Do you still believe in Father Christmas?

Do you still believe in Holocaust?

ANTISEMITIC INCIDENTS
Report 2015
Antisemitic letter sent to a synagogue in London, August 2015

you Jews
are a disgrace
to humanity
murderous!
May you all
die in Hell!
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- CST recorded **924 antisemitic incidents in 2015**, the third-highest annual total CST has ever recorded. The total of 924 incidents is a fall of 22 per cent from the 2014 total of 1,179 antisemitic incidents, which was the highest annual total recorded by CST. The second-highest annual total recorded by CST was 931 antisemitic incidents in 2009.¹

- The highest and second-highest annual totals of antisemitic incidents recorded by CST came in two years – 2009 and 2014 – in which there were significant trigger events, in the form of conflicts in Israel and Gaza, that caused sharp but temporary increases in the number of antisemitic incidents recorded in the UK. In contrast, **there was no such trigger event in 2015 and no identifiable temporary ‘spike’ in incidents** to explain the relatively high annual total. Previous years in which there was no significant trigger event include 2013, when 535 antisemitic incidents were recorded by CST; 2011, when 609 incidents were recorded; and 2008, when 546 incidents were recorded. The 2015 total of 924 antisemitic incidents is notably higher than the totals for these years.

- The highest monthly totals recorded by CST in 2015 were in January and February, two months when Jewish communities in France and Denmark were attacked by terrorists. It is possible that these terrorist attacks acted as trigger events, leading to an increase in reported antisemitic incidents in the UK; however, unlike the incident spikes of 2014 and 2009 when the numbers of reported incidents declined after the trigger event was over, the monthly incident totals recorded by CST remained high throughout 2015. The fact that the incidents recorded in 2015 were spread throughout the year, and that relatively few incidents involved references to terrorism against Jews, suggests that the high annual total may reflect either a generally high number of incidents taking place; or that a higher proportion of incidents are being reported to CST and to the Police than previously; or new sources of reporting to CST; or a combination of these factors.

- In addition to the 924 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in 2015, **a further 686 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.**

- **Around three-quarters of the 924 antisemitic incidents recorded in 2015 took place in Greater London and Greater Manchester**, the two largest Jewish communities in the UK. CST recorded 472 antisemitic incidents in Greater London in 2015 compared to 592 during 2014, a fall of 20 per cent. In Greater Manchester, CST recorded 226 incidents in 2015 compared to 309 in 2014, a fall of 27 per cent. Beyond these two centres, CST recorded 226 antisemitic incidents in 82 locations around the UK in 2014, compared to 278 incidents from 89 different locations in 2014 (a fall of 19 per cent in the number of incidents). The 2015 total included 34 antisemitic incidents in Leeds, 29 in Hertfordshire (of which 18 were in Borehamwood), 13 in Liverpool, 11 in Birmingham and 6 in Bradford.

- 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

---

¹ The numbers given in this report for previous years’ incident totals may differ from those previously published as this report includes incidents reported to CST after the publication of previous reports, and reflects the re-categorisation of some incidents after publication due to the emergence of new information. As well as affecting the annual totals, these adjustments mean that some of the monthly, category and geographical totals for previous years cited in this report differ from previously published data. CST has been recording antisemitic incident statistics since 1984.
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 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.² 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.³

• There were 86 violent antisemitic assaults reported to CST in 2015, an increase of 6 per cent from the 81 antisemitic assaults recorded in 2014 and the highest number since 2011, when CST recorded 95 violent antisemitic assaults. This is the only category of incidents that increased in 2015 compared to 2014.

• The 86 violent antisemitic incidents included 4 incidents categorised as Extreme Violence, meaning incidents that involved grievous bodily harm (GBH) or a threat to life. CST recorded one incident of Extreme Violence in 2014 and none in 2013.

• Incidents of Damage and Desecration to Jewish property fell by 20 per cent, from 81 incidents in 2014 to 65 incidents in 2015. There were 49 incidents in this category in 2013 and 53 in 2012.

• There were 685 incidents of Abusive Behaviour recorded by CST in 2015, a fall of 24 per cent from the 896 incidents recorded in this category in 2014. This category includes verbal abuse, hate mail, antisemitic graffiti on non-Jewish property and antisemitic content on social media. The 2015 total of 685 Abusive Behaviour incidents is the second-highest ever recorded by CST in this category.

• There were 76 incidents reported to CST in the category of Threats in 2015, which includes direct threats to people or property, rather than more general abuse. This is a decrease of 16 per cent compared to the 91 incidents of this type recorded in 2014. CST recorded 38 incidents in this category in 2013 and 39 in 2012.

• There were 12 incidents recorded in the category of Literature in 2015, which comprises mass-produced antisemitic mailings and emails, rather than individual hate mail. This is a fall of 60 per cent from the 30 incidents recorded in this category in 2014. CST recorded 5 incidents in this category in 2013 and 12 in 2012.

• The most common single type of incident in 2015 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 354 incidents, the victims were Jewish people, male or female, attacked or abused while going about their daily business in public places. In at least 161 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 458 antisemitic incidents out of the total of 924 incidents in 2015 involved verbal antisemitic abuse.


• CST recorded 159 antisemitic incidents that involved the use of internet-based social media in 2015, which represents 17 per cent of the overall total of 924 antisemitic incidents. For comparison, CST recorded 234 incidents in 2014 that involved the use of social media, which was 20 per cent of the overall incident total in 2014. This reflects the role 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 159 antisemitic incidents of this type recorded in 2015, 149 were in the category of Abusive Behaviour and 10 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.

