ANTISEMITIC INCIDENTS REPORT
JANUARY–JUNE 2014
CST recorded 304 antisemitic incidents across the United Kingdom in the first six months of 2014.

This is an increase of 36 per cent from the 223 antisemitic incidents recorded in the first six months of 2013. CST recorded 312 antisemitic incidents in the first six months of 2012, 294 in the first half of 2011 and 325 in the first half of 2010. The highest number of antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in the January–June period came in 2009, when 629 antisemitic incidents were recorded. This was largely due to antisemitic reactions to the conflict in Gaza in January of that year.

In addition to the 304 antisemitic incidents recorded in the first half of 2014 by CST, a further 152 potential incidents were reported to CST, but, on investigation, appeared not to show evidence of antisemitic motivation or targeting. These potential incidents, therefore, were not classified as antisemitic and are not included in the statistics contained in this report. Most of these rejected incidents, comprising 33 per cent of the total number of 456 potential incidents reported to CST, involved non-antisemitic crime affecting Jewish property or people; hostile reconnaissance or suspicious behaviour near to Jewish locations; or anti-Israel activity that did not involve antisemitic language, imagery or targeting.

Many of these 456 potential incidents required investigation or a security-related response by CST staff or volunteers, irrespective of whether or not they subsequently appeared to be antisemitic.

There has been no change in CST’s methodology or in the sources of antisemitic incident reports from 2013 to 2014 that might explain the increase in reported antisemitic incidents. There was an increase in the number of incidents taking place on social media that was reported to CST, which accounts for 23 per cent of the ‘extra’ incidents recorded in the first half of 2014 compared to 2013, but this is clearly not sufficient to explain most of the increase in the overall total.

There was no specific trigger event during the first six months of 2014 to cause the increase in reported incidents, which was spread across the period covered by this report: every month of the January–June period returned an incident total that was higher than for the same month in 2013. The highest monthly total was 62 antisemitic incidents recorded in June 2014, and the lowest was 39 in March. The increase was also felt across the UK, with rises recorded in London, Manchester, Hertfordshire and Leeds (see ‘Geographical Locations’, p.6).

Therefore it is likely that the increase in the number of incidents either reflects a genuine increase in the number of incidents that are taking place, or an improvement in the reporting of incidents to CST and the Police by members of the Jewish community and the wider public – or a combination of these two factors.

---

1. The incident totals for past years and months in this document may differ from those previously published by CST, due to the late reporting of some incidents to CST by incident victims, witnesses or other sources.
CST recorded 22 violent antisemitic assaults in the first six months of 2014, a fall of 32 per cent from the 29 violent assaults recorded in the first half of 2013. This was itself a fall of 19 per cent from the 36 violent assaults recorded in the first half of 2012. None of the 22 assaults recorded in the first six months of 2014 were serious enough to be classified as Extreme Violence, which would involve an incident that posed a threat to life or constituted grievous bodily harm (GBH). There were no Extreme Violence incidents recorded in the first half of 2013 and two in the first half of 2012. Taking the categories of Assault and Extreme Violence together (to give the overall number of violent incidents), the 22 violent assaults recorded in the first six months of 2014 is the lowest total for the January–June period since 2001, when the same number of assaults were recorded, and continues a consistent downward trend since 2009, when 79 incidents of Assault or Extreme Violence were recorded.

There were 27 incidents of Damage & Desecration of Jewish property recorded by CST in the first six months of 2014, an increase of 35 per cent from the 20 incidents of this type recorded in the first half of 2013. There were 29 incidents recorded in this category in the first six months of 2012 and 35 during the same period in 2011.

CST recorded 19 direct antisemitic threats (categorised as Threats) during the first half of 2014, one more than the 18 incidents of this type recorded during the first six months of 2013. There were 20 incidents recorded in this category in the first half of 2012 and 15 during the same period in 2011. Twelve of the threats from the first six months of this year involved direct, face-to-face verbal abuse from offender to victim, and three took place on social media.

There were 232 antisemitic incidents reported to CST in the category of Abusive Behaviour in the first half of 2014, an increase of 34 per cent from the 154 incidents of this type recorded during the first six months of 2013. The rise in this category total accounts for almost all the increase in the overall antisemitic incident total. This category includes a wide range of antisemitic incident types, including antisemitic graffiti on non-Jewish property, one-off hate mail, antisemitic verbal abuse and those social media incidents that do not involve direct threats. There were 223 incidents of Abusive Behaviour recorded in the first half of 2012 and 197 during the same period in 2011. The 232 incidents of this type recorded in the first six months of 2014 is the highest total for the January–June period since the first half of 2009, when 408 incidents were recorded in the Abusive Behaviour category. Fifty-one of the 232 incidents recorded in this category took place on social media; 20 involved antisemitic graffiti on non-Jewish property; 9 were cases of hate mail; 7 involved email; and 138 involved verbal abuse.

