Antisemitic image posted on Twitter by a far right account in Wales, December 2014
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

• CST recorded **1,168 antisemitic incidents in 2014**, more than double the 535 antisemitic incidents recorded in 2013 and the **highest annual total** ever recorded by CST. This is the first time that CST has recorded more than 1,000 antisemitic incidents in a calendar year.¹ This new record annual total of 1,168 incidents is a 25 per cent increase on the previous record high of 931 antisemitic incidents, which was recorded by CST in 2009.² The 2013 annual total of 535 antisemitic incidents was the lowest annual total since 2004 and represented a 43 per cent decrease from the 2009 previous record high.

• The single biggest contributing factor to the record number of antisemitic incidents recorded in 2014 was antisemitic reactions in the UK to the conflict in Israel and Gaza that began on 8 July 2014 and ended on 26 August 2014. CST recorded the **highest-ever monthly total of 314 antisemitic incidents** in July, and the third-highest ever monthly total of 228 incidents in August. For comparison, there were 59 incidents recorded in July 2013 and 48 in August 2013. Of the 542 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in July and August 2014, 258 (48 per cent) made reference to events in Israel and Gaza. In total, CST recorded 501 antisemitic incidents from 8 July to 26 August inclusive, compared to 87 incidents during the same period in 2013.

• The UK impact of the conflict in Israel and Gaza in July and August appears to have continued into September, when CST recorded 103 antisemitic incidents, the sixth-highest monthly total on record. For comparison, 59 antisemitic incidents were recorded in September 2013. It is possible that this partly reflects an increase in the willingness of Jewish people to report antisemitic incidents, due to increased concern about antisemitism, as well as any continuing increase in the number of incidents taking place.

• This pattern, whereby conflicts in the Middle East act as ‘trigger events’ that cause temporary ‘spikes’ in antisemitic incidents in the UK, was also the reason for the previous record annual total, in January 2009; and for the **record high** before that, which came in 2006.

• It is likely that 2014 would have shown an increase in the number of recorded antisemitic incidents compared to 2013, even if the trigger event of the conflict in Israel and Gaza had not taken place. In the **first six months of 2014** (i.e., before that conflict began) CST recorded 307 incidents, an increase of 38 per cent from the 223 incidents recorded during the same period in 2013. If the monthly totals for July, August and September 2014 are reduced to their 2013 levels in order to remove the impact of the conflict in Israel and Gaza on the overall incident total, the underlying trend still shows an increase of approximately 29 per cent for 2014 as a whole compared to 2013, and suggests a ‘baseline’ level of incidents more in keeping with the incident totals for the years 2010–2012.

• The increase in antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in 2014 was common throughout the UK, but was more pronounced in Greater London than in Greater Manchester. In Greater London, CST recorded 583 antisemitic incidents in 2014 compared to 246 during 2013, an increase of 137 per cent. In Greater Manchester, CST recorded 309 incidents in 2014 compared to 173 in 2013, an increase of 79 per cent. Over three-quarters of the 1,168 antisemitic incidents recorded in 2014 took place in Greater London and Greater Manchester.
the two largest Jewish communities in the UK. Beyond these two centres, CST recorded 276 antisemitic incidents in 89 locations around the UK in 2014, compared to 112 incidents from 50 different locations in 2013. These included 34 antisemitic incidents in Hertfordshire, 27 each in Leeds and in Liverpool, 21 in Glasgow, 14 in Birmingham and nine in Bradford.

- In addition to the 1,168 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in 2014, a further 498 reports of potential incidents were received by CST but not included in the total number of antisemitic incidents as there was no evidence of antisemitic motivation, targeting or content.

- It is likely that there is significant under-reporting of antisemitic incidents to both CST and the Police, and that the number of antisemitic incidents that took place is significantly higher than the number recorded in this report. A 2013 survey of Jewish experiences and perceptions of antisemitism in the EU found that 72 per cent of British Jews who had experienced antisemitic harassment over the previous five years had not reported it to the Police or to any other organisation; 57 per cent of British Jews who had experienced antisemitic vandalism to their home or car had not reported it. The same survey also found that, over the previous 12 months, 21 per cent of British Jews had suffered antisemitic harassment, 3 per cent had suffered antisemitic violence or the threat of violence had not reported it; and 46 per cent of British Jews who had suffered antisemitic vandalism to their home or car had not reported it. The same survey also found that, over the previous 12 months, 21 per cent of British Jews had suffered antisemitic harassment, 3 per cent had suffered antisemitic violence or the threat of violence and 2 per cent had experienced antisemitic vandalism to their home or car. Similarly, the Crime Survey for England and Wales estimates that around 40 per cent of all hate crimes come to the attention of the Police.

- There were 81 violent antisemitic assaults reported to CST in 2014, an increase of 17 per cent from the 69 antisemitic assaults recorded in 2013 and the highest number since 2011, when CST recorded 95 violent antisemitic assaults.

- The 81 violent antisemitic incidents included one incident categorised as Extreme Violence, meaning incidents that involved grievous bodily harm (GBH) or a threat to life. CST recorded no incidents of Extreme Violence in 2013 and two in 2012.

- Incidents of Damage and Desecration to Jewish property increased by 65 per cent, from 49 incidents in 2013 to 81 incidents in 2014. This is the highest number of incidents recorded by CST in this category since 2010, when 83 such incidents were recorded.

- There were 884 incidents of Abusive Behaviour recorded by CST in 2014, an increase of 136 per cent from the 374 incidents recorded in this category in 2013 and the highest total ever recorded in this category. This category includes verbal abuse, hate mail, antisemitic graffiti on non-Jewish property and antisemitic content on social media.

- There were 92 incidents reported to CST in the category of Threats in 2014, which includes direct threats to people or property, rather than more general abuse. This is an increase of 142 per cent compared to the 38 incidents of this type recorded in 2013. It is the highest number of incidents recorded in this category since 2004, when 93 incidents of this type were recorded.

- There were 30 incidents recorded in the category of Literature in 2014, which comprises mass-produced antisemitic mailings and emails, rather than individual hate mail. This is six times the number

---

of incidents of mass-mailed antisemitic literature or emails recorded in 2013, when five such incidents were recorded. It is the highest number of incidents of this type recorded by CST since 2009, when 62 such incidents were recorded.

- The most common single type of incident in 2014 involved verbal abuse directed at random Jewish people in public; such incidents are more commonly associated with anti-social behaviour or local patterns of street crime than with political activism or ideologies. In 397 incidents, the victims were ordinary Jewish people, male or female, attacked or abused while going about their daily business in public places. In at least 190 of these incidents, the victims were visibly Jewish, usually due to their religious or traditional clothing, school uniform or jewellery bearing Jewish symbols. A total of 585 antisemitic incidents out of the total of 1,168 incidents in 2014 involved verbal antisemitic abuse.

- CST recorded 233 antisemitic incidents that involved the use of internet-based social media in 2014, which represents 20 per cent of the overall total of 1,168 antisemitic incidents. For comparison, CST recorded 88 incidents in 2013 that involved the use of social media, which was 16 per cent of the overall incident total in 2013. This reflects the growing relevance of social media as a place where Jews encounter antisemitism and the ease with which it can be reported from there directly to CST online, rather than being an absolute measure of the amount of antisemitism on social media platforms. Of the 233 antisemitic incidents of this type recorded in 2014, 215 were in the category of Abusive Behaviour and 18 were in the category of Threats. CST does not proactively ‘trawl’ social media platforms to look for incidents of this type and will only record incidents that take place on social media if the offender is based in the UK, or if the incident involves the direct antisemitic targeting of a UK-based victim.

- 69 antisemitic incidents in 2014 targeted synagogues, and a further 41 incidents targeted synagogue congregants on their way to or from prayers, compared to 31 and 26 incidents respectively in 2013.

- In 213 incidents, the victims were Jewish community organisations, communal events, commercial premises or high-profile individuals, compared to 59 such incidents in 2013.

- 66 incidents targeted Jewish schools, schoolchildren or teachers in 2014, compared to 32 incidents relating to schools and schoolchildren in 2013. Of the 66 incidents of this type recorded in 2014, 27 affected Jewish schoolchildren on their journeys to or from school; 18 took place at the premises of Jewish faith schools; and 21 involved Jewish children or teachers at non-faith schools.

- In 19 antisemitic incidents, the victims were Jewish students, academics or other student bodies, more than double the number of campus-related incidents in 2013, when nine were recorded. Of the 19 incidents of this type recorded in 2014, eight took place on campus, while there were 11 incidents which affected students, academics or student bodies off campus. None of the eight incidents that took place on campus were in the category of Assault, while seven of the 19 incidents involved the use of social media.

- CST is often asked by journalists and members of the public to identify the
ethnic or religious background of incident offenders. CST will ask incident victims or witnesses if they can describe the person, or people, who committed the incident they are reporting, but this is difficult and imprecise: many antisemitic incidents involve public encounters where the antisemitic abuse may be generic, brief and sometimes non-verbal. While it is possible to collect data regarding the ethnic appearance of incident offenders, this data is not direct evidence of the offenders’ religious affiliations. In addition, many incidents do not involve face-to-face contact between offender and victim so it is not always possible to obtain a physical description of the offender. Where there is no face-to-face contact, it would be a mistake to assume to know the ethnicity or religion of an incident offender on the basis of the abusive language they use. Bearing in mind these caveats, CST does provide data regarding the ethnic appearance of incident offenders, and the discourse they use to abuse or threaten Jews.

• CST received a physical description of the incident offender in 340, or 29 per cent, of the 1,168 antisemitic incidents recorded during 2014. Of these, 148 offenders (44 per cent) were described as ‘White – North European’; 5 offenders (1 per cent) were described as ‘White – South European’; 26 offenders (8 per cent) were described as ‘Black’; 127 offenders (37 per cent) were described as ‘South Asian’; and 34 offenders (10 per cent) were described as ‘Arab or North African’. These proportions were significantly different for the months of July and August, during the conflict in Israel and Gaza: in these two months the proportion of offenders described to CST as ‘White – North European’ was 34 per cent; the proportion described as ‘Black’ was 5 per cent; the proportion described as ‘South Asian’ was 50 per cent; the proportion described as ‘Arab or North African’ was 12 per cent; and no offenders were described as ‘White – South European’.

