
Improving Legal and Other Protections for Europe's Jews

Michael Whine

Antisemitic incidents have risen continuously in some European states. While responses by inter-governmental agencies (IGOs) and some states have been designed to enhance protection of Jewish communities, they warrant recording and examination. These responses are being developed as states recognize that their Jewish communities face physical and political threats, and in some cases, the continued existence of several Jewish communities is becoming precarious.

In a recent *Justice* article, I noted that judgments by the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) and European states' case law have improved legal protections for Jews, and that European negotiations with U.S.-based social networks have been designed to reduce online antisemitism, where Internet content crosses the criminal threshold.¹

European law against racism and xenophobia, notably the EU Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA, has established a minimum legal level for incitement based on racial or religious grounds, and denial or gross trivialization of the Holocaust. The EU 2012 Victims Directive has improved protections by requiring member states to place the rights of victims at the heart of the criminal justice response to crime.²

Likewise, the Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime and the ECtHR judgement in *Delfi AS v Estonia* offer further protections. The former requires signatory states to criminalize online racial and religious incitement and denial of genocide including the Holocaust, and the latter held an Internet news portal responsible for criminally offensive comments published on its platform. Other important judgments by the ECtHR, and in domestic courts, have also strengthened protection against antisemitic incitement and Holocaust denial, including online incitement.³

This article updates the measures noted in my previous article and analyzes recent changes, which taken together now provide greater protection for European Jews. This is not to predict that antisemitism will decline immediately or that anti-Jewish terrorism will cease. But, recognition of the increasing number of incidents and crimes against Jews and Jewish institutions, and terror groups' plots to attack Jews, have spurred the European IGOs and

European governments to translate their former declarations and well-intentioned statements into real action.

Jihadi terrorism targeted against general populations, and Jewish communities in particular, by Islamic State (IS) and Al Qaeda affiliates in Belgium, France and Denmark, stimulated the European Union (EU) and its agencies, the Council of Europe and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to recommend

-
1. Michael Whine, *Combating Antisemitic Incitement through the European Courts and Online*, 57 *JUSTICE*, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, 2015-2016, available at <http://intjewishlawyers.org/justice/no57/files/assets/basic-html/page-4.html> (last visited April 19, 2017).
 2. Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 Nov. 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, O.J., (L328/55), available at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:328:0055:0058:en:PDF> (last visited April 19, 2017).
Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 Oct, 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA, O.J., (L315/57), available at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:L:2012:315:TOC> (last visited April 19, 2017).
 3. Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime, concerning the criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems, Council of Europe, Jan. 28, 2003, available at <https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/rms/090000168008160f> (last visited April 19, 2017).
For a useful summary of cases, including *Delfi AS v Estonia*, see *Hate Speech*, Press Unit, E.C.H.R., (March 2017) available at http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/FS_Hate_speech_ENG.pdf (last visited April 19, 2017).

that member states improve their understanding of contemporary antisemitism and enhance the security of their Jewish communities.⁴

In recalling these new initiatives, I shall proceed chronologically before making an assessment of their potential effectiveness. Other proposals focus on the wider range of racism and hate crimes, but they clearly also benefit Jewish communities.

Chronology of Initiatives

In November 2014, the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) convened a conference to review progress ten years after the Berlin High Level Conference on Antisemitism. Participants noted the continuing high levels of antisemitism and growing Jewish concerns.⁵ The conference recommendations were referred to the OSCE Ministerial Council meeting in Basel in December 2014, which proposed to offer member states a set of best practices to combat antisemitism.⁶

A series of consultative meetings was then held in Warsaw at ODIHR, and at the European Parliament in Brussels, which ultimately led to the creation of the "Words into Action" program. Preliminary consultations were held with European police representatives during 2016 to test the strategies and objectives of the program, which is being finalized as this article is being written. These will be presented in mid-2017 in the German parliament in Berlin, because the program is funded by the German government, as well as in Vienna, where the OSCE is headquartered, to diplomatic delegations representing their governments. It is expected that the two-year program will constitute an effective and focused response to antisemitism by proposing practical security, educational and other measures for governments and their law enforcement and security services to adopt.