CST recorded four incidents of mass-produced or mass-emailed antisemitic literature, categorised as Literature (as opposed to one-off cases of hate mail, which are classified as Abusive Behaviour), during the first six months of 2014, double the two incidents recorded in this category during the first half of 2013. There were four incidents of antisemitic literature reported to CST in the first six months of 2012 and five during the first half of 2011.

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

There were 92 antisemitic incidents reported to CST in the first six months of 2014 in which the victims were random Jewish individuals in public. In 56 incidents the victims were visibly Jewish, due to religious or traditional clothing, Jewish school uniforms or jewellery bearing religious symbols. One hundred and sixty-one antisemitic incidents involved verbal abuse (46 of which involved abuse shouted from a passing vehicle). These three characteristics, often found in combination, reflect the most common single type of antisemitic incident: random, spontaneous, verbal antisemitic abuse, directed at people who look Jewish, while they go about their business in public places.

There were eight antisemitic incidents recorded at Jewish schools in the first six months of 2014, compared to five recorded at Jewish schools in the same period in 2013. A further 10 incidents involved Jewish schoolchildren or staff on their way to or from school, while 13 incidents involved Jewish schoolchildren or staff at non-faith schools – making a total of 31 antisemitic incidents affecting people and buildings in the school sector, compared to 15 such incidents in the first half of 2013. Only one of the incidents affecting people and buildings in the school sector came in the category of Assault, while 25 were in the category of Abusive Behaviour.

Thirty-seven antisemitic incidents reported to CST in the first half of 2014 took place at people’s homes and ten occurred in a workplace environment. There were nine antisemitic incidents affecting Jewish students, academics, student unions or other student bodies in the first half of 2014, compared to six in the first half of 2013. Three of these nine incidents took place on campus, none of which occurred in the context of student political activity. None of the nine incidents involved violent assault.

There were six antisemitic incidents recorded during the first six months of 2014 that targeted synagogues, compared to 15 during the first half of 2013. A further 12 incidents targeted synagogue congregants or rabbis on their way to or from prayers (11 such incidents were recorded during the first half of 2013). There were 21 incidents that targeted Jewish organisations, Jewish events or Jewish-owned businesses (where there was clear evidence of antisemitism), an increase from the 14 incidents of this type in the first half of 2013. There were 11 incidents in the first half of 2014 in which the victim was a prominent Jewish individual or public figure, compared to 14 such incidents in the first half of 2013. There were five antisemitic desecrations of Jewish cemeteries in the first half of 2014, compared to none in the first half of 2013.

CST received a description of the gender of the victim or victims for 160 of the 304 antisemitic incidents in the first half of 2014. Of these, 100, or 63 per cent, were male; 55, or 34 per cent, were female; and in 5 incidents the victims were mixed groups of males and females.

CST received a description of the approximate age of the victim or victims in 120 of the antisemitic incidents reported during the first six months of 2014. Of these, 87, or 73 per cent, involved adult victims; 29, or 24 per cent, involved victims who were minors; and in four incidents the victims were mixed groups of adults and minors.
Identifying the ethnicity, gender and age of antisemitic incident offenders is a difficult and imprecise task. Many antisemitic incidents involve brief public encounters in which the offenders may not be fully visible, and the evidence of victims of, or witnesses to, antisemitic incidents may be vague and disjointed. In addition, many incidents do not involve face-to-face contact between incident offender and victim, so it is not always possible to obtain a physical description of the perpetrator. This section of the report should be read with these caveats in mind.

CST received a description of the ethnic appearance of the offender or offenders in 78 of the 304 antisemitic incidents reported during the first six months of 2014. Of these, 45, or 58 per cent, were described as white – north European; 3, or 4 per cent, were described as white – south European; 6 (8 per cent) were described as black; 21 (27 per cent) were described as south Asian; none as east or south-east Asian; and 3 (4 per cent) as Arab or north African.

CST received a description of the gender of the offender or offenders in 150 of the 304 antisemitic incidents reported to CST in the first half of 2014. Of these, 130 incidents, or 87 per cent, involved male offenders; 19 incidents, or 13 per cent, involved female offenders; and in one incident the offenders were a mixed group of males and females.

CST received a description of the approximate age of the offender or offenders in 89 incidents in the first half of 2014. Of these, 66 (74 per cent) involved adult offenders; 23 (26 per cent) involved offenders who were described as minors; and there were no incidents in which the offenders were a mixed group of adults and minors.

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

Of the 304 antisemitic incidents reported to CST during the first six months of 2014, the offender or offenders used some form of political discourse in 112 cases, or 37 per cent of the total. Of these, there were 89 incidents in which far right discourse was used; 21 in which reference was made to Israel, Zionism or the Middle East; and two in which Islamist discourse was used. In five incidents, more than one type of discourse was used.