• 50 antisemitic incidents in 2015 targeted synagogues, and a further 34 incidents targeted synagogue congregants on their way to or from prayers, compared to 69 and 41 incidents respectively in 2014.

• In 109 incidents, the victims were Jewish community organisations, communal events, commercial premises or high-profile individuals, compared to 214 such incidents in 2014.

• 85 incidents targeted Jewish schools, schoolchildren or teachers in 2015, compared to 66 incidents relating to schools and schoolchildren in 2014. Of the 85 incidents of this type recorded in 2015, 31 affected Jewish schoolchildren on their journeys to or from school; 38 took place at

TOTAL NUMBER OF ANTISEMITIC INCIDENTS REPORTED TO CST 2015

- Extreme Violence: 4
- Abusive Behaviour: 685
- Literature: 12
- Assault: 82
- Damage & Desecration: 65
- Threats: 76
- Total: 924
the premises of Jewish faith schools; and 16 involved Jewish children or teachers at non-faith schools.

- In 21 antisemitic incidents, the victims were Jewish students, academics or other student bodies, compared to 19 such incidents recorded in 2014. Of the 21 incidents recorded in this sector in 2015, 13 took place on campus, while there were 8 incidents that affected students, academics or student bodies off campus. None of the 21 incidents recorded in this sector were in the category of Assault, while 17 were in the category of Abusive Behaviour.

- 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 360, or 39 per cent, of the 924 antisemitic incidents recorded during 2015. Of these, 192 offenders (53 per cent) were described as ‘White – North European’; 15 offenders (4 per cent) were described as ‘White – South European’; 46 offenders (13 per cent) were described as ‘Black’; 77 offenders (21 per cent) were described as ‘South Asian’; 3 offenders (1 per cent) were described as ‘East or South East Asian’; and 27 offenders (8 per cent) were described as ‘Arab or North African’.

- There were 215 antisemitic incidents which showed far right, anti-Israel or Islamist beliefs or motivations alongside antisemitism in 2015, making up 23 per cent of the overall total of 924 antisemitic incidents, fewer than half the 454 incidents showing such ideas or motivations in 2014 (39 per cent of the overall total for that year). This fall probably reflects the lack of a political trigger event in 2015, compared to the role played by the conflict in Israel and Gaza in 2014. Of the 215 antisemitic incidents in 2015 showing ideological motivation or beliefs as well as antisemitism, 137 showed far right motivation or beliefs; 47 showed anti-Israel motivation or beliefs; and 31 showed Islamist motivation or beliefs.

- 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.

- CST receives reports of antisemitic incidents from a range of sources,
including directly from victims or members of their family; from witnesses; from CST’s own national volunteer structure; from security guards at Jewish buildings; and via incident data sharing programmes with Police forces around the UK. CST has operated incident data sharing programmes with Greater Manchester Police and the Metropolitan Police in London since 2011 and 2012 respectively. These 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. In 2014, CST signed a data sharing agreement with Nottinghamshire Police and in 2015 signed a national data sharing agreement with the National Police Chiefs’ Council (under its former name of the Association of Chief Police Officers). As a result of this agreement CST now shares anonymised antisemitic incident data with several Police forces around the UK and intends to expand this area of its work in 2016.

- The 686 potential incidents reported to CST that were not included in the annual total for 2015 included 380 cases of potential Information Collection and Suspicious Behaviour at Jewish locations. This is more than double the 161 incidents of this type recorded by CST in 2014. This large increase is likely to be a consequence of either increased concern about the threat of terrorism against the Jewish community; or the increased number of security guards at Jewish buildings following the expansion of government funding for security guarding at Jewish communal locations during 2015; or a combination of the two. The 380 cases of potential Information Collection and Suspicious Behaviour recorded in 2015 included 118 incidents of photography or videoing of Jewish buildings, while in 51 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.

- 305 of the 924 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST nationally in 2015 came to CST via incident data exchange programmes with the Police, representing 33 per cent of the incidents included in this report. A total of 365 incidents, or 40 per cent of the total, were reported directly to CST by the victims of antisemitic incidents, or by a friend or family member of an incident victim. One hundred and fifty-seven antisemitic incidents (17 per cent of the total) were reported to CST by people who had witnessed the incident but were not the direct victims of it. Thirty-nine antisemitic incidents were reported by CST staff or volunteers throughout the UK. CST received reports of 32 antisemitic incidents from security guards at Jewish buildings and organisations. This is an increase from the 20 incidents reported by security guards at Jewish buildings in 2014, which may reflect the increased number of guards operating at Jewish buildings as a result of new funding made available for this purpose by the government during 2015. Nine antisemitic incidents were recorded by CST during 2015 on the basis of media reports. The remaining incidents were reported to CST by other Jewish community or hate crime monitoring organisations.
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

Antisemitic graffiti in a children’s playground in Kent, May 2015

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. CST staff have 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 Police forces around the United Kingdom and compares antisemitic incident trends with analysts from the National Community Tension Team, which is part of the National Police Chiefs’ Council.

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 2015, CST received 686 reports of potential incidents that were rejected for this reason, and are not included in the total number of antisemitic incidents. These represent 43 per cent of the potential incidents reported to CST during 2015 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.

---
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ANTISEMITIC INCIDENTS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM IN 2015

CST recorded 924 antisemitic incidents in the UK in 2015, a fall of 22 per cent from the 1,179 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST for 2014, which was the highest annual total ever recorded by CST. The 2015 total of 924 antisemitic incidents is the third-highest annual total CST has recorded. The second-highest annual total came in 2009, when 931 antisemitic incidents were recorded.