• There were 453 antisemitic incidents which showed far right, anti-Israel or Islamist beliefs or motivations alongside antisemitism in 2014, making up 39 per cent of the overall total of 1,168 antisemitic incidents, compared to 130 incidents showing such ideas or motivations (24 per cent) in 2013. Of the 453 antisemitic incidents in 2014 showing ideological motivation or beliefs as well as antisemitism, 256 showed anti-Israel motivation or beliefs; 159 showed far right motivation or beliefs; and 38 showed Islamist motivation or beliefs. During the months of July and August, the proportion of incidents that showed political motivation alongside antisemitism rose to 54 per cent of the overall total, of which 76 per cent showed anti-Israel motivation alongside evidence of antisemitism.

• There is no clear correlation between the ethnicity of incident offenders and the antisemitic language they use; contemporary antisemitic incident offenders will select from a range of Jewish-related subjects, particularly insults related to the Holocaust or Israel, for language or imagery with which to abuse, insult or threaten their Jewish victims.

• 336 of the 1,168 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST nationally came via incident exchange programmes with the Police in Manchester and London, which allow for the systematic sharing of antisemitic incident reports between CST and the Police, so that both organisations have sight of incidents that had not otherwise been reported to them. The
incident reports are fully anonymised to comply with data protection requirements. A further 13 antisemitic incidents were reported to CST by the Police in other parts of the UK on an ad hoc basis. In total, Police forces provided reports of 349 antisemitic incidents, or 30 per cent of the total number of incidents recorded by CST. A total of 697 incidents, or 60 per cent, were reported directly to CST by the victims of, or witnesses to, antisemitic incidents, or by a friend or family member of an incident victim or witness. One hundred and one incidents were reported by CST staff or volunteers, or by the security officers at Jewish buildings and organisations. Thirteen antisemitic incidents were recorded by CST during 2014 on the basis of media reports.

- The 498 potential incidents reported to CST that were not included in the annual total included 161 cases of potential Information Collection and Suspicious Behaviour at Jewish locations. These included 60 incidents of photography or videoing of Jewish buildings, while in 32 cases suspicious people tried to gain entry to Jewish premises. These types of incidents are not categorised as antisemitic by CST as it is often not possible to determine their motivation, and many are likely to have innocent explanations. However, identifying and preventing the potential hostile reconnaissance of Jewish buildings or other potential terrorist targets is an important part of reducing the possibility of future terrorist attacks.

- In total, there were 1,666 incidents, including antisemitic incidents and those of a non-antisemitic security-related nature, which required a response from CST staff and volunteers during 2014.

**TOTAL NUMBER OF ANTISEMITIC INCIDENTS REPORTED TO CST 2014**
INTRODUCTION

The Community Security Trust
The Community Security Trust (CST) is a UK charity that advises and represents the Jewish community on matters of antisemitism, terrorism, policing and security. CST received charitable status in 1994 and is recognised by Government and the Police as a best practice model of a minority-community security organisation.

CST provides security advice and training for Jewish schools, synagogues and Jewish communal organisations and gives assistance to those bodies that are affected by antisemitism. CST also assists and supports individual members of the Jewish community who have been affected by antisemitism and antisemitic incidents. All this work is provided at no charge.

An essential part of CST’s work involves representing the Jewish community to Police, legislative and policy-making bodies and providing people inside and outside the Jewish community with information to combat antisemitism.

CST has recorded antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom since 1984.

Definition of antisemitic incidents
The statistics in CST’s annual Antisemitic Incidents Reports include antisemitic hate crimes and antisemitic non-crime incidents. CST defines an antisemitic incident as 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. This is a narrower definition than that used by the criminal justice system, which defines an antisemitic hate incident as “Any non-crime incident which is perceived by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on a person’s race/religion or perceived race/religion.”

Antisemitic incidents can take several forms, including physical attacks on people or property, verbal or written abuse, or antisemitic leaflets and posters. CST does not include the general activities of antisemitic organisations in its statistics; nor does it include activities such as offensive placards or massed antisemitic chanting on political demonstrations. CST does not record as incidents antisemitic material that is permanently hosted on internet websites, nor does CST ‘trawl’ social media platforms to look for antisemitic comments. However, CST will record antisemitic comments posted on internet forums or blog talkbacks, or transmitted via social media, if they have been reported to CST by a member of the public who fulfils the role of a victim or witness; if the comment shows evidence of antisemitic content, motivation or targeting; and if the offender is based in the United Kingdom or has directly targeted a UK-based victim. Examples of antisemitic expressions that fall outside this definition of an antisemitic incident can be found in CST’s annual Antisemitic Discourse Reports, available on the CST website.

Reporting antisemitic incidents
Antisemitic incidents are reported to CST in a number of ways, most commonly by telephone, email, via the CST website, via CST’s social media platforms, by post or in person to CST staff and volunteers. In recent

years, supported by grants from the Ministry of Justice Victim and Witness General Fund (formerly run by the Home Office), CST has conducted advertising campaigns to encourage incident reporting in areas of London and Manchester with significant Jewish communities. CST staff have also undergone specialist training from the Victim Support charity, in order to provide the best possible response to incident victims and witnesses who contact CST.

Incidents can be reported to CST by the victim, a witness, or by someone acting on their behalf. In 2001, CST was accorded ‘Third Party Reporting’ status by the Police, which allows CST to report antisemitic incidents to the Police and to act as a go-between for victims who are unable or unwilling to report to the Police directly. CST works closely with Police services and specialist units in monitoring and investigating antisemitic incidents. CST regularly exchanges anonymised antisemitic incident reports with Greater Manchester Police and the Metropolitan Police Service.

The Crime Survey for England and Wales estimates that around 40 per cent of all hate crimes come to the attention of the Police. It is likely, therefore, that most antisemitic incidents go unreported either to CST or to the Police, and therefore the true figures will be higher than those recorded in this report. No adjustments have been made to the figures to account for this. It is likely that this non-reporting also varies from category to category: a 2013 survey found that 72 per cent of British Jews who had experienced antisemitic harassment over the previous five years had not reported it to the Police or to any other organisation; 57 per cent of British Jews who had experienced antisemitic violence or the threat of violence had not reported it; and 46 per cent of those who had suffered antisemitic vandalism to their home or car had not reported it.

If an incident is reported to CST but shows no evidence of antisemitic motivation, language or targeting, then it will not be recorded as antisemitic and will not be included in CST’s annual antisemitic incident total. In 2014, CST received 498 reports of potential incidents that were rejected for this reason, and are not included in the total number of antisemitic incidents. These represent 30 per cent of the potential incidents reported to CST during 2014 and mostly involved criminal damage to, or theft from, Jewish property; assaults on or theft from Jewish people; suspicious activity or potential information-gathering around Jewish locations; or anti-Israel activity which did not involve the use of antisemitic language or imagery and was directed at pro-Israel campaigners, rather than being directed at Jewish people, buildings or organisations chosen solely because they are Jewish.

CST always prioritises the wishes and needs of incident victims, both individuals and the heads of Jewish organisations or communal buildings. In particular, CST treats the issue of victim confidentiality as a top priority. If an incident victim chooses to remain anonymous, or wishes there to be no publicity about an incident, CST will respect their request whenever possible.
**Contexts and patterns**

The sharp increase, and record high total, in antisemitic incidents recorded in 2014 follows a pattern whereby UK-based reactions to ‘trigger events’, often from overseas, cause temporary but significant ‘spikes’ in antisemitic incidents in the UK. In this case, antisemitic reactions in the UK to the conflict in Israel and Gaza that occurred in July and August 2014 were the biggest contributing factor to the record total of incidents reported to CST. A similar pattern contributed to the two previous record yearly totals in 2009 and 2006, due to antisemitic reactions to conflicts in Israel and Gaza (2009) and Israel and Lebanon (2006). Other past trigger events include the Iraq war in 2003; the 9/11 terrorist attacks in 2001; and the outbreak of the Second Intifada in 2000.

This ‘trigger effect’ directly influenced the monthly totals for July and August 2014, when the conflict in Israel and Gaza took place. In July, CST recorded 314 antisemitic incidents, a 432 per cent increase from the 59 incidents recorded in July 2013 and more than the number of antisemitic incidents recorded in the first six months of 2014 combined. In August, CST recorded 228 antisemitic incidents (a 375 per cent increase from the 48 incidents recorded in August 2013). Of the 542 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in July and August 2014, 258 (48 per cent) involved direct or indirect reference to the conflict in Israel and Gaza alongside antisemitic content, motivation or targeting. In September 2014, CST recorded 103 antisemitic incidents, almost double the 54 incidents recorded in September 2013. The monthly total for September suggests that, even though the conflict in Israel and Gaza ended on 26 August, its impact on antisemitic incident totals in the UK only gradually receded. This may suggest that the heightened level of antisemitic incident offending took time to dissipate, or it may reflect an increase in the willingness of Jewish people to report antisemitic incidents, due to increased and enduring concern about antisemitism. The impact of the conflict in Israel and Gaza on UK antisemitic incident patterns in 2014 is discussed in more detail in the section “Antisemitism and the Israeli/Palestinian conflict”, p.29.

It is highly likely, though, that there would have been an increase in the number of antisemitic incidents recorded during 2014 even without the trigger event of the Israel/Hamas conflict in July and August. Prior to that conflict, in the first six months of 2014, CST recorded 307 antisemitic incidents, an increase of 38 per cent compared to the 223 incidents recorded during the same period in 2013. One way to get a rough idea of the underlying trend through the year is to reduce the monthly totals for July, August and September 2014 to their 2013 levels in order to remove the impact of the conflict in Israel and Gaza on the overall incident total. Doing this suggests that the underlying trend shows an increase of 29 per cent for 2014 as a whole when compared to 2013. It is possible that the
reporting of antisemitic incidents to CST would have increased during and after the conflict in Israel and Gaza, due to heightened concern in the Jewish community about antisemitism. However, the fact that there had already been an increase of 38 per cent in recorded incidents prior to the conflict in Israel and Gaza (i.e., in the period from January to June 2014), suggests that improved reporting cannot, on its own, explain why the underlying trend shows an increase in recorded incidents for the year as a whole. Reducing the incident totals for July, August and September to their 2013 levels produces overall incident totals for the year that are more in keeping with the totals for the years 2010–2012 (reducing those three monthly totals to their 2012 levels produces a similar result).

The influence of a trigger event such as the conflict between Israel and Gaza does not only affect the overall total number of incidents; it also influences other factors, such as the type and location of incidents that take place; the most common type of offender; and the language or imagery used by antisemitic incident offenders. For example, in the first six months of 2014, those incident offenders described to CST as ‘White – North European’ or ‘White – South European’ comprised 62 per cent of the total number of offenders for whom CST obtained a description during this period.
However, during the months of July and August, this figure fell to 34 per cent. Similarly, the language and imagery used by antisemitic incident offenders changes depending on the nature of a particular trigger event. As stated above, 258 incidents recorded during July and August 2014 involved direct or indirect reference to the conflict in Israel and Gaza alongside evidence of antisemitic content, motivation or targeting. For comparison, in the whole of 2013, just 49 antisemitic incidents made reference to Israel or the Palestinians.

