beginning of 2011. It is always difficult and risky to make firm interpretations of short-term changes in incident data, which could be explained by several different, overlapping factors. There have been no changes to CST’s reporting systems since 2011 and no perceptible decline in the willingness of Jewish people in Manchester to report incidents to CST. Consequently, this fall may represent a genuine decline in the number of incidents that took place in Greater Manchester during this period when compared to the same period in 2011.

CST recorded 73 antisemitic incidents in March 2012, the highest monthly total in the first half of the year and higher than any monthly total in the whole of 2011. This total appears to have been influenced

---

1 The incident totals for past years and months in this document may differ from those previously published by CST, due to the late reporting of some incidents to CST by incident victims, witnesses or other sources.
by reactions to the terrorist shooting at the Ozar Hatorah Jewish school in Toulouse, France, on 19 March. Of the 73 incidents reported to CST from across the UK during March 2012, 24 were reported before 19 March and 49 were reported on or after 19 March. However, none of the antisemitic incidents reported to CST involved any direct or indirect reference to the shooting. This suggests that the spike in incidents may reflect a greater motivation on the part of British Jews to report antisemitic incidents in the aftermath of the shooting, rather than an actual increase in incidents.

One hundred and twenty-six of the 299 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST during the first half of 2012 were reported directly to CST by the victims themselves, and 17 incidents were reported on their behalf by a friend or relative of the victim. In 21 cases, the incident was reported to CST by somebody who had witnessed the incident take place. There were 90 incidents reported to CST by the Police, mostly as part of incident exchange programmes in Manchester and London. Thirty-eight antisemitic incidents were reported by CST staff or volunteers or by security officers at Jewish buildings, and three incidents were taken from media reports.

In addition to the 299 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST during this period, a further 214 potential incidents were reported to CST but not classified as antisemitic and therefore not included in these statistics. This is because, on investigation, there was no evidence of antisemitic motivation, targeting or content. Most of these rejected incidents, comprising 42 per cent of the total number of potential incidents reported to CST, involved non-antisemitic crime affecting Jewish property or people. Anti-Israel activity which does not use antisemitic language or imagery and is directed at pro-Israel campaigners, rather than at Jewish people or institutions per se, is also not classified by CST as antisemitic.

Many of these 513 potential incidents required some level of investigation or security response by CST staff and volunteers, irrespective of whether or not they turned out to be antisemitic.
CST recorded 33 violent antisemitic assaults in the first six months of 2012, a fall of 21 per cent from the 42 violent assaults recorded in the first half of 2011. One of these 33 assaults was serious enough to be classified as Extreme Violence, which means it posed a threat to life or constituted grievous bodily harm (GBH). There were no Extreme Violence incidents in the first half of 2011.

There were 45 violent antisemitic assaults in the first half of 2010, none of which constituted Extreme Violence; and 79 in the first half of 2009, two of which were classified as Extreme Violence.

There were 45 violent antisemitic assaults in the first half of 2010, none of which constituted Extreme Violence; and 79 in the first half of 2009, two of which were classified as Extreme Violence.

There were 47 incidents recorded in this category in the first six months of 2010 and 64 during the same period in 2009.

CST recorded 18 direct antisemitic threats (categorised as Threats) during the first half of 2012, three more than the 15 incidents of this type recorded during the first six months of 2011. There were 19 incidents recorded in this category in the first half of 2010 and 34 during the same period in 2009.

There were 217 antisemitic incidents reported to CST in the category of Abusive Behaviour in the first half of 2012, an increase of 10 per cent from the 197 incidents of this type recorded during the first six months of 2011. This category includes a wide range of antisemitic incident types, including antisemitic graffiti on non-Jewish property, one-off hate mail and antisemitic verbal abuse. There were 211 incidents of Abusive Behaviour recorded in the first half of 2010 and 407 during the same period in 2009.

CST recorded just three incidents of mass-produced or mass-eailed antisemitic literature, categorised as Literature (as opposed to one-off cases of hate mail, which are classified as Abusive Behaviour), during the first six months of 2012, two fewer than the five incidents recorded in this category during the first half of 2011. There were three incidents of antisemitic literature reported to CST in the first six months of 2010 and 44 during the first half of 2009. There is no obvious explanation for why the number of incidents recorded in this category has fallen by so much in the past three years. It may reflect the shift to electronic forms of mass mailing, which are either easily deleted or may be caught by filters designed to intercept spam or junk emails.