**Contexts and patterns**

The fact that there was a decrease in the total number of antisemitic incidents recorded in 2015 compared to 2014 fits previous patterns of antisemitic hate incident totals. This is because, unlike the previous year, 2015 did not include any ‘trigger events’ such as the conflicts in Israel and Gaza in 2014 and 2009 that in the past have led to temporary but significant ‘spikes’ in antisemitic incidents in the UK. However, the total number of 924 incidents in 2015 is higher than might have been expected, given this lack of trigger events. For example, in 2010, following the 2009 then-record high of 931 antisemitic incidents, CST recorded 646 antisemitic incidents, a fall of 31 per cent. This was a larger fall, and a smaller annual total, than was recorded in 2015. Other years in which there was no trigger event include 2013, when 535 antisemitic incidents were recorded by CST; 2011, when 609 incidents were recorded; and 2008, when 546 incidents were recorded.

The 2015 total of 924 antisemitic incidents is notably higher than the totals for these years. This may reflect a long-term increase in the number of antisemitic incidents taking place; or that a higher proportion of incidents are being reported to CST and to the Police; or it may be as a result of new sources of antisemitic incident reporting to CST; or a combination of these factors.

The highest monthly totals recorded by CST in 2015 were 109 incidents recorded in January and 88 incidents in February, two months when Jewish communities in France and Denmark were attacked by terrorists.

It is possible that these terrorist attacks on Jews in other West European countries acted as trigger events, leading to an increase in the number of antisemitic incidents in the UK. Alternatively, relatively few incidents recorded by CST during those months made any reference to the terrorist attacks overseas, suggesting that the increase in incident totals for those months may have been largely fuelled by an increase in the reporting of all types of antisemitic incidents, rather than an increase in the occurrence of incidents inspired by those terrorist attacks.

However, unlike the incident spikes of 2014 and 2009 when the numbers of reported incidents declined after the trigger event was over, the monthly incident totals recorded by CST remained relatively consistent throughout 2015. For example, CST recorded 85 antisemitic incidents in June 2015, 87 in July, 74 in September and 74 in November. The lowest monthly total in the year was August, when 59 antisemitic incidents were recorded. This is the highest ‘lowest monthly total’ in any year since CST began recording antisemitic incidents. It is possible that these relatively high numbers of incidents recorded throughout 2015 reflect the fact that terrorism, and the potential threat to British Jews of a terrorist attack, remained high in public and communal consciousness during 2015 and consequently the motivation to report antisemitic incidents to CST and to the Police also remained high. It is also possible that the

7. This is a higher number than the 1,168 incidents cited in CST’s Antisemitic Incidents Report 2014, as it includes incidents reported to CST after the publication of that report, and reflects the re-categorisation of some incidents after publication due to the emergence of new information. Similar changes have also been made for previous years. As well as affecting the annual totals, these adjustments mean that some of the monthly, category and geographical totals for previous years cited in this report differ from previously published data.
sustained high monthly totals are a result of an increased security presence at Jewish buildings in 2015. This increased presence is partly a result of increased Jewish communal concern about terrorism, and partly due to government funding for security guards at Jewish communal buildings that was made available in 2015. It is also possible, though, that the sustained high monthly totals throughout 2015 simply indicate that the number of antisemitic incidents taking place remains at a higher level than might have been expected in a year when there was no trigger event. Alternatively, the relatively high annual incident total for 2015 may be best explained by a combination of these factors: a high number of incidents taking place; and a high motivation and ability of incident victims and witnesses to report incidents to CST and the Police.

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 antisemitic incident data exchange 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.

8. This funding has been available for Jewish voluntary aided state schools since 2010.
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, CST signed a similar data sharing agreement with Nottinghamshire Police and in 2015, CST signed a national data sharing agreement with the National Police Chiefs’ Council (under its former name of the Association of Chief Police Officers). As a result of this agreement, CST now shares anonymised antisemitic incident data with several Police forces around the UK and intends to expand this area of its work in 2016. In 2015, 305 antisemitic incidents were reported to CST by this method, which had not been reported directly to CST from any other source. These comprised 33 per cent of the incidents recorded by CST in 2015, compared to 30 per cent in 2014 and 34 per cent in 2013. Prior to the introduction of these programmes, antisemitic incidents had been shared by the Police with CST on an ad hoc basis, for operational or community engagement purposes; 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, these new and significant sources of antisemitic incident reports must be taken into consideration when comparing CST’s antisemitic incident totals since 2011 with those from 2010 and earlier.

Antisemitic incident totals can also rise for circumstantial reasons. CST recorded 24 antisemitic incidents on the five days in September that covered the Jewish High Holy Days of Rosh Hashanah, Kol Nidre and Yom Kippur, compared to 16 incidents on the same five dates in 2014 (when no Jewish festivals fell on those dates). The 24 incidents recorded on those five festival days in September 2015 comprised 32 per cent of the total number of antisemitic incidents recorded by CST during that month. 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. The 24 incidents recorded on Rosh Hashanah, Kol Nidre and Yom Kippur in 2015 is similar to the 26 incidents recorded on these festivals in 2014.

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 2015, and the picture they show is one of complexity. In short, 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 1,179 antisemitic incidents reversed a short-term trend of falling incident totals since 2009, but continued 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. 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 2015, are given below.9

Extreme Violence
Incidents of Extreme Violence include any attack potentially causing loss of life or grievous bodily harm (GBH). There were four incidents of Extreme Violence in 2015, compared with one in 2014 and none in 2013. The incidents of Extreme Violence recorded in 2015 included:

• **London, February:** A white male with an East European accent attacked a man on a London Underground train. He asked for money and then shouted “you f**king Jews”, “f**king Jewish b*****d”, “get off my train you f**king Jewish b*****d” while punching the man repeatedly in the face. The Police told CST that the assault would be treated as GBH. However when the offender was arrested he was instead dealt with under the mental health act. The victim of this incident was not Jewish.