Of the 304 antisemitic incidents reported to CST during the first six months of 2014, 69, or 23 per cent, showed evidence of political motivation. Of these, 52 incidents showed evidence of far right motivation; 15 showed evidence of anti-Zionist motivation; and two showed evidence of Islamist motivation. All incidents needed to show evidence of antisemitism alongside any political motivation in order to be recorded by CST as an antisemitic incident.

For comparison, in the first six months of 2013, 85 of the 223 antisemitic incidents reported to CST involved the use of political discourse alongside the antisemitism, of which 61 used far right discourse; 20 made references to Israel, Zionism or the Middle East; and four involved Islamist discourse. In seven of these incidents, more than one type of discourse was used. During the same period, there were 58 antisemitic incidents that showed evidence of political motivation, of which 38 showed evidence of far right motivation; 16 showed evidence of anti-Zionist motivation; and four showed evidence of Islamist motivation.
Of the 304 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in the first six months of 2014, 240, or almost four out of every five incidents, were recorded in the main Jewish centres of Greater London and Greater Manchester.

In Greater London, CST recorded 144 antisemitic incidents from January to June 2014, a rise of 53 per cent from the 94 antisemitic incidents recorded in the first half of 2013. The 94 incidents recorded in the first half of 2013 represented a 37 per cent fall from the 150 antisemitic incidents recorded in London during January–June 2012. There is no obvious explanation for why the total recorded by CST should have fallen so sharply in the first half of 2013 and then increased to a similar extent in 2014; for example, CST’s recording methodology and sources of antisemitic incident reports have not changed over the period in question. This includes the exchanging of anonymised antisemitic incident and crime reports with the Metropolitan Police Service, a programme which has run consistently since the beginning of 2012.

CST recorded antisemitic incidents in 22 of the 32 Metropolitan Police boroughs in London, plus one incident in the City of London and one in London that fell under the jurisdiction of the British Transport Police. Of the 144 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in Greater London, 47 took place in Barnet, the borough with the largest Jewish population in the country; 19 in Camden; 18 in Hackney; 12 in Redbridge; and 11 in Haringey.

In Greater Manchester in the first half of 2014, CST recorded 96 antisemitic incidents, an increase of 16 per cent from the 83 antisemitic incidents recorded there in the first half of 2013. Both of these totals are higher than the 79 antisemitic incidents recorded in Greater Manchester in the first half of 2012. The highest number of antisemitic incidents in Greater Manchester in the first half of 2014 was in the borough of Salford, with 42 antisemitic incidents. The next highest borough totals were 23 incidents in Bury and 19 in the borough of Manchester.

Outside Greater London and Greater Manchester, CST recorded 64 antisemitic incidents from 33 different locations around the UK in the first six months of 2014, compared to 46 incidents from 29 different locations in the first half of 2013. The 64 antisemitic incidents recorded around the UK included ten in Leeds, eight in Hertfordshire, seven in Liverpool and four in Bradford.
CST classifies as an antisemitic incident any malicious act aimed at Jewish people, organisations or property, where there is evidence that the victim or victims were targeted because they are (or are believed to be) Jewish. 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 proactively ‘trawl’ social media platforms to look for antisemitic comments in order to record them as incidents. However, CST will record antisemitic comments posted on internet forums or blog talkbacks, or transmitted by 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 Antisemitic Discourse reports, available on the CST website.

Fifty-four of the 304 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in the first six months of 2014 were reported to CST as having taken place on social media, such as Facebook, Twitter or YouTube, compared to 35 reported antisemitic incidents involving social media in the first six months of 2013 and 21 in the first half of 2012.

The inclusion of the number of incidents from social media recorded by CST is not intended to reflect the real number of antisemitic comments on social media, which is likely to be so large as to be effectively immeasurable, but rather to reflect the reality that social media platforms have become increasingly prominent as arenas for public expressions of antisemitism that Jewish people are more likely to view and to report, even if they are not the intended audience.

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 profiles or in person to CST staff and volunteers. Incidents can be reported to CST by the victim, a witness, or by somebody acting on their behalf. In 2001, CST was accorded third-party reporting status by the Police.

In the first half of 2014, 88 of the 304 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST were reported directly to CST by the victims themselves, and 32 incidents were reported on their behalf by a relative or friend. In 50 cases, the incident was reported to CST by somebody who had witnessed the incident take place. Twenty-three antisemitic incidents were reported by CST staff or volunteers or by security guards at Jewish buildings. There were six antisemitic incidents recorded on the basis of media reports. Ninety-eight antisemitic incidents were reported to CST by the Police under the incident exchange programmes in London and Manchester, whereby CST and the Police share antisemitic incident reports, fully anonymised to comply with data protection requirements, so that both agencies have as full a picture as possible of the number and type of reported incidents. Sixty of these 98 incidents were reported to CST by the Metropolitan Police Service and 38 by Greater Manchester Police. Any incidents that had been reported to both CST and the Police are excluded from this process to ensure there is no ‘double-counting’ of incidents. A further seven antisemitic incidents were reported to CST by the Police in other parts of the country on an ad hoc basis.