Some trigger events may have small impacts in the UK in terms of incident numbers, but are still significant. For example, on 18 November 2014 CST recorded 11 antisemitic incidents, an unusually high daily total for a normal period. It may be relevant that on 18 November, worshippers at a synagogue in the Har Nof neighbourhood of Jerusalem were murdered by Palestinian assailants. Four of the antisemitic incidents recorded by CST on that day involved actions and language that may have been indirect references to the Har Nof synagogue murders. Two of these incidents were as follows:

- **Birmingham, November:** Four South Asian males, one possibly carrying a knife, tried to gain entry to a Masonic hall that was formerly a synagogue while shouting “Kill the infidels, you are Satan worshippers, are there any f*****g Jews in there”.

- **London, November:** A rabbi was driving through London when a man shouted, “Itbah al-Yahud” at him (Arabic for “slaughter the Jews”) while running his finger across his throat in a cutting action.

Antisemitic incident totals can also rise for circumstantial reasons. CST recorded 26 antisemitic incidents on the five days in September and October that covered the Jewish High Holy Days of Rosh Hashanah, Kol Nidre and Yom Kippur. This pattern occurs most years and is partly explained by the increased numbers of visibly Jewish people on the streets as they walk to and from synagogue, and also by an increased CST and Police presence in Jewish communities, which in turn makes it easier for victims of antisemitism to report incidents.

Changes in the numbers of incidents recorded by CST can sometimes reflect changes to the way in which incidents are reported, as well as changes in how, when and why they take place. Since 2011, CST has operated an incident exchange programme with Greater Manchester Police, and since 2012 CST has done so with the Metropolitan Police Service in London. These programmes allow for the systematic sharing of individual reports between CST and the Police to give both agencies sight of incidents that had not previously been reported to them. The reports are fully anonymised to comply with data protection requirements, and any duplicates – incidents that had been reported to both CST and the Police – are eliminated to ensure that there can be no ‘double counting’. In 2014, 336 antisemitic incidents were reported to CST by this method. Prior to the introduction of these programmes, antisemitic incidents in London and Manchester had been shared by the Police with CST on an ad hoc basis, for operational or community engagement purposes, as they still are in other parts of the country; but most incidents reported to the Police would not have been shared with CST and therefore were not counted in CST’s antisemitic incident statistics. Consequently, this new and significant source of antisemitic incident reports must be taken into consideration when comparing CST’s antisemitic incident totals since 2011 with those from 2010 and earlier.
Answering the questions of why antisemitic incidents take place, who carries them out and who suffers from them is not always straightforward. Sometimes the evidence of victims or witnesses concerning what may have been a shocking, traumatic and brief experience can be vague and disjointed. Many antisemitic incidents, particularly those that take place on social media or via graffiti in public places, do not have a specific victim and the offender is often unknown. The antisemitic incident reports provided to CST by Police forces are anonymised to comply with data protection requirements, but this often strips them of detail that would help to classify the victim and offender by age, gender and ethnic appearance. While allowing for all these caveats, it is still possible to analyse the data contained in the individual incident reports received by CST during 2014, and the picture they show is one of complexity. In short, and despite the significant role played by specific trigger events in 2014, there is no single profile of an antisemitic incident victim, nor of an antisemitic incident offender, nor is there a single explanation as to why antisemitic incidents take place. This is explained in more detail in the sections “Incident victims”, p.24; “Incident offenders”, p.26; and “Discourse and motives”, p.27.

Long-term trends
The 2014 total of 1,168 antisemitic incidents reverses a short-term trend of falling incident totals since 2009, but continues a long-term trend of rising antisemitic incident totals since 2000. The incident data collected by CST since 1984 suggests that when trigger events occur frequently, as they did during the decade following 2000, successive spikes in antisemitic incident levels generate a gradual, long-term increase in the baseline level of antisemitic incidents recorded in the UK. This factor is particularly noticeable in London, where incident totals correlate to the national totals more than anywhere else does. On the other hand, the relative absence of major trigger events since 2010 led to a gradual decrease in the baseline level, until the next trigger event occurred in 2014. As described above in relation to the annual incident total for 2013, individual annual totals can also turn out in subsequent years to be anomalies, rather than indicating a more significant change in incident trends.

As well as this impact of repeated incident spikes over several years, the gradual increase in incident totals also reflects better awareness in the Jewish community of CST’s work, and a consequent improvement in the rates of reporting antisemitic incidents to CST by Jewish communities around the UK. It is also influenced by the introduction of new sources of antisemitic incident reporting, such as online incident reporting facilities and the incident exchange programmes with GMP and MPS. In addition, in recent years social media has provided a new arena and medium for antisemitic incidents to occur and to be reported. Therefore, any comparison of current recorded antisemitic incident totals with those from a decade ago or more should be done with caution.

Despite improvements in reporting, it is to be expected that antisemitic hate crime and hate incidents, like other forms of hate crime, are significantly under-reported. This is particularly the case where the victims are minors; where the incident is considered of ‘lesser’ impact by the victim; and for incidents that take place on social media. Consequently, the statistics contained in this report should be taken as being indicative of general trends, rather than absolute measures of the number of incidents that actually take place.
INCIDENT CATEGORIES

CST classifies antisemitic incidents by six distinct categories: Extreme Violence; Assault; Damage and Desecration of Property; Threats; Abusive Behaviour; and Antisemitic Literature. The definitions of these categories, and examples of incidents recorded in each one during 2014, are given below.9

Extreme Violence

Incidents of Extreme Violence include any attack potentially causing loss of life or grievous bodily harm (GBH). There was one incident of Extreme Violence in 2014, compared with none in 2013 and two in 2012. The incident of Extreme Violence recorded in 2014 was as follows:

• London, September: The victim was called a “Jewish c***” and then hit with a glass and a baseball bat.

Assault

Incidents of Assault include any physical attack against a person or people, which does not pose a threat to their life and is not GBH.

CST recorded 80 incidents of Assault in 2014, compared to 69 in 2013. This means that the total number of violent antisemitic incidents (combining the categories of Assault and Extreme Violence) recorded in 2014 was 81, a 17 per cent increase from the 69 incidents recorded in these two categories combined in 2013. The total of 81 violent antisemitic assaults reported to CST in 2014 is the highest since 2011, when 95 violent incidents were recorded.

Sixty-three of the 81 incidents of Assault recorded in 2014 were random attacks on Jewish people in public places, of which 38 targeted people who were visibly Jewish, usually due to their religious or traditional clothing. Eight assaults targeted synagogue congregants on their way to or from prayers, and four targeted Jewish schoolchildren on their way to or from school. CST received a description of the gender of the victims in 69 of the incidents of Assault. Of these, the victims were male in 45 incidents; in 11 incidents they were female; and in 13 they were mixed couples or groups of males and females. CST received a description of the age of the victims in 44 of the incidents of Assault or Extreme Violence. Of these, in 29 incidents the victims were adults; in 9 incidents the victims were minors; and in 6 incidents they were mixed groups of adults and minors.

CST received a description of the gender of the offenders in 40 of the incidents of Assault, of which 36 involved male offenders, three involved female offenders and one involved male and female offenders acting together. CST received a description of the age of the offenders in 31 of the incidents of Assault. Of these, the offenders were adults in 17 incidents; in 11 incidents they were minors; and 3 incidents involved adults and minors offending together. Nineteen of the incidents involved objects, usually eggs, being thrown at visibly Jewish people from passing cars. Particular targets for this kind of incident are the strictly Orthodox communities in Salford and Bury in north Manchester and in Golders Green and Hendon in north London.

Incidents in the category of Assault in 2014 included:

• Manchester, March: A visibly Jewish man was cycling to synagogue when a group of youths jumped out at him, causing him to wobble on his bike. They then surrounded him and called him a “Jew”. The Jewish man slipped over and the group kicked him while he was on the ground. He did not suffer serious injury.
• London, April: Two men entered a kosher restaurant late at night, made a Nazi salute and shouted, “Heil, Adolf Hitler.” One of them grabbed one of the diners in a bear hug. One of the offenders was subsequently convicted of racially or religiously aggravated harassment and assault.

• Edinburgh, June: A 12-year-old boy sprayed deodorant onto a Jewish girl in his school year while saying, “Gas the Jews.”

• London, June: A Jewish man was walking in an area with a large visibly Jewish community, when the occupant of a passing vehicle shouted, “Hey Jew” and threw an egg at him.

• Manchester, July: Five cars with pro-Palestinian banners on them drove through an area of Manchester with a large Jewish community. The occupants of the cars shouted antisemitic abuse and threw eggs and cans at Jewish pedestrians.

• Gateshead, July: Four teenagers were convicted of racially aggravated common assault after they chased a Jewish man down the street and threw a piece of wood at him. The men then surrounded their victim, who had tripped while running away, and were about to kick him before a witness shouted at them to stop. They told Police that they had driven from Newcastle to Gateshead to find a Jewish person to attack due to the conflict in Israel and Gaza.

• London, July: A visibly Jewish boy was cycling in an area with a large Jewish community, when a woman wearing a niqab threw a stone that hit him on his cycle helmet.

• London, October: Five girls from a Jewish secondary school were at a London Underground station when a man approached them saying, “You shouldn’t be Jewish, being Jewish is wrong”, “You are going to die if you carry on being Jewish” and “I will kill you all after school.” He grabbed one of the girls by the wrist and said, “Come with me and be a Christian”, but she kicked him in the shin and ran away.

• Newcastle, November: A rabbi was on a train from Newcastle to London when a group of football fans got on. When they saw the victim they shouted, “Hey look there’s a Jew over there” and started singing antisemitic songs and throwing food at the victim. The abuse continued for 15–20 minutes until the fans disembarked at Darlington.

• Manchester, December: A visibly Jewish man was spat at by the occupant of a passing vehicle, who also shouted, “F*****g Jewish c***” at him.

Media report of the conviction of a gang for antisemitic assault in Gateshead, July 2014
Damage and Desecration to Jewish Property

This category includes any physical attack directed against Jewish-owned property, or property that is perceived to be connected to Jews, which is not life-threatening. This includes the daubing of antisemitic slogans or symbols (such as swastikas) – including fixing stickers and posters – on Jewish property; and damage caused to property where it appears that the property has been specifically targeted because of its perceived Jewish connection, or where antisemitic expressions are made by the offender while causing the damage.