In March 2015, the newly formed European Parliament Working Group on Antisemitism held a meeting for Members of the European Parliament and European Commission (EC) staff, at which high priority was accorded to the enforcement of existing European mechanisms, and the strengthening of cultural and educational programs that are designed to reduce racism. A second meeting held a month later focussed on the rise in antisemitism within Muslim communities. At the meeting, prominent moderate Muslim campaigners against Islamist extremism noted that they were also engaged in combating antisemitism within their own communities.⁷

The adoption of the Working Definition of Antisemitism by the 31 member states of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) in Bucharest in March 2016 will help governments, their law enforcement

agencies and civil society to understand contemporary antisemitism.⁸ The Working Definition was first formulated in 2005 at the request of the European Union Monitoring Centre (EUMC), when some of its monitoring agents indicated that they did not see antisemitism, because it was no longer expressed in medieval-era or Nazi-like tropes. The Working Definition is not a legal definition and it is not designed to replace domestic laws. Rather, it provides guidance on the contemporary nature of antisemitism for police officers and criminal justice agencies, as well as for the human rights community. However, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), the EUMC successor agency, removed the Working Definition from their website in November 2013, despite protests from Jewish bodies, insisting that it provided an agreed upon and authoritative explanation for antisemitism in the current era. IHRA has since adopted it and now recommends its use alongside its definition of Holocaust denial. These two definitions now provide a set of tools by which to measure contemporary antisemitism and aid analysis and policy formulation. This becomes ever more important as the EC and other European IGOs seek to approximate laws and judicial responses to hate crime.

Annual reports and surveys by FRA indicate that Jewish experiences of antisemitism are substantially under-

4. Reactions to the Paris attacks in the EU: fundamental rights considerations, FRA-European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, Jan. 2015, available at <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2015/reactions-paris-attacks-eu-fundamental-rights-considerations> (last visited April 19, 2017).
5. 10th Anniversary of the OSCE's Berlin Conference on Anti-Semitism, Final Report, OSCE, 12-13 Nov. 2014, available at <http://www.osce.org/odihhr/136561?download=true> (last visited April 19, 2017).
6. Declaration on Enhancing Efforts to Combat Anti-Semitism, OSCE, Ministerial Council, 2014, MC.DOC/8/14, Dec. 5, 2014, available at <http://www.osce.org/cio/130556?download=true> (last visited April 19, 2017).
7. Antisemitism in Europe, European Parliament Working Group on Antisemitism, 14 April 2015 Statement, available at <http://www.antisem.eu/antisemitism-in-europe/> (last visited April 19, 2017).
8. Working Definition of Antisemitism, International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, June 26, 2016, available at <https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/media-room/stories/working-definition-antisemitism> (last visited April 19, 2017).

recorded by police and other agencies because they fail to recognize the evolving contemporary manifestations of antisemitism and therefore measure them adequately. The *Survey on Perceptions of Antisemitism* also indicated quite starkly that many European Jews have little confidence that criminal justice agencies are prepared to investigate antisemitic incidents and crimes, or prosecute the culprits (see below).

Spurred by the IHRA decision to define antisemitism, the UK government adopted the Working Definition in December 2016.⁹ The Scottish government later endorsed the decision in March 2017.¹⁰ Shortly after, the UK Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Sajid Javid MP, “strongly encouraged” local authorities in England and Wales to adopt the Definition in his letter sent to them on January 30, 2017, and several have done so since.¹¹ The British police had already adopted it in their Hate Crime Operational Guidance sent to all police forces in 2014.¹²

In March 2016, the German Parliament and Foreign Ministry hosted a joint conference with the Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism in Berlin, which was addressed by German Chancellor Angela Merkel, EU Vice President Frans Timmermans, UNESCO Director General Irina Bokova, UK Justice Secretary Michael Gove MP and other eminent public figures.¹³