• **Manchester, September:** Four visibly Jewish teenagers were attacked by three white males at a Metrolink station. Antisemitic remarks were made by the offenders, and one of the victims suffered serious head injuries including a fractured skull. Two offenders pleaded guilty to GBH, actual bodily harm and assault and were sentenced to youth detention.

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 82 incidents of Assault in 2015, compared to 80 in 2014. This means that the total number of violent antisemitic incidents (combining the categories of Assault and Extreme Violence) recorded in 2015 was 86, a 6 per cent increase from the 81 incidents recorded in these two categories combined in 2014. The total of 86 violent antisemitic assaults reported to CST in 2015 is the highest since 2011, when 95 violent incidents were recorded. The 86 violent incidents comprised 9 per cent of the overall total in 2015, compared to 7 per cent in 2014 and 13 per cent in 2013.

Sixty-seven of the 86 incidents of Assault or Extreme Violence recorded in 2015 were random attacks on Jewish people in public places, of which 32 targeted people who were visibly Jewish, usually due to their religious or traditional clothing. Seven assaults targeted synagogue congregants on their way to or from prayers, and 6 targeted Jewish schoolchildren on their way to or from school.

CST received a description of the gender of the victims in 75 of the incidents of Assault or Extreme Violence. Of these, the victims were male in 52 incidents; in 14 incidents they were female; and in 9 they were mixed couples or groups of males and females. CST received a description of the age of the victims in 45 of the incidents of Assault or Extreme Violence. Of these, in 25 incidents the victims were adults; in 17 incidents the victims were minors; and in 3 incidents they were mixed groups of adults and minors.

CST received a description of the gender of the offenders in 56 of the incidents of Assault or Extreme Violence, of which 46 involved male offenders, 7 involved female offenders and 3 involved male and female offenders acting...
together. CST received a description of the age of the offenders in 39 of the incidents of Assault or Extreme Violence. Of these, the offenders were adults in 18 incidents; in 21 incidents they were minors; and no incidents involved adults and minors offending together. Thirteen 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 2015 included:

- **London, March**: A Jewish man was stopped in the street by the occupants of a passing car who asked him for directions. When he began to answer a male occupant of South European appearance called him a “f**king dirty Jew” and threw eggs at him.

- **Manchester, April**: Three visibly Jewish boys aged 12 were leaving a hospital after visiting a friend. They were attacked by a group of assailants of a similar age. Two Jewish boys were punched and one was spat on.

- **Manchester, May**: A man was seen making a Nazi salute and shouting “Heil Hitler” in public. When a Jewish passer-by approached him to protest, the offender repeated his salute before punching the victim twice, knocking him to the ground.

- **Manchester, July**: A man on a bicycle threw a stone at the head of a Jewish man and shouted “F**king Jew”.

- **London, July**: Five Jewish girls aged 14 and wearing Jewish school uniforms were at a shopping centre and then got onto a bus home. Three white girls of similar age followed them onto the bus and called them “Jew b**tches” before punching one Jewish girl in the head and kicking another.

- **London, July**: A visibly Jewish man was in a shop when three men, one of whom was black and two of Arab appearance, walked in and asked him where he was from. One of the men said “He is from Israel” and another said “Why do you keep bombing us? I am Muslim and I don’t like what you’re doing to my people. I don’t have a problem with you but I hate you if you are a Zionist.” One of the men then said “Stupid Jews. You don’t belong here. Get out of this shop you Jew”, while knocking the victim’s kippah off his head.

- **London, August**: A Jewish man was crossing over a pedestrian bridge when a man passed him and spat on his jacket as he walked past. The victim said “What are you doing?” and the offender replied, “You’re a f**king Jew”.

- **Manchester, September**: A visibly Jewish man was walking home when a group of youths shouted “Jew” and threw stones at him.

- **Manchester, October**: A Jewish man was walking along a street when he passed a group of three South Asian men, one of whom said the word “Jewish” loudly. The offender then followed the Jewish man, came up very close to him and asked him whether he hated Palestine while repeatedly prodding him increasingly hard. The offender appeared to be drunk and was dragged away by his friends.

**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 65 incidents of Damage and
Desecration in 2015, a decrease of 20 per
cent from the 2014 total of 81 incidents in this
category. There were 49 antisemitic incidents
recorded in this category in 2013 and 53 in
2012. Of the 65 incidents recorded in 2015,
24 affected the homes of Jewish people, or
vehicles parked at their homes. Six involved
desecrations of, or antisemitic damage to,
synagogues. There was one incident in 2015
that involved antisemitic damage to, or
desecration of, a Jewish cemetery, and 5 that
involved the antisemitic hacking of websites of
Jewish organisations.

Incidents of Damage and Desecration in 2015
included:

- **Liverpool, January**: Four swastikas were
carved into the doors of the prayer room at
a Jewish cemetery.

- **London, March**: The website of a Jewish
organisation was hacked by people who
left a message reading “Hacked by Islamic
State”, with an image of the Islamic State /
Da’esh flag.

- **Manchester, May**: A student at Manchester
University had a swastika drawn on a poster
in her bedroom.

- **Birmingham, June**: Members of the neo-
Nazi ‘National Action’ organisation attached
a Nazi flag and other antisemitic signs to
a large public Chanukiah in a park, and
sprayed antisemitic slogans on walls nearby.

- **London, July & August**: On separate
occasions the words “Yid Out” and “Yid
Sh*t” with a swastika were written on the
wall of a Jewish school.

- **Bournemouth, October**: A swastika was
drawn on the front door of a Jewish
man’s home.