There were 81 incidents of Damage and Desecration in 2014, an increase of 65 per cent from the 2013 total of 49 incidents in this category. The 2014 total of 81 incidents is the highest in this category since 2010, when 83 incidents of this type were recorded. Of the 81 incidents recorded in 2014, 39 affected the homes of Jewish people, or vehicles parked at their homes. Nine involved desecrations of, or antisemitic damage to, synagogues. There were seven incidents in 2014 that involved antisemitic damage to, or desecration of, Jewish cemeteries, and two that involved the antisemitic hacking of websites of Jewish organisations.

Incidents of Damage and Desecration in 2014 included:

- **Manchester, January:** A swastika and the words “Get Out” were daubed on the home of a Jewish person.

- **Manchester, February:** Swastikas and the phrase “Jewish slag” were daubed on gravestones at a Jewish cemetery.

- **Manchester, April:** A swastika was scratched onto the bonnet of a car belonging to a visibly Jewish family.

- **London, May:** “F**k Yids” was written on the front door of a Jewish person’s property.

- **London, May:** A Star of David was defaced with a swastika in the multi-faith prayer room at an airport.

- **London, July:** The website of a Jewish school was hacked and a message left that read: “We are Muslims...Quran is our book...#OpSaveGaza...Jerusalem is ours...F**** Israel...Al Khilafah is coming soon.”

- **Brighton & Hove, August:** “Free Gaza” was daubed on the outer wall of a synagogue.

- **Hertfordshire, September:** Several cars in the same road, some of which were owned by Jewish residents, had swastikas scratched onto them.

- **London, September:** The word “Jew” was painted onto the back door of a Jewish person’s house.

- **Manchester, October:** A group of youths were throwing stones at Jewish homes and Jewish-owned vehicles while shouting, “Bloody Jews.”
Threats
This category includes only direct antisemitic threats, whether verbal or written.

There were 92 incidents reported to CST in the category of Threats in 2014, an increase of 142 per cent compared to the 38 incidents recorded in 2013. The 92 recorded incidents in 2014 is the highest total in this category since 2004, when 93 antisemitic threats were recorded. Twenty-nine of the 92 threats recorded in 2014 took place in public, of which nine involved threats shouted from passing vehicles. Sixty-three incidents in this category involved verbal abuse, 18 took place on social media, four threats were delivered by paper hate mail and three by email.

Incidents in the category of Threats in 2014 included:

- **London, January:** A Jewish woman was walking past a synagogue when a man approached her and said, “I’m gonna kill the Jews, let them know.”

- **London, February:** A Jewish politician received a voicemail message that said, “You f*****g pathetic piece of f*****g kike filth. Cannot wait to see the day when you are hanging from a f*****g rope. Die f*****g kike vermin.”

- **London, March:** A university student took a photograph of a visibly Jewish person on a bus and then posted it on Twitter with the comment, “50 retweets and I’ll knock this Jew out”.

- **London, May:** A visibly Jewish man was in an area with a large Jewish population, when a driver got out of his car and started shouting about Jews killing Palestinians, before threatening to kill him.

- **Manchester, July:** A man phoned a Jewish organisation and asked to speak about the “butchering in Gaza”, before saying, “If it continues there will be reprisals against the Jews in Britain” and that he would be all for it.

- **London, June:** A man entered a Jewish bakery and threatened customers, saying he was going to “kill Jews in this area”, while making Nazi salutes. The man was later arrested.

- **Manchester, August:** A taxi driver drove his car towards a group of Jewish pedestrians, forcing them to move out of the way, and said, “I’m going to run you over Jew.”

- **London, September:** A group of Jewish schoolchildren boarded a bus and a male passenger began to shout, “Get the Jews off the bus”, “All the Jews do is f**k us”, “I’m going to burn the bus” and “I’m going to burn the Jews.” The offender pleaded guilty to a racially aggravated public order offence and was given a 16-week prison sentence.

- **London, November:** A drunk male entered a Jewish food shop and threatened the staff, shouting, “F*****g Jew, I will f*****g shoot you, you f*****g Jew.”
Abusive Behaviour
This category includes verbal and written antisemitic abuse. The verbal abuse can be face to face or via telephone calls and voicemail messages. The category also includes antisemitic emails, text messages, tweets and social media comments, as well as targeted antisemitic letters (that is, one-off letters aimed at and sent to a specific individual), irrespective of whether or not the recipient is Jewish. This is different from a mass mailing of antisemitic leaflets, pamphlets or group emails, which is dealt with by the separate Literature category. Antisemitic graffiti on non-Jewish property is also included in this category.

There were 884 incidents of Abusive Behaviour reported to CST in 2014, by some distance the highest number of incidents ever recorded by CST in this category. The previous record high in this category was 611 incidents, recorded in 2009. The 884 antisemitic Abusive Behaviour incidents recorded in 2014 is an increase of 136 per cent from the 374 incidents of this type recorded in 2013. In 302 of the incidents in this category, the victims were random Jewish people in public places; in at least 139 of these incidents, the victims were visibly Jewish. Verbal antisemitic abuse was used in 478 incidents in this category; while 215 incidents of Abusive Behaviour took place on social media. Sixty-five incidents of Abusive Behaviour occurred via email and 22 involved the use of paper hate mail. Sixty-five involved antisemitic daubings, graffiti or stickers on non-Jewish property.

Incidents of Abusive Behaviour in 2014 included:

- **Manchester, January:** Some visibly Jewish people were at a petrol station when two occupants of another car spat towards their vehicle and shouted, “F*****g Jews, I’m talking to you f*****g Jewish c***s” while making offensive hand gestures and a gun symbol with their fingers.

- **London, January:** A group of teenage boys shouted, “Auschwitz” and made Nazi salutes towards the occupants of a Jewish school bus.

- **Leeds, February:** A Jewish student wearing a yarmulke was walking through Leeds University campus when three women said “Jew” and “kike” towards him.

- **London, February:** The offender boarded a bus and shouted, “F*****g Jews” at some Jewish schoolchildren who were on-board.

- **London, March:** A woman shouted, “Get out Jews” and “You worship the devil” at staff and parents at a Jewish school.

- **Manchester, March:** A visibly Jewish nine-year-old boy was walking near his home when somebody drove past, shouted, “Jew, Jew, Jew” and took a photograph of him.

- **London, March:** A Jewish school’s football team was playing against a non-Jewish team and one of the players on the non-Jewish team said, “You should have all been killed by the Nazis, you Jew.”

- **Leeds, April:** A visibly Jewish student was walking home on Shabbat when a car drove past and the driver shouted, “Jewish b*****d.”

- **London, April:** A Jewish person was paying for petrol at a petrol station. As he walked back to his car, the occupant of the car behind his shouted at him to hurry up and called him a “f*****g Yiddo.”

- **Hertfordshire, April:** A rabbi was in his vehicle when a pedestrian shouted, “Yiddo, Yiddo” at him.
• **London, May:** A football fan was making Nazi salutes at a match against Tottenham Hotspur.

• **Birmingham, May:** The occupants of a vehicle shouted, “F**k you Jews” at a visibly Jewish person walking to synagogue.

• **Manchester, June:** The occupant of a vehicle shouted, “Anti-Palestinian f***ers” at visibly Jewish pedestrians.

• **London, July:** A group of girls from an Orthodox Jewish secondary school were on a school trip when some girls from a different school swore at them, while holding up three fingers to taunt them about three teenagers who had been kidnapped in Israel.

• **London, July:** A rabbi was walking to synagogue through a local park when two youths saw him and shouted, “Free Palestine”, “F**k the Zionists”, “F**k the Jews” and “Allah Akhbar”. One of them then shouted, “Orthodox Jews are fine, it’s the Zionists that should be killed.”

• **Liverpool, July:** A Jewish couple were leaving synagogue when a car drove past and the occupant shouted, “Baby murderers” at them.

• **Newcastle, July:** Two men paid for goods in a shop, and after they left the shop assistants noticed that the notes they used had “Get the Jews before they get you” and “Jews are taking over the world” written on them.

• **London, July:** A Jewish organisation received an email that read: “What you Jews are doing in Palestine is just as serious as what the Nazis did to your people. There is no excuse for killing young children in school. TO HELL WITH THE JEWS FROM NOW UNTIL ETERNITY.”

• **London, July:** A man entered a Jewish charity shop and began ranting about Israel, before saying that he wouldn’t buy anything from Jews. The same man returned a few days later and posted hate mail through the door that read: “IS THIS YOUR 2014 PALA CAUST. NO WONDER PEOPLE DO NOT LIKE JEWISH PEOPLE.”

• **Leicester, July:** A posting on Facebook read: “What is WRONG with the JEWISH RELIGION? They were baby killers in Roman times over two thousand years ago, and they were still baby killers in 1947, and still they are BABY KILLERS in 2014. It is obviously a religion founded on terrorism and cruelty! If I am WRONG please prove me WRONG! I would find it very difficult to remain being a Jew if I had been one.”

• **Manchester, July:** A man was standing at a bus stop shouting, “F**k the Jews” and “F**k Zionists” at nobody in particular. He was also shouting about Gaza and Israel.

• **Glasgow, August:** A woman was looking at a copy of the Jewish Telegraph newspaper in a supermarket when a man wearing a “Support Gaza” badge approached her and subjected her to antisemitic verbal abuse.

• **London, August:** A Jewish-owned estate agents received a voicemail message that said, “You Jewish b*****d baby–killing c**ts.”

• **Manchester, August:** A Jewish woman posted a Facebook status that read: “Support Israel, we want peace.” In reply, someone posted “Shame we cannot bring back Hitler, he should have wiped you all out.”

• **London, August:** Graffiti was daubed on a pavement reading “Jews kill Palestinian babies.”
• **Manchester, August:** A Jewish person was at a pro-Israel demonstration when the occupant of a passing vehicle shouted, “I wish Hitler was here” three times in her direction.

• **Birmingham, September:** A man approached a synagogue on Shabbat and shouted that he hated Jews and they were all “devil worshippers”.

• **Brighton, September:** A man shouted, “F*****g Jews” at a synagogue on the Jewish festival of Rosh Hashanah. He was given a Police caution for a racially aggravated offence.

• **London, October:** An antisemitic comment was left on the website of a Jewish newspaper. It read: “Too bad the Holohoax is a complete lie! 6 million less Satanic Jew parasites on the planet would be a blessing to everyone! Jews deserve to be exterminated once and for all!”