A second inter-parliamentary initiative, by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe a month later in April 2016, occurred when Resolution 2106 on “Renewed commitment in the fight against Antisemitism in Europe” was agreed upon.¹⁴ Prior to passing the resolution, a substantial report on antisemitism was published by the Council of Europe Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination, which in turn was examined by the Council of Europe Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy.¹⁵ This protracted but necessarily thorough process noted *inter alia* that Jewish communities are threatened by violent attacks, that states have an obligation to build trust with Jewish communities, encourage them to report antisemitic attacks and hate crimes, provide police forces with appropriate training, ensure security by cooperating with Jewish communities and their representatives, and that parliamentarians should establish cross-party parliamentary groups to combat antisemitism in their legislatures, etc.¹⁶

In May 2016, the EC signed a Code of Conduct on illegal online hate speech with the major social networks. European states have become increasingly frustrated by the social networks’ policy of allowing almost complete freedom for antisemites and other extremists to publish what they want on the different platforms, often in contravention of European and national domestic laws.

Despite successful prosecutions at the state and European level, it was felt necessary to persuade the main networks to agree upon a code whereby they would remove illegal content, and do so within a specified time limit.¹⁷

The Code owed its genesis to the Best Practices for Responding to Cyberhate declaration, to which the major social networks had signalled assent in 2014, and which

9. Press Release, Government leads the way in tackling antisemitism, UK Gov., Dec. 12, 2016, available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-leads-the-way-in-tackling-anti-semitism> (last visited April 19, 2017).
10. Response by Angela Constance MSP, Cabinet Secretary for Communities, Social Security and Equalities, Scottish Parliament, March 2, 2017, available at <http://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/28877.aspx?SearchType=Advance&ReferenceNumbers=S5W-07668> (last visited April 19, 2017).
11. Adoption of the IHRA working definition of antisemitism, Letter to Local Authority Leaders from the Rt. Hon Sajid Javid MP, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Jan. 30, 2017, available at <http://www2.guildford.gov.uk/councilmeetings/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=7358> (last visited May 8, 2017).
12. Hate Crime Operational Guidance, College of Policing, Coventry, at 36- 38, available at <http://library.college.police.uk/docs/college-of-policing/Hate-Crime-Operational-Guidance.pdf> (last visited April 19, 2017).
13. Landmark German Parliamentary Conference, March 13-15, 2016, Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism, available at <https://www.facebook.com/Inter-parliamentary-Coalition-for-Combating-Antisemitism-ICCA-363913460650/> (last visited May 8, 2017).
14. Eur. Parl. Ass., Renewed commitment in the fight against antisemitism in Europe, Resolution 2106, 20 April 2016, available at <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=22716&lang=en> (last visited April 19, 2017).
15. Eur. Parl. Ass., Renewed commitment in the fight against antisemitism in Europe, Report, Committee on Equality and Discrimination, Doc. 14008, Parliamentary Assembly Council of Europe, 31 March 2016, <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=22576&lang=en> (last visited July 12, 2017).
16. Eur. Parl. Ass., Renewed commitment in the fight against antisemitism in Europe, Doc.14023, Committee Opinion, Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy, April 19, 2016, available at <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-DocDetails-en.asp?FileID=22599&lang=en>.
17. European Commission, Code of Conduct on Countering Illegal Hate Speech Online, May 2016, available at http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/hate_speech_code_of_conduct_en.pdf (last visited April 19, 2017).

was noted in my previous article in Justice. The earlier document, however, had little public impact and its provisions were not binding on the social networks, although it had for the first time brought them together to discuss the mounting concerns of Jewish groups and others who joined in later meetings, including legal, academic, Muslim and womens' groups.¹⁸

The EC Code of Conduct, however, has a built-in monitoring mechanism, whereby expert civil society organizations, including my own, Community Security Trust, at a meeting in February 2017, were tasked with recording the speed and effectiveness with which Facebook, Google and Twitter remove material containing criminal content.¹⁹ The processes are transparent and the conclusions are publicized. They include that, overall, only 28.2% of notifications by selected civil society groups of criminal content were removed by the three main social networks: 28.3% of cases by Facebook, 19.9% by Twitter and 48.5% by Youtube, and that 40% of criminal content was removed in less than 24 hours after notification (as agreed), but that 43% took up to 48 hours to remove.²⁰ A second monitoring round started as this article is being written, and therefore, it is too early to say if the social networks' performance has improved at this stage in the monitoring process.