A full explanation of CST’s antisemitic incident categories can be found in the leaflet “Definitions of Antisemitic Incidents”, available on CST’s website at www.thecst.org.uk
Incident Victims

There were 136 antisemitic incidents reported to CST in the first six months of 2012 in which the victims were random Jewish individuals in public. In 67 incidents the victims were visibly Jewish, due to religious or traditional clothing, Jewish school uniforms or jewellery bearing religious symbols. One hundred and sixty-nine antisemitic incidents involved verbal abuse (36 of which involved abuse shouted from a passing vehicle). These three characteristics, often found in combination, reflect the most common single type of antisemitic incident: random, spontaneous, verbal antisemitic abuse, directed at people who look Jewish while they go about their business in public places.

There were 12 antisemitic incidents recorded at Jewish schools in the first six months of 2012, twice the number recorded in the same period in 2011. A further 11 incidents involved Jewish schoolchildren or staff on their way to or from school, while seven incidents involved Jewish schoolchildren or staff at non-faith schools – making a total of 30 antisemitic incidents affecting people and buildings in the school sector, compared to 25 such incidents in the first half of 2011.

There were 14 antisemitic incidents affecting Jewish students, academics, student unions or other student bodies in the first half of 2012, compared to 16 in the first half of 2011 and 28 in the first six months of 2010. None of these 14 incidents involved violent assault: 11 came in the category of Abusive Behaviour, two involved Damage & Desecration of Jewish property and there was one incident of a direct antisemitic threat. Nine of the 14 incidents took place on campus, of which two occurred in the context of student political activity. Five antisemitic incidents affecting Jewish students, academics, student unions or other student bodies took place off campus.

There were 21 antisemitic incidents recorded during the first six months of 2012 that targeted synagogues, compared to 24 during the first half of 2011. A further 15 incidents targeted synagogue congregants or rabbis on their way to or from prayers (16 such incidents occurred during the first half of 2011). There were 17 incidents that targeted Jewish organisations, Jewish events or Jewish-owned businesses (where there was clear evidence of antisemitism), less than half the 36 incidents of this type in the first half of 2011. There were five incidents in the first half of 2012 in which the victim was a prominent Jewish individual or public figure, compared to 10 such incidents in the first half of 2011. There were two desecrations of Jewish cemeteries in the first half of 2012, compared to just one in the first half of 2011.

CST received a description of the gender of the victim or victims for 193 of the 299 antisemitic incidents in the first half of 2012. Of these, 128, or 66 per cent, were male; 46, or 24 per cent, were female; and in 19 incidents the victims were mixed groups of males and females.

CST received a description of the approximate age of the victim or victims in 139 of the antisemitic incidents reported during the first six months of 2012. Of these, 104, or 75 per cent, involved adult victims; 29, or 21 per cent, involved victims who were minors; and in six incidents the victims were mixed groups of adults and minors.
Incident Perpetrators and Motives

Identifying the ethnicity of the perpetrators of antisemitic incidents is a difficult and imprecise task. Many antisemitic incidents involve brief public encounters, and the evidence of victims of, or witnesses to, antisemitic incidents may be vague and disjointed. In addition, many incidents do not involve face-to-face contact between incident perpetrator and victim, so it is not always possible to obtain a physical description of the ethnicity of the perpetrator. Bearing in mind these limitations and caveats, a physical description of the ethnicity of the perpetrator or perpetrators was provided to CST in 76 of the 299 antisemitic incidents reported during the first six months of 2012. Of these, 43, or 57 per cent, were described as white – north European; none were described as white – south European; one was described as black; 22, or 29 per cent, were described as south Asian; none as east or south-east Asian; and 10, or 13 per cent, as Arab or north African.

CST received a description of the approximate age of the perpetrator or perpetrators in 118 incidents in the first half of 2012. Of these, 74, or 63 per cent, involved adult perpetrators; 41, or 35 per cent, involved perpetrators who were described as minors; and in three incidents the perpetrators were mixed groups of adults and minors.