• **Manchester, October:** A Jewish boy was sent an Instagram photo that featured a doctored image from the film *Jaws*. In the photo, the word “Jaws” was replaced with “Jews” and the image of a shark was replaced with a picture of Adolf Hitler.

• **Liverpool and London, October:** Several antisemitic tweets were sent to a Jewish Member of Parliament, including the hashtag “#HitlerWasRight” and personal abuse directed at the victim.

• **Glasgow, November:** Following a TV news item about the possible opening of a Holocaust study centre in Scotland, the TV channel’s Facebook page received antisemitic postings, including: “Don’t the Jews own most of the banks?”, “The Holohoax or Holocaust” and “... the so-called ‘holocaust’ is nothing but a fabrication and down right demonization of the German people, who still are held to ransom over this terrible lie, and that the world has been fooled by the Jewish holocaust political weapon.”

• **Manchester, November:** A passer-by shouted, “Dirty Jewish b*****d” and “Nazi” at pro-Israel demonstrators outside a shop selling Israeli products.

• **Manchester, November:** A 12-year-old girl was walking on Shabbat when the occupant of a passing vehicle shouted, “F*****g Jew” at her.

• **London, December:** An image on Twitter showed a dining table with nooses hanging over every chair. The caption read: “Preparing for dinner with some Jews!”
Literature
This category covers mass-produced antisemitic literature which is distributed in multiple quantities. This can involve a single mass mailing or repeated individual mailings, but it must involve the multiple use of the same piece of literature in order to fall into this category. This is different from one-off cases of hate mail targeted at individual people or organisations, which would come under the category of either Abusive Behaviour or Threats (depending on the hate mail’s content). The Literature category includes literature that is antisemitic in itself, irrespective of whether or not the recipient is Jewish, and cases where Jews are specifically targeted for malicious distribution, even if the material itself is not antisemitic. This would include, for instance, the mass mailing of neo-Nazi literature to targeted Jewish organisations or homes, even if the literature did not mention Jews. This category also includes emails that are sent to groups of recipients.

The statistics for the category of Literature give no indication of the extent of distribution. A single mass mailing of antisemitic literature is only counted as one incident, although it could involve material being sent to dozens of recipients. Thus the number of incidents reflects the number of offenders, rather than the number of victims.

There were 30 incidents recorded in the category of Literature in 2014, six times the number of incidents of this type in 2013, when five such incidents were recorded. This is the highest number of incidents recorded in this category since 2009, when 62 were recorded by CST. The number of incidents of this type had declined markedly since 2009, with 25 recorded in 2010, seven in 2011 and 12 in 2012. The 30 incidents recorded in this category in 2014 interrupts this decline. Fifteen of the Literature incidents recorded in 2014 involved email and 15 involved the distribution of paper leaflets or pamphlets.

Examples of Literature incidents in 2014 included:

- **Manchester, February**: A secondary-school pupil stuck notes around the school that read: “All Jews go to hell” and “Death to all Jews”.

- **London, May**: A Jewish organisation received a mass email that included the allegation of “The Jewish conspiracy of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions”.

Antisemitic and anti-Israel leaflet placed amongst Israeli produce, a supermarket, Norfolk, July 2014
• **London, July:** An Israeli organisation received a mass email that had a picture of Adolf Hitler with the captions “Yes man, you were right” and “I could have killed all the Jews but I left some of them to let you know why I was killing them”.

• **London, July:** A leaflet was sent to several Members of Parliament that was titled “Multiculturalism is White Genocide”, and read: “The end goal of multiculturalism, globalisation and the New World Order is to create a 1% Jewish master-race and a 99% dumbed down multi-racial or mixed race breed of debt slaves to serve them. You can probably see this happening around you in Britain today.”

• **Norfolk, July:** A leaflet was placed amongst Israeli produce in a supermarket. The leaflet had an image of the Israeli flag with the title “The flag of Zionist racist scum”. It also read: “Deny the Holocaust? Of course there was a Holocaust. What a pity Adolf and Co. didn’t manage to finish the job properly!”

• **London, August:** Several synagogues received an email that read: “Stop murdering Palestinian children.”

• **Birmingham, Liverpool and London, August:** Several synagogues received an anonymous letter that read, “Israeli-Nazis have turned Gaza into a modern Auschwitz and are now annihilating its civilians without remorse.” The letter contained an image of a swastika inside a Star of David.

• **Leeds, November:** A leaflet was put through the doors of Jewish and non-Jewish homes in an area with a large Jewish community. The leaflet contained several negative references to Jews, such as “Why not tell Cameron enough is enough and stop his complicity in Jew War crimes.” The leaflet also contained offensive references to other minorities.

### GEOGRAPHICAL INCIDENT CATEGORIES

**2014: LONDON & MANCHESTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Manchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Behaviour</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage &amp; Desecration</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INCIDENT VICTIMS

THE VICTIMS of antisemitic incidents come from the whole spectrum of the Jewish community: from strictly Orthodox to Liberal, Reform and secular Jews; from the largest Jewish communities of London and Manchester to small, isolated communities all over the United Kingdom; and from Jewish schoolchildren to Members of Parliament.

The most common single type of incident involved verbal abuse randomly directed at visibly Jewish people in public. Such incidents are more commonly associated with anti-social behaviour or local patterns of street crime than with political activism or ideologies: 39 per cent of incidents recorded in 2014 showed evidence of political motivations or beliefs, while 61 per cent did not. In 397 incidents, the victims were ordinary Jewish people, male or female, attacked or abused while going about their daily business in public places. In at least 190 of these, the victims were visibly Jewish, usually due to their religious or traditional clothing, school uniform or jewellery bearing Jewish symbols. Sixty-nine incidents targeted synagogue property and staff, compared to 31 in 2013, and a further 41 incidents targeted congregants on their way to or from prayers, compared to 26 in 2013. There were 213 incidents that targeted Jewish community organisations, communal events, commercial premises or high-profile individuals, compared to 59 in 2013, while 90 incidents happened at people’s private homes (58 in 2013). Twenty-seven antisemitic incidents took place in the workplace or were work-related, compared to 15 in 2013.

A total of 66 antisemitic incidents took place at schools or involved Jewish schoolchildren or teaching staff, compared to 32 in 2013. Of the 66 incidents of this type in 2014, 18 took place at Jewish schools, 21 at non-faith schools and 27 affected Jewish schoolchildren on their journeys to and from school. Five of the 66 school-related incidents were in the category of Assault, none of which took place at Jewish school premises; three involved Damage and Desecration of Jewish property; six were in the category of Threats; 51 were in the category of Abusive Behaviour; and one was in the category of Literature.

There were 19 antisemitic incidents in which the victims were Jewish students, academics or other student bodies, compared to 9 campus-related antisemitic incidents in 2013. Of the 19 incidents of this type reported to CST in 2014, 8 took place on campus and 11 off campus. One of the 19 incidents involving students, academics or student bodies was in the category of Assault and took place off campus. Of the remaining 18 incidents, 15 were in the category of Abusive Behaviour, which includes verbal abuse and antisemitic graffiti; there were two campus-related incidents of Damage and Desecration of Jewish property; and there was one incident in the category of Threats. Three of the antisemitic incidents that took place on campus involved the use of social media, and three involved verbal abuse. Three involved the use of language or imagery related to the Holocaust or the Nazi period, while one involved the use of language or imagery related to Israel and the Middle East. None of the eight on-campus antisemitic incidents occurred in the immediate context of student political activity.

CST received a description of the gender of the victim or victims in 566 (48 per cent) of the 1,168 antisemitic incidents reported to CST during 2014. Of these, the victims were male in 308 incidents (54 per cent of incidents where the victim’s gender was known), female in 219 incidents (39 per cent) and groups of males and females together in 39 incidents (7 per cent).
CST received a description of the age of the victim or victims of 351 (30 per cent) of the 1,168 incidents recorded during 2014. Breaking this down into adults and minors (while acknowledging the difficulty in accurately categorising incident victims who may be merely described by witnesses as “youths” or “teenagers”) shows that 260 incident victims were described to CST as adults (74 per cent of incidents where the victim's age was described), 65 were described as minors (19 per cent) and in 26 cases (7 per cent) the victims were described as adults and minors together.

WHO AND WHAT IS BEING TARGETED
2014
INCIDENT OFFENDERS

CST is often asked by journalists and members of the public to identify the ethnic or religious background of incident offenders. This can be a difficult and imprecise task. CST will ask incident victims or witnesses if they can describe the person, or people, who committed the incident they are reporting, but many antisemitic incidents involve public encounters where the antisemitic abuse may be generic, brief and sometimes non-verbal. The evidence of victims of, and witnesses to, antisemitic incidents may rely on their interpretation of the offender’s physical appearance, language or other indicators. While it is possible to collect data regarding the ethnic appearance of incident offenders, this data is not direct evidence of the offenders’ religious affiliations. In addition, many incidents do not involve face-to-face contact between offender and victim so it is not always possible to obtain a physical description of the offender. The content of an antisemitic letter may reveal the motivation of the offender, but it would be a mistake to assume to know the ethnicity or religion of a hate mail sender on the basis of the discourse they employ. Social media platforms afford a level of anonymity to offenders, should they wish to hide their identity, but can also provide some personal details of offenders, such as their name, photograph or approximate location. As explained in the "Contexts and patterns" section of this report (p.11), the anonymised antisemitic incident reports provided to CST by Police forces are stripped of much of the detail of the offender’s age, gender and ethnic appearance.

Bearing in mind all these limitations, a physical description of the offender was obtained in 340, or 29 per cent, of the 1,168 incidents recorded by CST in 2014.10 Of these, 148 offenders were described as ‘White – North European’ (44 per cent); five offenders were described as ‘White – South European’ (1 per cent); 26 offenders were described as ‘Black’ (8 per cent); 127 offenders were described as ‘South Asian’ (37 per cent); 34 offenders were described as being ‘Arab or North African’ (10 per cent); and no offenders were described as ‘East or South East Asian’. These figures partly reflect the fact that Britain’s Jewish communities tend to live in relatively diverse urban areas, and that street crime offenders (where most antisemitic incidents take place) make up a younger, and more diverse, demographic profile than the population as a whole.

CST received a description of the gender of the offender or offenders in 589 (50 per cent) of the 1,168 antisemitic incidents recorded in 2014. Of these, the offenders were described as male in 512 incidents (87 per cent of incidents where the offender’s gender was known), female in 67 incidents (11 per cent) and mixed groups of males and females in 10 incidents (2 per cent).