In June 2016, efforts to combat antisemitism picked up further momentum when the European Union High Level Group on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Other Forms of Intolerance was launched in Brussels. This new initiative was designed to exchange and disseminate best practices between national authorities. It was followed six months later by a second meeting that reviewed progress, and in turn identified the need to improve hate crime standards and practices for law enforcement agencies, to better implement existing legislation and provide better protection for victims of hate crime.²¹ The High Level Group has spawned other initiatives. One is an expert sub-group focused on methodologies for recording and collecting data on hate crime, organized by FRA in cooperation with the EC.²²

Another initiative is the thematic discussion on hate crime training, which led to the publication in February 2017 of ten guiding principles that member states are encouraged to implement after recognition that more than half of EU member states provide some form of hate crime training for law enforcement and other criminal justice agencies, and that best practices could be identified.²³ At the same time, it published a review of existing resources available to support such training.²⁴

The European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), formerly the European Police Agency, has been given new strategic direction after its 2014

transfer to Budapest from Bramshill. The former UK Police Staff College was tasked with creating new training programs on hate crime. They include an online module and a "train the trainers" Hate Crime Certified Training

-
18. Best Practices for Responding to Cyberhate, Anti-Defamation League, available at <http://www.adl.org/combating-hate/cyber-safety/best-practices/#.WKr9wekae74> (last visited April 20, 2017).
 19. First meeting of countering hate speech online subgroup, FRA, Oct. 12, 2016, available at <http://fra.europa.eu/en/news/2016-first-meeting-countering-hate-speech-online-subgroup> (last visited April 20, 2017).
 20. European Commission Code of Conduct on countering illegal hate speech online: First results on implementation, Dec. 2016, available at http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0ahUKEwiLgc6m24jTAhWKL8AKHXHYDLMQFgggMAA&uI=http%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Fnewsroom%2Fdocument.cfm%3Fdoc_id%3D40573&usg=AFQjCNEL6trtMzPJWNOh316C243-bLooTg&sig2=QoqquKfmhENMUR0Dh3V2tA&bvm=bv.151325232,d.bGg (last visited April 20, 2017).
 21. A EU High Level Group on combating racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance, European Commission, Feb. 27, 2017, available at http://ec.europa.eu/newsroom/just/item-detail.cfm?item_id=51025. (last visited April 20, 2017). European Commission, Minutes of the second meeting of the EU High Level Group on combating racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance, Dec. 7, 2016, available at <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetailDoc&id=29734&no=1> (last visited April 20, 2017).
 22. Subgroup on methodologies for recording and collecting data on hate crime, FRA, Oct. 2016, available at <http://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2017/subgroup-methodologies-recording-and-collecting-data-hate-crime> (last visited April 20, 2017).
 23. European Commission, Hate Crime Training for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Authorities: 10 Key Guiding Principles, Feb. 2017, available at http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0ahUKEwjyY-Myf7SAhVBKMAKHZe8ChEQFgghMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Fnewsroom%2Fdocument.cfm%3Fdoc_id%3D43050&usg=AFQjCNEHJF1C00RfX7y-vTLa3mvH3zUFiQ&sig2=dJjOzST2kTdzHufr1ziBIA&bvm=bv.151325232,d.d24 (last visited April 20, 2017).