- **London, October**: “Jesus killers” was
written on the front door of a synagogue.

- **London, December**: “Free Gaza” was
daubed on the business premises of a
kosher food company, and the owner’s car
was scratched.

- **London, December**: A Jewish woman
received a Chanukah gift via Amazon. When
she opened the gift, she found that the
‘Happy Chanukah’ message card had “F**k
Israel”, “#free Gaza” and “#free Palestine”
handwritten on it.
Threats
This category includes only direct antisemitic threats, whether verbal or written.

There were 76 incidents reported to CST in the category of Threats in 2015, a fall of 16 per cent compared to the 91 incidents recorded in this category in 2014. There were 38 antisemitic incidents recorded in this category in 2013 and 39 in 2012. Thirty-one of the 76 threats recorded in 2015 took place in public, of which 10 involved threats shouted from passing vehicles. Fifty-five incidents in this category involved verbal abuse and 10 took place on social media.

Incidents in the category of Threats in 2015 included:

- **Manchester, January:** A Jewish man was filling his car up at a petrol station when the occupant of another vehicle containing four South Asian men wound down his window and asked “Are you Jewish?”, before saying “We need to kill you all.” He then made a gun gesture at the victim before driving away.

- **Gateshead, January:** Some visibly Jewish people were walking down a street when a car drove past and the male occupants shouted “We’re going to kill you” at them.

- **London, January:** A Jewish school received a bomb threat by telephone. The caller said “Is that the Jewish school? Who are you, f**k you, up the Palestinians we’re going to blow up the school.” The offender phoned a second time and said “I am going to kill you”.

- **Manchester, January:** The day after the above incident, a Jewish school received a similar bomb threat by telephone. The caller said “Is that a Jewish school? I hate the f**king lot of you. We’re going to bomb the lot of you.” The offender phoned a second time and said “F**k the Jews”.

- **London, February:** A group of South Asian and black men shouted “Are you Jews? We’ll cut your f**king heads off” at a group of two Jewish men and one woman.

- **Hertfordshire, April:** A visibly Jewish couple were getting on a train when a black man on the platform shouted “F**king Jews” and “All of you should die” at them.

- **London, April:** A synagogue received a letter that read “All Jews will die IS”.

- **London, June:** A man shouted “F**king Jews” and “I’ll f**king kill you, I’ll f**king break your neck” at two visibly Jewish men walking along a river towpath.

- **London, October:** Three men walked past a Jewish nursery. One asked “Is this a Jewish school?” and another said “IS will come and kill you” and made a gun gesture with his hand.

- **Hertfordshire, October:** A visibly Jewish couple were getting on a train when a black man on the platform shouted “F**king Jews” and “All of you should die” at them.

- **London, October:** A white man threatened a group of congregants outside a synagogue. He shouted “You blew up the King David Hotel”, “You killed British Tommies”, “If you come on my land I’m going to f**king kill you.” He also made a Nazi salute and appeared to be drunk.
There were 685 incidents of Abusive Behaviour reported to CST in 2015, the second highest total CST has ever recorded in this category. The record high in this category was 896 incidents, recorded in 2015. Therefore the 685 antisemitic Abusive Behaviour incidents recorded in 2015 is a fall of 24 per cent from the 896 incidents of this type recorded in 2014. There were 374 incidents of Abusive Behaviour recorded in 2013 and 477 in 2012. In 252 of the incidents recorded in this category in 2015, the victims were random Jewish people in public places; in at least 116 of these, the victims were visibly Jewish. Verbal antisemitic abuse was used in 344 incidents in this category, 30 which were by phone. There were 149 incidents of Abusive Behaviour recorded that took place on social media. Eleven incidents of Abusive Behaviour occurred via email and 15 involved the use of paper hate mail. Eighty-five incidents in this category involved antisemitic daubings, graffiti or stickers on non-Jewish property.

Incidents of Abusive Behaviour in 2015 included:

- **London, December:** A man of Arab appearance said “All Jews can die” and made a throat-slitting gesture towards a group of two Jewish women and one man.

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 685 incidents of Abusive Behaviour recorded to CST in 2015, the second highest total CST has ever recorded in this category. The record high in this category was 896 incidents, recorded in 2015. Therefore the 685 antisemitic Abusive Behaviour incidents recorded in 2015 is a fall of 24 per cent from the 896 incidents of this type recorded in 2014. There were 374 incidents of Abusive Behaviour recorded in 2013 and 477 in 2012. In 252 of the incidents recorded in this category in 2015, the victims were random Jewish people in public places; in at least 116 of these, the victims were visibly Jewish. Verbal antisemitic abuse was used in 344 incidents in this category, 30 which were by phone. There were 149 incidents of Abusive Behaviour recorded that took place on social media. Eleven incidents of Abusive Behaviour occurred via email and 15 involved the use of paper hate mail. Eighty-five incidents in this category involved antisemitic daubings, graffiti or stickers on non-Jewish property.

Incidents of Abusive Behaviour in 2015 included:

- **London, January:** Two South Asian men were seen shouting “Allah Akhbar” and banging on the wall of a Jewish building.

- **London, January:** A Twitter user received three antisemitic tweets on Holocaust Memorial Day. The first read “Today the Jews have killed more innocent people than Hitler did so who is the real monster? I Do wonder”. The second read “Holocaust day is a Scam for many Fake Jews such as these stinking Zionist Pigs While a sad day for the genuine Jews who lost innocent people". The third said “I care about the innocent Jews who was killed by the west & Hitler but I wish a Holocaust 4 Zionists worldwide at the hands of the merciless”.