CST received a description of the approximate age of the offender or offenders in 350 of the 1,168 incidents reported during the year (30 per cent). Of these 350 incidents, and allowing for the same caveats as when attempting to analyse the ages of incident victims, the offenders were described as adults in 272 antisemitic incidents (78 per cent of incidents where the offender’s age was estimated), minors in 73 incidents (21 per cent) and adults and minors together in five incidents (1 per cent). Younger antisemitic incident offenders appear to be more likely than adults to be involved in violent incidents (albeit usually using relatively limited violence): minors were responsible for 35 per cent of the incidents recorded by CST in the category of Assault in 2014 (where an age description of the offender was provided), but for only 18 per cent of the incidents in the categories of Abusive Behaviour or Threats combined (where an age description of the offender was provided).

10. CST uses the ‘IC1-6’ system, used by the UK Police services, for categorising the ethnic appearance of offenders. This uses the codes IC1, IC2, IC3, etc for ‘White – North European’; ‘White – South European’; ‘Black’; ‘South Asian’; ‘East or South East Asian’; and ‘Arab or North African’. This is obviously not a foolproof system and can only be used as a rough guide.
DISCOURSE AND MOTIVES

ANALYSING the content of incidents can help to identify the motives of incident offenders, although the link between the discourse used in an incident and the motivation of the offender or offenders is not always obvious. For example, compare these two incidents:

- **Manchester, June:** An activist in a far right organisation tweeted an image of the Israeli flag with the words “Die f*****g Jew” and “I f*****g hate Jews”. Another tweet read: “We’re waging war against the Jew in Britain. We will not stop until this nation belongs to our folk.”

  In the first example, despite the use of an Israeli flag, it is clear from the language used, and the organisational affiliation of the offender, that the incident was motivated by far right beliefs. However, although the offenders in the second incident used classic Nazi language to express support for Adolf Hitler, their ethnicity suggests that they were unlikely to have been motivated by neo-Nazi ideology of that type. Alternatively, political discourse may be used by an incident offender in ways that are confused and not tied to any particular ideological outlook. For example:

- **London, July:** An Israeli organisation in London received an email that read: “As an indigenous Englishman, I used to admire the Jewish race. However, now we all see the hatred you wicked vile pieces of s**t scum have always had towards Palestine and its civilians, in particular directed towards its little innocent children and womenfolk. You evil cowards and BIG HYPOCRITES that you are, never ever to be trusted again in world politics and military operations. You loathsome killers, murdering b******ds; you perpetrators of infanticide. Hope you ISRAELI ‘NAZI WAR CRIMINALS’ all go to ‘Hell’ when you die, you ‘rotten to the core’ modern day ‘NAZI JEWS’.”

  This incident is clearly politically motivated but it is not obvious what ideology drives the offender. The author of the email uses language and imagery relating to both the Holocaust and the Israeli–Palestinian conflict, while clearly expressing animosity towards Jews in general. The content of the letter primarily concerns the actions of the State of Israel, but the references to being an “indigenous Englishman” and to the “Jewish race” suggest a way of thinking more associated with traditional, far right attitudes. However, the writer then goes on to call the victims “Nazi Jews”, suggesting that he himself is not a neo-Nazi. He may sympathise with far right attitudes (but not Nazism), or he may be motivated primarily by anti-Israel sentiments, or a combination of the two.

  Sometimes, the use of political discourse does not reflect any ideological motivation at all, as can be seen in this incident:

- **London, August:** A Jewish man was trying to park outside a house a few doors down from the people he was visiting. The male owner of the house did not want him to park there. He came out of the house, opened the car door and said, “Do you think we are all Palestinians? The Germans should have done a better job and finished you all off, f**k off c**t.”

  This particular incident is typical of contemporary antisemitic incident offenders, who will often select from a range of Jewish-
related discourses for language or imagery with which to abuse, insult or threaten their Jewish victims. Sometimes the specific language used is of secondary importance, compared to the desire to insult or abuse Jews.

Rather than being limited to prejudice rooted in traditional, far right beliefs, or fuelled exclusively by more contemporary extremisms or anti-Israel sentiment, the antisemitic incidents reported to CST in 2014 represent the multifaceted nature of contemporary antisemitism. In 239 of the 1,168 antisemitic incidents reported to CST in 2014, the offenders employed discourse based on the Nazi period, including swastikas and references to the Holocaust. Of these, 159 showed evidence of far right motivation or beliefs. For comparison, in 2013, Nazi-related discourse was used by offenders in 143 antisemitic incidents, of which 88 showed evidence of far right motivation or beliefs. In contrast, discourse related to Israel or the Middle East was used in 303 antisemitic incidents in 2014 (compared to 49 in 2013), of which 256 showed evidence of anti-Israel motivation or beliefs (37 in 2012); and discourse relating to Islam or Muslims was present in 38 antisemitic incidents in 2014 (seven in 2013), while 38 incidents showed evidence of Islamist motivation or beliefs (five in 2012). Clearly, the trigger event of the conflict in Israel and Gaza in July and August 2014 is reflected in the political motivations of, and discourse used by, antisemitic incident perpetrators. This is discussed in more detail in the section “Antisemitism and the Israeli/Palestinian conflict,” p.29. Overall, 39 per cent of incidents in 2014 showed some degree of ideological motivation or belief, compared to 24 per cent of incidents in 2013. In all of these incidents, it was necessary for there to be evidence of antisemitic language, targeting or motivation, as well as any political or ideological motivation, for the incident to be recorded by CST as antisemitic.
CST antisemitic incident data has established, over several years, that trigger events that are perceived to involve Jews or Israel can spark a temporary rise in antisemitic incidents in Britain (see “Contexts and patterns”, p.11). It is usually possible to determine whether spikes in incidents of this nature are caused by increased reporting of incidents, or whether there is a genuine rise in the number of incidents taking place. For example, after the shooting of a teacher and three children at a Jewish school in Toulouse, France, in March 2012, CST recorded an increase in antisemitic incidents in Britain. However, none of those incidents involved any reference to events in Toulouse and all fitted the profile of types of incidents commonly reported to CST during ‘normal’ periods when there is no trigger event. CST’s assessment of that particular spike in incidents, therefore, was that it was caused by increased reporting due to heightened community tension, and not reflective of an actual rise in antisemitic activity.

However, in July and August 2014 the incidents reported to CST presented a very different picture. Almost half the incidents recorded in those two months – 258, or 48 per cent of the 542 incidents recorded in July and August – made direct or indirect reference to the conflict in Israel and Gaza that began on 8 July 2014 and concluded on 26 August. There was also a daily correlation between the number of antisemitic incidents reported to CST during this period and specific events in the conflict in Israel and Gaza for example, CST recorded 16 antisemitic incidents on 21 July, the day after intense fighting in the Gaza district of Shuja’iyya and also a day when media reported that a hospital in Gaza had been shelled. On 28 July, a day when media reported an explosion at the al-Shifa hospital in Gaza, CST recorded 22 antisemitic incidents in the UK. The following day, when a power station in Gaza was reported to have been hit, CST recorded 18 antisemitic incidents. The highest daily total came on 31 July, the day after 19 Palestinians died at a UN school in Gaza, when CST recorded 39 antisemitic incidents (the same number as for the whole of the month of March). In total, CST recorded 147 antisemitic incidents during the seven days from 26 July to 1 August, a period of intense fighting in Israel and Gaza bracketed by two ceasefires.

Incidents recorded by CST during July and August that showed a connection to events in Israel and Gaza included:

- **London, July:** Several synagogues received copies of a letter that read: “You Jews are all murderers. Shame on you! So many innocent people, children slaughtered! Hitler was right.”

- **London, July:** An Israeli organisation received an email that read: “Hi yids, Just watching BBC news. Yids killing innocent PALESTINIANS. About time Arabs wiped your country off the face of the eRth [sic]. Jews are the liwest [sic] form of insects. Pure evil long nosed shekel money driven diamond loving skull capped b******s.”

- **Bradford, July:** A Jewish couple were in slow-moving traffic and some charity collectors were collecting money from drivers as they sat in the queuing traffic. One man approached the couple’s car and said they were collecting for Gaza. The Jewish man said, “Good luck but I don’t want to donate.” The offender then called him a “F*****g Jewish b******d”, before another man used a loud-hailer to shout, “You f*****g Jewish b*****d” and “Jewish
b*****ds coming down the road”, to alert the other collectors.

- **Liverpool, July**: A synagogue received a voicemail message that said, “What Jews do in Palestine is f*****g disgusting. You should be ashamed with yourselves.”

- **Leeds, July**: A man phoned a Jewish organisation and said, “Why are you killing all the kids in Palestine?...I’m coming up there in half an hour and you will regret it.”

- **London, July**: A poster reading “Child Murderers” was stuck to the door of a synagogue.

- **London, August**: A kosher butcher received an abusive voicemail message that said, “You Jewish baby–murdering c**ts.”

- **London, August**: A visibly Jewish man was walking with his children on Shabbat, when a man got off a bus and called him a “f*****g child-killing b*****d”.

- **Bradford, August**: A group of people were walking near to a synagogue when two men of South Asian appearance shouted from a passing car, “You’re killing our babies in Palestine, why don’t you go back to your own country?”

The type of incidents and incident offenders, and the language used, also differed in July and August when compared to a ‘normal’ period. To illustrate this, it is helpful to compare the incident totals for July and August to the incident totals for the first six months of 2014, when there was no comparable trigger event.

In the first six months of 2014, 7 per cent of recorded antisemitic incidents were violent; 9 per cent involved Damage and Desecration of Jewish property; 10 per cent targeted Jewish community organisations or events, commercial premises or high-profile individuals; 7 per cent involved antisemitic emails or paper hate mail; and 18 per cent involved the use of social media. In contrast, in July and August 2014, 5 per cent of recorded antisemitic incidents were violent; 6 per cent involved Damage and Desecration of Jewish property; 26 per cent targeted Jewish community organisations or events, commercial premises or high-profile individuals; 17 per cent involved antisemitic emails or paper hate mail; and 24 per cent involved the use of social media. Both periods contained similar levels of verbal abuse directed at random Jewish people in the street. These figures suggest that the ‘extra’ incidents fuelled by reactions to the conflict in Israel and Gaza predominantly involved abusive and threatening messages directed at Jewish organisations, shops, institutions or communal leaders, whether via email, paper hate mail or on social media.