Program that aims to establish higher common standards for European police officers and prosecutors who investigate hate crime, including antisemitism. The program was constructed during 2016 as an offering to police forces and prosecution agencies within the 2017-2019 Work Program.²⁵

Although the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) has published its authoritative annual report on antisemitism since 2005, it was the FRA Survey on “Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU Member States: experiences and perception of antisemitism” that may finally have persuaded governments that their understanding of antisemitism, if they had any, was inaccurate or outdated. Large scale polling of Jews in eight EU member states demonstrated that Jews are unwilling to report antisemitic incidents because they believed that criminal justice agencies were unable or unwilling to investigate or prosecute the perpetrators, and that consequently, substantial numbers in the worst affected states were contemplating emigration.²⁶

Dispiritingly, the latest annual report, published in November 2016, notes that twelve years “after the first report on the manifestation of antisemitism in the EU, there is little progress to report with regard to data collection on antisemitism in the EU.”²⁷

However, the Survey is to be repeated and in March 2017, FRA hosted a stakeholders and academics meeting to set the research parameters for the second Survey to be conducted during 2018.²⁸

At the wider European level, and following consultation with a small group of European experts, the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, Nils Muižnieks, in October 2016, issued a public statement warning against Holocaust denial, minimization and trivialization. In it, he noted that denial and associated activities were on the rise, and that despite strong international and European sanctions, states were failing to prosecute such crimes. He further noted that their own populations had played an active role in the persecution and mass murder of Jews and that some states were attempting to relativize the crimes committed by their own collaborationist wartime regimes. In doing so, he noted that remembrance lies at the heart of the Council of Europe, which existed to remember the crimes of the Nazi era. Member states ignored the evidence of rising antisemitism and Holocaust denial at their peril. European states should encourage Internet media providers and social media to take action to prevent and combat hate speech, accede to the 2003 Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime and recall that they are bound to sanction racist hatred and violence under the terms of Article 4 of the

International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination, and are required by the 2008 EU Framework Decision to criminalize Holocaust denial.²⁹

The final initiative worth recording is that of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), a human rights agency of the Council of Europe. The Commission advises member states in matters relating to combating racism, xenophobia and antisemitism by

24. European Commission, Overview of resources and initiatives to support hate crime training programs in the EU Member States, Feb. 2017, available at http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0ahUKEwj8OqwyP7SAhXKJMAKHZKyDsQQFggaMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Fnewsroom%2Fdocument.cfm%3Fdoc_id%3D43147&usq=AFQjCNG49CC6Ymk7RS4LpD6mV-g6XMAHmQ&sig2=uPGdPrCJIUE-rEj9MPzrPQ&bvm=bv.151325232,d.d24 (last visited April 20, 2017).

25. CEPOL – Single Programming Document: Years 2017-2019, at 2427, European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training, Nov. 2015, available at <https://www.cepol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/31-2015-GB.pdf> (last visited April 20, 2017).

It should also be noted that the author is part of a small team creating the training programs.

26. Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU Member States: experiences and perceptions of antisemitism, FRA, 2013, available at <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/discrimination-and-hate-crime-against-jews-eu-member-states-experiences-and> (last visited May 8, 2017).

27. Antisemitism – Overview of data available in the European Union 2005-2015, FRA-European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, at 5, Nov. 2016, available at http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2016-antisemitism-update-2005-2015_en.pdf (last visited April 20, 2017).

28. Stakeholders discuss FRA’s second antisemitism survey, FRA, March 2017, available at <http://fra.europa.eu/en/event/2017/stakeholders-discuss-fras-second-antisemitism-survey> (last visited April 20, 2017).