- **Manchester, February:** Two Jewish men were walking to synagogue when a car drove past with two South Asian male occupants and one of them shouted “You f**king Jews” at them.

- **London, February:** A Jewish student was leaving her university when she saw a man handing out anti-racist flyers. She approached him and said she agreed with him because as a Jew she had encountered antisemitism and thought more should be done about it. The man started talking at length about Palestine and kept calling her a Zionist, even though she had not mentioned Israel. He then denied that the Holocaust happened and ended the conversation by saying “I won’t talk to you anymore you Zionist”.

- **London, February:** A Jewish man was approached by a work colleague who wanted to discuss the recent terrorist attacks in France. The colleague, a white male, said that Zionists are behind 9/11 and every other terrorist attack since.
• **London, February:** A swastika was daubed on a wall in black paint, in an area with a large Jewish population.

• **London, March:** Four Jewish schoolboys were playing football in a park after school. They were approached by a group of three South Asian boys and one black boy who stole their football and challenged them to a fight. The offenders then noticed the Jewish boys’ school blazers which identified them as going to a Jewish school, at which point they began shouting “Jews Jews Jews” and “Go to the gas chambers”.

• **Brighton, March:** A visibly Jewish man was on a Brighton to London train when he was approached by an elderly male who aggressively accused him of being a “child killer” in reference to Gaza.

• **Manchester, March:** Two Jewish men were walking through an area with a large Jewish population when a van drove past and the driver, a white male, shouted “Where are the gas chambers mate” and “Hitler” at them.

• **Hertfordshire, April:** Graffiti including “This school is ours forever!” and “F**k off Jews” was daubed at a non-denominational primary school.

• **Nottingham, April:** Graffiti including “Dirty Jew” and “Haille Hitler” [sic] was daubed in a public place.

• **Essex, June:** A man on a flight from Budapest to London directed several antisemitic remarks at a group of Strictly Orthodox Jews on the airplane. The comments included “Yids”, “F**king Yids” and “F**king shalom to you”.

• **London, June:** Two white men who were drinking cans of alcohol got on a bus and saw a visibly Jewish teenager sat on the bus. They shouted “He’s a f**king Jew” and “Look at that f**king Jew” while continuing to drink.

• **London, June:** A woman approached a Jewish building, made a Nazi salute and said “They are Jews and they have everything we have nothing. They pretend to listen but don’t listen, they control everything, they are Satan’s spawn. Muhammad can’t save you, Lord will save you, they are infidels, they will go to hell.”

Antisemitic tweet from UK neo-Nazi group, March 2015

---

Antisemitic tweet from UK neo-Nazi group, March 2015
• **London, July:** Graffiti reading “Jews Die” in Polish was found on a wall.

• **London, July:** A Jewish man was walking down a street when a South Asian man approached him and shouted “F**king Jew, F**king murderer, F**king pr**k”.

• **London, July:** A Jewish woman was waiting at a bus stop with her three children. Two people, a white woman and a man of Arab appearance, walked past and the woman said “Get out of the way you F**king Yid”.

• **London, August:** A white male shouted “Sieg Heil” and made a Nazi salute at a visibly Jewish man in the street.

• **Glasgow, August:** Two abusive phone calls were made to a synagogue by what sounded like young males, who said “Jewish c**t” and other offensive terms.

• **Manchester, August:** A Jewish man was walking through an area with a large Jewish population when a South Asian man driving past shouted “F**k off Jew” at him.

• **London, August:** A car was stopped in traffic outside a Jewish building. The black male driver put his middle finger up, shouted “F**k the Jews” and then crossed himself.

• **Manchester, September:** A Jewish property manager gave notice to a tenant on behalf of a Jewish landlord. The tenant said “This is a Zionist way of making money”. When the property manager expressed his offence about the comment, the offender said “That was nothing to do with being Jewish, it was about Israel.”

• **London, September:** Graffiti showing two Stars of David and a swastika was drawn on the floor at a London Underground station.

• **London, September:** Three white males made Nazi salutes outside a Jewish building. They appeared to be drunk.

• **Manchester, September:** Three teenage boys cycled past a synagogue on the Jewish festival of Yom Kippur. They shouted at the security guards “Why are you defending the Hebrews?” and “Jewish b****ds”.

• **London, October:** Two staff members at Israel-related organisations were tagged in a tweet that equated Zionism with Nazism and then read “Because Jews don’t do false flag operations, no wait they’re the f**king experts”.

• **London, November:** A white male was
heard making a hissing sound to mimic a gas chamber and referring to Tottenham Hotspur fans as “Yids” prior to a match between Spurs and Arsenal.

- **Birmingham, November**: Some visibly Jewish people were walking down a street when they passed a group of youths who they heard saying “F**king Jew” and “Bloody Jew”.

- **Hertfordshire, December**: Several congregants had antisemitic abuse shouted at them on their way to synagogue by the occupants of a van driving past them. The offenders, who were white men, shouted “Hitler is coming” and other comments about Hitler, gas and Jews.

- **London, December**: Graffiti reading “Kill Zions”, “Kill Jews” and “Heil Hitler” was found on a block of flats.

- **Southampton, December**: Two Southampton FC supporters received three-year bans from attending football matches for antisemitic comments and gestures made during a Premier League match against Tottenham Hotspur. The pair had made Nazi salutes, hissing noises and shouted “Gas the 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). This 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 antisemitic emails that are sent to groups of recipients.

Examples of Literature incidents in 2015 included:

- **Manchester, January**: A leaflet was posted into people’s homes that had a picture of a noose and was titled “Multiculturalism is White Genocide”. The leaflet 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... there needs to be a British Nuremberg Trials of the multiculturalists who hijacked the Labour Party and their Jewish puppet masters.”