CST also tries to measure the number of antisemitic incidents each year in which there is evidence of political motivation alongside the evidence of antisemitism, or where political discourse is employed by the incident perpetrator. The use of political discourse and evidence of political motivation are not synonymous; for example, a black or south Asian perpetrator giving a Nazi salute to a Jewish victim could be described as employing far right discourse, but is unlikely to be motivated by support for neo-Nazi politics.

CST received a description of the gender of the perpetrator or perpetrators in 139 of the 299 antisemitic incidents reported to CST in the first half of 2012. Of these, 110 incidents, or 79 per cent, involved male perpetrators; 25 incidents, or 18 per cent, involved female perpetrators; and in four incidents the perpetrators were mixed groups of males and females.

Of the 299 antisemitic incidents reported to CST during the first six months of 2012, 91, or 30 per cent, showed some evidence of political motivation. Of these, 71 incidents showed evidence of far right motivation; 15 incidents showed evidence of anti-Zionist motivation; and five showed evidence of Islamist motivation. All incidents needed to show evidence of antisemitism alongside any political motivation in order to be recorded by CST as an antisemitic incident.

For comparison, in the first six months of 2011, 141 of the antisemitic incidents reported to CST involved the use of political discourse alongside the antisemitism, of which 77 used far right discourse; 52 made reference to Israel, Zionism or the Middle East; and 12 involved Islamist discourse. In 26 of these incidents, more than one type of discourse was used. During the same period, there were 101 antisemitic incidents that showed evidence of political motivation, of which 53 showed evidence of far right motivation; 35 showed evidence of anti-Zionist motivation; and 13 showed evidence of Islamist motivation.
Geographical Locations

Of the 299 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in the first six months of 2012, 226, or just over three-quarters, were recorded in the main Jewish centres of Greater London and Greater Manchester. However, these two communities showed opposing trends when compared to 2011.

In Greater London, CST recorded 148 antisemitic incidents, a rise of 48 per cent from the 100 antisemitic incidents recorded in the first half of 2011. As explained above, this increase appears to be entirely the result of an expansion of CST’s incident reporting sources, namely the introduction of an incident exchange programme between CST and the Metropolitan Police Service. This resulted in 48 antisemitic incidents being reported to CST by the Police during the first six months of 2012 that had not previously been reported to CST directly by the incident victims, or from other sources.

CST recorded antisemitic incidents in 21 of the 32 Metropolitan Police boroughs in London (plus one in the City of London). Of the 148 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in London, 53 took place in Barnet, the borough with the largest Jewish population in the country; 14 in Hackney and 10 in Haringey, which cover the Jewish community of Stamford Hill; 11 in Camden; 10 in Harrow; nine in Westminster; eight in Kensington & Chelsea; and seven in Redbridge.

The model of anonymised incident data exchange used in London in 2012 was first piloted by CST and Greater Manchester Police in 2011, where it has proved to be a success and is now an ongoing programme. In Greater Manchester in the first half of 2012, CST recorded 78 antisemitic incidents, a 38 per cent fall compared to the 125 incidents recorded there in the first half of 2011. There is no obvious change in the rate or pattern of antisemitic incident reporting to CST and no reduction of CST’s services in the city to explain this fall, so it may represent a genuine decrease in the number of incidents, at least over a six-month period. The highest number of antisemitic incidents in Greater Manchester was in the borough of Salford, with 31 antisemitic incidents. The next highest borough totals were 23 incidents in Bury and 17 in the borough of Manchester.

Outside Greater London and Greater Manchester, CST recorded 73 antisemitic incidents from 31 different locations around the UK in the first six months of 2012, compared to 69 incidents from 31 different locations in the first half of 2011. The 73 antisemitic incidents recorded around the UK included 10 in Hertfordshire; 10 in Leeds; and four each in Glasgow and Brighton & Hove.

Eighteen antisemitic incidents were reported to CST as having taken place on social media, such as Facebook, Twitter or YouTube, in the first six months of 2012. This is the first year that CST has used ‘social media’ as a location for recording incidents, having previously recorded them according to the location of the victim. CST does not record static websites or videos on YouTube as antisemitic incidents, but does record antisemitic comments posted on social media platforms as incidents if they are reported to CST. CST does not proactively search for such comments in order to record them as incidents. The publication of the number of incidents from social media reported to CST is not intended to reflect the real number of incidents that take place on social media, which is likely to be so large as to be effectively immeasurable, but rather to encourage the reporting of incidents that take place on social media platforms.