There was also a significant difference reported to CST in the descriptions of incident offenders and what they said, when comparing the incidents recorded in July and August 2014 to those recorded in the first six months of 2014. CST obtained a description of 78 incident offenders in the first half of 2014 (25 per cent of the total number of incidents recorded) and 167 in July and August 2014 (31 per cent of the total). In the first six months of the year, 58 per cent of the incident offenders for whom CST obtained a description were described to CST as ‘White – North European’; 4 per cent as ‘White – South European’; 8 per cent as ‘Black’; 27 per cent as ‘South Asian’; and 4 per cent as ‘Arab or North African’. In contrast, in July and August 2014, 34 per cent of the incident offenders for whom...
CST obtained a description were described to CST as ‘White – North European’; none as ‘White – South European’; 5 per cent as ‘Black’; 50 per cent as ‘South Asian’; and 12 per cent as ‘Arab or North African’. This pattern, whereby the proportion of incident offenders described to CST as ‘South Asian’ or ‘Arab or North African’ increases when there is a significant trigger event involving Israel, was also seen in 2009 and 2006.

Similarly, the proportion of incidents involving anti-Israel discourse alongside antisemitic content, motivation or targeting, increased significantly during July and August 2014 compared to the first six months of the year. Thus, 258 incidents in July and August 2014 (48 per cent of the total for those months) involved direct or indirect reference to Israel or Gaza, compared to 21 incidents in the January to June period (18 per cent of the total). Twenty-six incidents in July and August involved the use of Islamist discourse (5 per cent of the total), compared to two in January to June (2 per cent of the total). The proportion of incidents in which discourse related to the Holocaust or neo-Nazism fell, although the absolute number rose: there were 171 such incidents in July and August (32 per cent of the total), compared to 90 in the first half of 2014 (79 per cent of the total). This reflects the use of neo-Nazi or Holocaust-related discourse alongside anti-Israel sentiments. There were 110 incidents in July and August 2014 in which more than one type of political discourse was used by the offenders. In 45 incidents, the offenders compared Israel or Jews to Nazis. In 57 incidents, slogans such as “Hitler was right” or “Hitler should have killed you all” were used in an anti-Israel context. Therefore although 171 incidents involved the use of neo-Nazi or Holocaust-related discourse, only 43 of these actually showed evidence of neo-Nazi motivation or political beliefs. Other discourse used by antisemitic incident perpetrators showed quite specific correlation to narratives in negative media and campaigning depictions of Israel during the conflict. For example, 48 incidents involved the use of phrases such as “child murderers” or “baby killers” alongside antisemitic content, motivation or targeting. The death of Palestinian children in Gaza was a dominant theme of negative portrayals of Israel’s actions during the conflict, while also being, perhaps coincidentally, an idea found in classical antisemitism through the myth of the ‘blood libel’.
CST received reports of 498 potential incidents during 2014 that, after investigation, did not appear to be antisemitic and were therefore not included in the total of 1,168 antisemitic incidents. These 498 potential incidents included examples of anti-Israel activity directed at organisations involved in pro-Israel work, which did not involve explicitly antisemitic language or imagery and were therefore not classified by CST as antisemitic. Examples of anti-Israel incidents during 2014 that were not recorded by CST as antisemitic include the following:

- **Manchester, August**: A link was posted on Facebook to an Amazon page selling Israeli flags decorated to look like they had blood spattered on them.

- **Manchester, August**: By chance, a Jewish person received two £10 notes that had “#FREEPALESTINE #BOYCOTTISRAEL” written on them.

Sometimes the targeting of a particular incident can suggest an intention to intimidate or offend Jews on the part of the offender. For example, graffiti reading “F**k Israel” would probably be classified as an antisemitic incident if it appears to be targeted at an area known for having a large Jewish community, but would probably not be counted as antisemitic if it appears in an area where few Jews live. Similarly, anti-Israel material that is sent unsolicited to a synagogue at random may be recorded as an antisemitic incident (because the synagogue was targeted simply because it is Jewish and the offender has failed to distinguish between a place of worship and a political organisation), when the same material sent unsolicited to specifically pro-Israel organisations would not be. On the other hand, if a particular synagogue has been involved in public pro-Israel advocacy, and subsequently is sent anti-Israel material, it may not be classified as antisemitic unless the content of the material dictates otherwise.

The political discourse used in an incident may also influence why the incident is deemed antisemitic or not. Incidents equating Israel to Nazi Germany would normally be recorded as antisemitic, but those comparing Israel to, for instance, apartheid South Africa, normally would not. While the charge that Israel practises apartheid upsets many Jews, it does not contain the same visceral capacity to offend Jews on the basis of their Jewishness as does the comparison with Nazism, which carries particular meaning for Jews because of the Holocaust.

Irrespective of whether or not these incidents are classified as antisemitic by CST, they are still relevant to CST’s security work as they often involve threats and abuse directed at Jewish people or organisations who work with, or in support of, Israel, and therefore have an impact on the security of the UK Jewish community.
OVER three-quarters of the 1,168 antisemitic incidents recorded in 2014 took place in Greater London and Greater Manchester, the two largest Jewish communities in the UK. In Greater London, CST recorded 583 antisemitic incidents in 2014 compared to 246 during 2013, an increase of 137 per cent. In Greater Manchester, CST recorded 309 antisemitic incidents during 2014, an increase of 79 per cent compared to the 173 incidents recorded there during 2013.

A total of 194 antisemitic incidents, a third of the incidents in Greater London, were recorded in the borough of Barnet, which has the largest Jewish community of any
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GLASGOW 21
LEEDS 27
BRADFORD 9
MANCHESTER 309
LIVERPOOL 27
BIRMINGHAM 14
HERTFORDSHIRE 34
LONDON 583
local authority in the UK. There were 69 antisemitic incidents recorded in Camden, 58 in Hackney, 43 in Kensington & Chelsea, 36 in Westminster, 35 in Redbridge, 31 in Haringey and 21 in Harrow. In Greater Manchester, 121 antisemitic incidents (39 per cent of the Greater Manchester total) were recorded in the Metropolitan Borough of Salford. There were 78 antisemitic incidents recorded in the Borough of Bury, 64 in the Borough of Manchester and 17 in the Borough of Trafford.

Outside Greater London and Greater Manchester, CST received reports of 276 antisemitic incidents from 89 locations around the UK in 2014, compared to 112 incidents from 50 different locations in 2013. There were 34 antisemitic incidents in Hertfordshire, compared to 15 in 2013; 27 in Leeds, compared to 16 in 2013; 27 in Liverpool, compared to 15 in 2013; 21 in Glasgow (two in 2013); 14 in Birmingham (two in 2013); and nine in Bradford (one in 2013). Going by Police region rather than specific locations, and in addition to the figures already given for London, Manchester and Hertfordshire, CST recorded 41 antisemitic incidents in West Yorkshire, 31 in Scotland, 27 in Merseyside, 17 in the West Midlands and nine in Northumbria. Twenty-five antisemitic incidents were recorded as having an unknown location, usually because they took place on social media and it was not possible to attach the incident to a particular geographical location.

Further differences between incident types in Greater London and Greater Manchester can be drawn out of the statistics. Taken broadly, and allowing for rough generalisations, the statistics show that antisemitic incidents in Greater Manchester are more likely to involve random street racism – what might be called antisemitic hooliganism – against individual Jews; while ideologically motivated antisemitism – which normally takes the form of hate mail, abusive phone calls or antisemitic graffiti – tends to be concentrated in Greater London where most of the Jewish community’s leadership bodies and public figures are based. So, 52 per cent of antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in Greater Manchester targeted individual Jews in public, compared to 31 per cent of the incidents recorded in Greater London; whereas 25 per cent of incidents recorded in Greater London targeted Jewish organisations, events or communal leaders, compared to 10 per cent of the incidents in Greater Manchester. Incidents in Greater London are more likely to involve hate mail, abusive emails or online antisemitism: there were 186 such incidents in Greater London in 2013 (32 per cent of incidents in Greater London), compared to 47 in Greater Manchester (15 per cent of incidents in Greater Manchester). Two hundred and nineteen incidents (38 per cent) in Greater London showed some form of political motivation, compared to 90 incidents in Greater Manchester (29 per cent).
A STUDY of antisemitic incidents recorded by the Metropolitan Police Service from 2001 to 2004 defined ‘mission’ incidents as those in which “the offender takes some premeditated action to instigate the incident by engineering their interaction with the victim. In addition, antisemitism seemingly drives the offender’s actions – as manifest by their language or symbols they use” (Iganski, Keilinger & Paterson, 2005). Applying this definition to the 1,168 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in 2014 reveals that 780 incidents, or 67 per cent of the total, showed evidence of being mission incidents. This does not mean that, in every case, the offender left their house intending to find a Jewish person or building to attack, although this did happen in several cases. Rather, it relates to incident offenders who, in the moments preceding an antisemitic incident, take some action to make contact with a person, organisation or property they believe to be Jewish, in order to express their bigotry. Examples of mission incidents recorded in 2014 include:

- **London, January:** A Jewish man was at a supermarket with his baby daughter when a man approached him and called him a “dozy old Yid”.

- **Essex, May:** A visibly Jewish man was walking home when a vehicle repeatedly drove past him and the occupants shouted, “F*****g Jew” and “Dirty Jew” out of the window. The car turned round twice more to drive past while the occupants shouted more abuse.

- **London, July:** A man went up to a Jewish person on a bus and said, “You bloody Jew, I hate you.”

- **London, July:** A teacher from a Jewish school was in a park, when a woman approached her and started shouting abuse about Gaza, saying that it’s not right what the Jews are doing to the children and blaming all Jews for what was happening.

- **Cardiff, August:** A Jewish man who was wearing a Star of David necklace was out with his girlfriend when they were approached by two men who asked him, “Are you a f*****g Jew?” They then asked his girlfriend the same question and spat at her before saying, “Hitler had the right idea. Pity he left some of you.”

- **London, September:** A visibly Jewish man was in his car, when two men approached the vehicle and shouted, “Yid, Yiddo” through the open car window.

- **Manchester, September:** A man approached a Jewish school and shouted through the fence at the children in the playground, “You Jewish b*****ds, go f**k yourselves.”

- **London, October:** A vehicle slowed down outside a synagogue and the occupants wound down the window and shouted, “You f*****g Jews”, then drove off.

The 780 mission incidents recorded by CST in 2014 can be further broken down by type of incident. The eight examples given above are all what can be referred to as ‘mission-direct’, which involves direct, face-to-face contact between offender and victim. Other incidents, which do not involve this face-to-face contact, can be classified as ‘mission-indirect’, of which these are examples:

- **London, January:** A Jewish public figure received a tweet that read: “Shut up Zionist..."
Jew f**k. I’ll stick you in a gas chamber you big nose f**k.”