29. Nils Muižnieks, Why remembering the Holocaust is a human rights imperative, Council of Europe, Oct. 18, 2016, available at http://www.coe.int/de/web/commissioner/blog/-/asset_publisher/xZ32OPEoxOkq/content/why-remembering-the-holocaust-is-a-human-rights-imperative/pop_up?_101_INSTANCE_xZ32OPEoxOkq_languageId=en_GB (last visited April 20, 2017).

publishing five yearly country reports, policy guidance notes on related general themes, convening regular meetings with "specialized human rights bodies" (i.e. national human rights commissions and Ombudsman's offices) and "round table" meetings with civil society organizations. During 2016, ECRI revised its 2004 General Policy Recommendation No. 9 on The Fight Against Antisemitism, as part of a project to publish attractively produced, short versions of its lengthy general policy recommendations to governments, and to disseminate them to the media and civil society. Previously, they tended to be seen only by member states and other IGOs. The publication on antisemitism is to be disseminated, as part of a series of shortened general policy recommendations, during 2017.³⁰

In parallel to these activities, European Jewish institutions have also established new response mechanisms to rising tensions and threats. The European Jewish Congress Security and Crisis Centre, which opened in Vienna during the course of 2016, offers advice and training on managing crises, and the World Jewish Congress created a similar institution for communities elsewhere.³¹

A two-day conference on crisis management and community resilience-building was held in Barcelona in November 2016 for European Jewish leaders organized by the European Council of Jewish Communities, in partnership with the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, at which community leaders were coached on leading their communities during crises.³²

Conclusion

The European IGOs' understanding of the evolving nature of antisemitism has been developing since 2003, when the OSCE held its first High Level Meeting on Antisemitism in Vienna. At that time, the international community was disinclined to label the meeting a full conference, for fear of singling out antisemitism among other forms of intolerance, and suggesting that any hierarchy existed. This has never been the argument advanced by Jewish organizations. What they have argued for is the singularity of antisemitism, due to its longevity, evolving nature from religious to racial and finally, to political hatred, culminating in genocide, which warrants particular attention and remedies.

The antisemitic core at the heart of Islamism and jihadi terror, which has led to IS and Al Qaeda attacks against Jews, has added weight to Jewish claims, and is finally receiving the particular attention it deserves. The IGOs and European governments now appear to recognize their responsibilities towards their Jewish citizens, and are pledged to improving their protection. Of course, the threats arise at a time when racist violence has risen as a consequence of other factors, including economic, political

and populist reactions to economic distress and large scale migration to Europe from the Middle East, Asia and Africa.

Now for the first time, commitments to take coordinated and effective action are being given some meaning, with the recognition that Jewish communities require extra attention. European leaders have also been worried that Jews no longer trust European or national institutions to understand or deal professionally with the threats that confront them, or that states are capable of overcoming their political reservations and inertia to take effective counter action against antisemitism. But the threat of thousands of Jews leaving states which are pledged to guarantee human rights and uphold basic freedom, strikes at the heart of post-war Europe and undermines many of the lessons that might have been learned from the Holocaust.

The Words into Action program refocused hate crime training for EU police officers and prosecutors and the disciplinary measures agreed upon with the social networks by EU Code of Conduct indicate the seriousness with which European policy makers now view threats to Jewish life. They see that these are also threats to everyone, undermine European cohesion and security and risk undoing the positive gains made since 1945.

It remains to be seen whether states pursue these new initiatives with appropriate commitment and funding, at a time when Europe faces political and economic challenges that threaten the very nature of Europe. The prospects now however appear to be better than they were previously. ■

Michael Whine MBE is Government and International Affairs Director at the Community Security Trust, and the UK Member of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) at the Council of Europe. He is also a member of the Hate Crime Independent Advisory Group of the UK Government.

30. Council of Europe General Policy Recommendation No.9, ECRI, 2004, available at https://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/ecri/activities/GPR/EN/Recommendation_N9/Rec.09%20en.pdf (last visited April 20, 2017).

31. SACC by EJC opens its first office in Vienna to meet European Jewish community's security challenges, European Jewish Congress, Sept. 26, 2016, available at <http://www.eurojewcong.org/EJC%20In%20Action/15627-sacc-by-ejc-opens-its-first-office-in-vienna-to-meet-european-jewish-communitys-security-challenges.html> (last visited April 20, 2017).

32. Building Resilient Communities, European Council of Jewish Communities, available at <http://www.ecjc.org/building-resilient-communities> (last visited April 20, 2017).