- **Nottingham, March**: Various Jewish and non-Jewish buildings received identical leaflets containing threats about killing Jews and Christians, and expressing support for jihadist terrorist organisations.

- **Manchester, June**: A selection of leaflets and stickers supporting the neo-Nazi ‘British Movement’ and other far right organisations was posted to a Jewish organisation.

- **London, July**: A Jewish man was one of dozens of recipients of a mass email which claimed that “America has surreptitiously been taken over by the Zionist Jews/Israel Congress is a Zionist Jew puppet agency... Israel did 9/11... Israel and American Zionist Traitors are the main problem in America They are War Criminals, Mass Murderers, Liars and Thieves Our whole political system is infested with Zionist criminals”.

- **London, October**: A leaflet was distributed at a London Underground station which was titled “Isreal [sic] Terrorist” and quoted from several Jewish religious texts before claiming that there is a “terror mentality among the Jews”.

- **London, November**: A Jewish man was one of several recipients of an offensive mass email titled “DNA science and the Jewish bloodline”.

The statistics for this category 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 12 incidents recorded in the category of antisemitic Literature in 2015, a fall of 60 per cent from the 30 incidents recorded in this category in 2014. The 2014 total was the highest since 2009, when 62 incidents of antisemitic Literature were recorded by CST. There were 5 incidents recorded in this category in 2013 and 12 in 2012. Four of the Literature incidents recorded in 2015 involved email and 8 involved the distribution of paper leaflets or pamphlets.
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 rather than with political activism or ideologies: 23 per cent of incidents recorded in 2015 showed evidence of political motivations or beliefs, while 77 per cent did not. In 354 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 161 of these, the victims were visibly Jewish, usually due to their religious or traditional clothing, school uniform or jewellery bearing Jewish symbols. Fifty incidents targeted synagogue property and staff, compared to 69 in 2014, and a further 34 incidents targeted congregants on their way to or from prayers, compared to 41 in 2014. There were 109 incidents that targeted Jewish community organisations, communal events, commercial premises or high-profile individuals, compared to 214 in 2014, while 75 incidents happened at people’s private homes (91 in 2014). Twenty-six antisemitic incidents took place in the workplace or were work-related, compared to 27 in 2014.

A total of 85 antisemitic incidents took place at schools or involved Jewish schoolchildren or teaching staff, compared to 66 in 2014. Of the 85 incidents of this type in 2015, 38 took place at Jewish schools, 16 at non-faith schools and 31 affected Jewish schoolchildren on their journeys to and from school. Twelve of the 85 school-related incidents were in the category of Assault; 12 involved Damage and Desecration of Jewish property; 7 were in the category of Threats; and 54 were in the category of Abusive Behaviour.

There were 21 antisemitic incidents in which the victims were Jewish students, academics or other student bodies, compared to 19 campus-related antisemitic incidents in 2014. Of the 21 incidents of this type reported to CST in 2015, 13 took place on campus and 8 off campus. None of the 21 incidents involving students, academics or student bodies were in the category of Assault: there were 2 incidents of Damage and Desecration of Jewish property; 2 in the category of Threats; and 17 in the category of Abusive Behaviour. Of the 13 antisemitic incidents that took place on campus, 5 involved graffiti or other daubing on non-Jewish property and 2 on Jewish property; there were four incidents that involved verbal abuse and one that took place on social media. Seven involved the use of language or imagery related to the Holocaust or the Nazi period, while 1 involved the use of language or imagery related to Israel and the Middle East. One of the 13 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 511 (55 per cent) of the 924 antisemitic incidents reported to CST during 2015. Of these, the victims were male in 329 incidents (64 per cent of incidents where the victim’s gender was known), female in 134 incidents (26 per cent) and groups of males and females together in 48 incidents (9 per cent).
CST received a description of the age of the victim or victims of 307 (33 per cent) of the 924 incidents recorded during 2015. 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 in 221 incidents, the victims were described to CST as adults (72 per cent of incidents where the victim’s age was described), in 66 incidents they were described as minors (21 per cent) and in 20 cases (7 per cent) the victims were described as adults and minors together.

**WHO AND WHAT IS BEING TARGETED**

2015
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. 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.

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. 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 often stripped of much of the detail of the age, gender and ethnic appearance of both offenders and victims.

Bearing in mind all these limitations regarding the availability and reliability of this data, a description of the ethnic appearance of the offenders was obtained in 360, or 39 per cent, of the 924 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in 2015. Of these, 192 offenders were described as ‘White – North European’ (53 per cent); 15 offenders were described as ‘White – South European’ (4 per cent); 46 offenders were described as ‘Black’ (13 per cent); 77 offenders were described as ‘South Asian’ (21 per cent); 3 offenders were described as ‘East or South East Asian’ (1 per cent); and 27 offenders were described as being ‘Arab or North African’ (8 per cent). 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 513 (56 per cent) of the 924 antisemitic incidents recorded in 2015. Of these, the offenders were described as male in 420 incidents (82 per cent of incidents where the offender’s gender was known), female in 77 incidents (15 per cent) and mixed groups of males and females in 16 incidents (3 per cent).

CST received a description of the approximate age of the offender or offenders in 326 of the 924 incidents reported during the year (35 per cent). Of these 326 incidents, and allowing for the same caveats as when attempting to analyse the ages of incident victims, the offenders were described as adults in 224 antisemitic incidents (69 per cent of incidents where the offender’s age was estimated), minors in 101 incidents (31 per cent) and adults and minors together in one incident. 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 54 per cent of the incidents recorded by CST in the
categories of Assault and Extreme Violence in 2015 where an age description of the offender was provided, but for only 26 per cent of the incidents in the categories of Abusive Behaviour or Threats combined (where an age description of the offender was provided). Similarly, incident victims described as minors comprised 38 per cent of victims of incidents in the combined categories of Assault and Extreme Violence (where an age description was obtained), but only 19 per cent of victims in the combined categories of Threats and Abusive Behaviour where such a description was obtained.