- **London, February:** A swastika and “BNP” were drawn on the door of a Jewish person’s house.

- **London, April:** A Jewish organisation that held an event about the Holocaust received a tweet that read: “Why are they allowed to continue to lie? We know the 6 million figure is not a true figure.”

- **London, June:** A Jewish organisation received an email that read: “F**k off Jew.”

- **London, July:** An Israeli organisation received an email titled “Shelling ‘kills 15 in Gaza shelter’ – you b*****d murderers!!!!”. The body of the email was a picture of Adolf Hitler with the caption “By fighting off the Jews, I am doing the Lord’s work.”

- **Nottingham, August:** A synagogue received a letter that read: “YOU MURDEROUS YIDS B*****DS KILLING WOMAN AND KIDS BRING BACK THE GAS OVENS GET RID OF ALL OF YOU B*****DS EVERY LAST ONE.

OF YOU YIDS VICTORY TO THE PALESTINE PEOPLE DEATH TO ISRAEL.”

Other mission incidents do not target a specific victim, but rather take place in a public area – where the victims can be any members of the public who happen to pass by – or on social media where the offending comments are publicly visible. Examples of these ‘mission-indiscriminate’ incidents include:

- **London, January:** Three swastikas and the words “Heil Hitler” and “Jews Suck” were daubed on a wall in an area of London with a large Jewish community.

- **London, January:** The slogan “quenelle 4 ever” was written on a wall at an anti-Israel protest site, referring to the salute popularised by the French antisemite Dieudonné M’Bala M’Bala.

- **London, March:** A person tweeting about a Tottenham Hotspur football match tweeted, “These spurs fans are leaving White Hart Lane quicker than their fans went to Auschwitz.”

- **London, July:** A man was seen shouting, “Jews are murdering babies” in the street in an area with a large Jewish community.

- **Northern Ireland, July:** A prominent sportsman tweeted, “If you are lucky enough to know or work with a Jew, punch him right on the nose tomorrow #c**ts.”

- **London, September:** Graffiti reading “What’s the difference between a Jew and a pizza? A pizza comes out of the oven” was written on a bus stop.

- **London, October:** A fan attending a match at Tottenham Hotspur’s ground heard away fans singing “There’s only one Adolf Hitler.”
The final type of mission incident that made up the 780 mission incidents in 2014 were ‘mission-inadvertent’, whereby the offender’s expression of antisemitism is inadvertently overheard or seen by somebody who the offender did not intend to directly abuse. Examples of this from 2014 include:

- **Manchester, January**: A Jewish couple were playing bridge at their local bridge club. The conversation turned to who they were playing the following week and one of the offending couple, not realising their opponents were Jewish, said, “Four obnoxious Jews from Sedgley.” His playing partner added, “You should try and arrange the game for a Friday night.”

- **Lancashire, June**: The chair of a local committee made an antisemitic remark to the committee’s treasurer, saying “Were you born Jewish?”, without realising that one of the other committee members was Jewish.

- **Hertfordshire, June**: A man told a Jewish woman that “I used to work for a disgusting pig of a Jew”, without realising that she was Jewish.

In contrast to these ‘mission’ incidents, 229 incidents, or 20 per cent of the 1,168 antisemitic incidents recorded in 2014, appeared to be ‘opportunistic’, whereby “the offender takes immediate advantage of an opportunity that presents itself to vent their antisemitism, rather than engineering the incident in a premeditated way” (Iganski, Keilinger & Paterson, 2005). Examples of opportunistic incidents from 2014 include:

- **Manchester, April**: A Jewish person was driving through Manchester, when they drove past a person on a street corner who shouted, “You f*****g Jews”.

- **London, May**: A visibly Jewish boy was walking home when a vehicle passed him and the occupant shouted, “F**k Jews. Hitler didn’t do a good enough job, he should have killed all the Jews.”

- **London, July**: A Jewish family was leaving synagogue when a group of five mean wearing pro-Palestinian clothing and carrying a Palestinian flag saw them. One of the men shouted, “Death to the Jews.”

- **London, September**: A man was standing outside a supermarket while wearing a T-shirt from a Jewish charity. Two men walking past shouted, “F*****g Jewish c***t” and spat in his direction.

- **Hertfordshire, July**: A woman wearing a Star of David necklace was walking along a shopping street when a man shouted, “Oi you dirty f*****g Jew” at her.

---

Antisemitic letter sent to a synagogue in north London, July 2014

> You Jews are murderers. Shame on you! So many innocent people, children slaughtered! May God punish you for ever, may you all go to Hell! Hitler was right.
One hundred and thirty-one incidents, or 11 per cent of the overall total of 1,168 incidents, were what may be categorised as ‘aggravated’ incidents, whereby “the offender and victim are caught up in a conflict situation that initially does not involve antisemitism. However, in the course of the conflict the offender’s bigotry emerges” (Iganski et al., 2005). Examples of aggravated incidents recorded by CST in 2014 include:

- **London, January:** A group of Jewish schoolboys were in a sweet shop and the owner, who wanted them to leave, said, “Why can’t you Jews just f**k off.”

- **Manchester, February:** A Jewish person got into an argument with somebody who had been at a neighbour’s house party. During the argument the offender said, “F**k off you Jewish c***s.”

- **Liverpool, March:** A Jewish employee at a golf club approached a non-Jewish member who had not paid his course fee, and the member called him a “Jewish b****d”.

- **Manchester, March:** A Jewish football team were playing an under-14s match and one of the opponents said to one of their players, “Get up you stupid Jewish p***k.”

- **London, April:** A bailiff who was trying to recover a debt said to the victim, “Call your Jew family, they’ll have the money.”

- **London, June:** A visibly Jewish man was driving round a corner and got into a confrontation with another driver. The other driver called him a “f*****g Jew”.

- **Manchester, September:** A man shouted, “F**k you, you fat b*****d Jewish pig” and “Wish the Nazis had finished you all” at a shopkeeper who refused to give him credit to buy cigarettes. The offender was given a Police caution.

Antisemitic threats published on social media, London, August 2014
ONE of the most important jobs CST does is to record and analyse incidents of potential hostile reconnaissance (categorised by CST as ‘Information Collection’) and Suspicious Behaviour around Jewish locations. The recent tragic history of antisemitic terrorism against Jewish schools, shops and other buildings in Paris, Toulouse, Mumbai, Kansas City and Brussels attests to the importance of this work. It is well known that terrorist groups often collect information about their targets before launching an attack. Identifying and preventing the gathering of this kind of information is an integral part of CST’s work in protecting the UK Jewish community from the danger of terrorism.

Jewish communities have long been the targets of terrorists of different and varied political and religious motivations. Since the late 1960s, there have been over 400 terrorist attacks, attempted attacks and foiled terrorist plots against Diaspora Jewish communities and Israeli targets outside Israel. In the UK, several terrorist plots targeting Jewish communities in the United Kingdom came to trial or were publicised via the media in recent years. The most serious of these involved a local couple in Manchester, Mohammed and Shasta Khan, who had conducted surveillance of the Manchester Jewish community as part of their preparations for a terrorist attack in the city, for which they are now serving prison sentences. In addition to this threat from violent jihadist terrorism, there is growing evidence of efforts by British neo-Nazis to plan and execute terrorist attacks against minorities here in Britain, including against the Jewish community.

Cases of potential Information Collection and Suspicious Behaviour are not included in CST’s antisemitic incident statistics, as the motivation for many of them is not possible to determine. The vague and uncertain nature of many of these incidents means that they are easier to analyse if the two categories are combined, rather than treated separately. Taken together, there were 161 such incidents reported to CST in 2014, compared to 135 in 2013.

Of the 161 incidents of potential Information Collection and Suspicious Behaviour reported to CST in 2014, 60 involved the photography or videoing of Jewish buildings, while in 32 cases suspicious people tried to gain entry to Jewish premises. Many of these incidents are likely to have innocent explanations and it is often not possible to determine their motivation. However, neither CST nor the Police underestimate the threat posed to Jewish communities by various terrorist organisations and networks. Identifying and preventing the potential hostile reconnaissance of Jewish buildings or other potential terrorist targets is an important part of reducing the possibility of future terrorist attacks.

12. For a full chronology and analysis of this history of modern anti-Jewish terrorism, see the CST publication “Terrorist Incidents against Jewish Communities and Israeli Citizens Abroad 1968–2010”, available at www.cst.org.uk
IMAGES OF ANTISEMITISM ON SOCIAL MEDIA

Antisemitic tweet with threat to bomb Stamford Hill, July 2014

Antisemitic tweet from neo-Nazi organisation, June 2014

Antisemitic tweet with conspiracy theory about the ‘Trojan Horse’ Birmingham school allegations, June 2014

Antisemitic tweet, July 2014

Antisemitic tweet with threat to Golders Green, July 2014
Antisemitic message sent to a Jewish woman on Facebook, July 2014

Antisemitic tweet, July 2014

Antisemitic tweet with threat to Stamford Hill, July 2014

Antisemitic tweet related to football match between Liverpool and Tottenham Hotspur, August 2014
### ANNUAL ANTEISEMITIC INCIDENT FIGURES

#### Antisemitic incident figures by category, 2004–2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Violence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage and Desecration</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Behaviour</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>532</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Antisemitic incident figures by month, 2004–2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>532</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Antisemitic incident figures, full breakdown, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Extreme Violence</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Damage and Desecration</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Abusive Behaviour</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>MONTH TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the numbers in the tables may differ from those previously published by CST, due to the late reporting of incidents to CST by incident victims and witnesses, or the recategorisation of some incidents due to new information.
CST’S MISSION

• To work at all times for the physical protection and defence of British Jews.

• To represent British Jews on issues of racism, antisemitism, extremism, policing and security.

• To promote good relations between British Jews and the rest of British society by working towards the elimination of racism, and antisemitism in particular.

• To facilitate Jewish life by protecting Jews from the dangers of antisemitism, and antisemitic terrorism in particular.

• To help those who are victims of antisemitic hatred, harassment or bias.

• To promote research into racism, antisemitism and extremism; and to use this research for the benefit of both the Jewish community and society in general.

• To speak responsibly at all times, without exaggeration or political favour, on antisemitism and associated issues.

CST CONTACT DETAILS

WEBSITE www.cst.org.uk

TWITTER @CST_UK

FACEBOOK Community Security Trust

LONDON (Head Office) 020 8457 9999
Emergency (24-hour) 0800 032 3263

MANCHESTER (Northern Regional Office) 0161 792 6666
Emergency (24-hour) 0800 980 0668