**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:

- **Cambridge, January**: A flyer for the neo-Nazi ‘National Action’ organisation was stuck to the public noticeboard of a Jewish building.
- **Leeds, February**: “Free Palestine” was daubed onto the perimeter wall of a Jewish care home.

In both of these examples, the link between political motivation and the antisemitic targeting of the incident appears straightforward. In both cases Jewish property has been targeted for criminal damage due to its Jewish connection. The first incident appears to be motivated by neo-Nazi political beliefs, while the second appears to have been motivated by anti-Israel political beliefs. However, in other incidents the connection between the discourse used and any political motivation is not so clear. For example, consider these two incidents:

- **London, February**: A Jewish woman was in a supermarket when she saw a man wearing a Palestinian flag badge who was talking loudly about a recent appearance on BBC Question Time by then-MP George Galloway. The man said “It was 99 per cent Jews, what do you expect” and “the Jews won’t let him talk”. When the woman told him that she disagreed, the offender said “So you support Nazi Israel then?” and followed her around the shop calling her a “Nazi”.
- **London, November**: A visibly Jewish boy was on a London Underground train when two white men in his carriage said “Oi Jew. Wanna box? Go back to f**king Israel. Get off the train”.

In both these incidents, the offenders refer to Israel in the language they use to abuse their victim. However, while the offender in the first incident appears to be politically opposed to Israel (while also using antisemitic language), the offenders in the second incident only mention Israel as part of their xenophobic discourse directed at a visibly Jewish person. Thus the use of discourse about Israel by an incident offender does not necessarily indicate that the incident is motivated by anti-Israel attitudes.

In other incidents, different discourses relating to Jews are so mixed up that there is no clear
indication as to a particular political motivation, rather than a more general antisemitic and conspiracist mindset. For example:

- **London, August**: An Israel-related organisation was sent a message on social media that read “Destroy criminal Luciferian: “Vatican”, the Pope Francisco, The Queen Elizabeth 2 of the U.K. and Zionists and the New World Order and the Rothschild!” It then had links to conspiracy websites.

- **London, December**: A non-Jewish Member of Parliament received an email that read “How wonderful for you that anyone who criticises [sic] your sponsorship of the concept of Jewish victimhood is an “extremist” carrying out “attacks” against the Jewish people via the vehicle your noble self... I object to wall-to-wall and continuous propaganda labelling the bank-owning, corporation-dominating, government-controlling most dominant group in the country as “victims”... A growing number of people are becoming aware that the story that has been shoved down our throats for the past 70 years regarding ‘human gas chambers’ is a lie... Everything Jesus told us about these people (the Rabbinical/Jewish overclass, their money-manufacturing friends who work in allegiance with militarised gentile gangsters) remains true today.”

In these incidents, fragments of political discourse are present but they do not add up to a coherent, identifiable political outlook. Rather, both incidents reflect a belief in conspiracy theories and the ubiquity of antisemitism in conspiratorial mindsets.

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

- **Warwick, July**: Boys from a Jewish secondary school were on a school trip when boys from another secondary school on a trip to the same place shouted “Go back to the ghetto”, “Go back to the gas chambers”, “F**k the Jews” and “Free Palestine”.

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 2015 represent the multifaceted nature of contemporary antisemitism. In 221 of the 924 antisemitic incidents reported to CST in 2015, the offenders employed discourse based on the Nazi period, including swastikas and references to the Holocaust. Of these, 137 showed evidence of far right motivation or beliefs. For comparison, in 2014, Nazi-related discourse was used by offenders in 240 antisemitic incidents, of which 160 showed evidence of far right motivation or beliefs. Discourse related to Israel or the Middle East showed a large contrast from 2014 to 2015, for reasons that will be explained. In 2015, discourse relating to Israel or the Middle East was used in 81 antisemitic incidents, of which 47 showed evidence of anti-Israel motivation or beliefs; compared to 303 incidents using Israel-related discourse in 2014, of which 256 showed evidence of anti-Israel motivation or beliefs. The most likely explanation for this large discrepancy is that the conflict in Israel and Gaza in July and August 2014 acted as a significant trigger event for a large number of antisemitic incidents motivated by
anti-Israel sentiment and for the increased use of Israel-related language by incident offenders; whereas the lack of a similar trigger event in 2015 meant that references to the Holocaust and the Nazi period, rather than references to Israel, were the most common type of discourse used. In addition, language or images relating to Islam or Muslims was present in 38 antisemitic incidents in 2015, the same number as in 2014, while 31 incidents showed evidence of Islamist motivation or beliefs (38 in 2014).

The specific language used by incident offenders can also be influenced by wider public and media discourse in relation to Jews at any given time. For example, in 2014 discourse about Jews being ‘child killers’ or ‘child murderers’ was used in antisemitic incidents 49 times, whereas in 2015 it was only used once. This may reflect the fact that during the conflict in Israel and Gaza in 2014, the issue of Palestinian child casualties was a subject of significant media and political debate.

Overall, 23 per cent of incidents in 2015 showed some degree of ideological motivation or belief, compared to 39 per cent of incidents in 2014. 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.

ANTISEMITIC OR ANTI-ISRAEL?

CST is often asked about the difference between antisemitic incidents and anti-Israel activity, and how this distinction is made in the categorisation of incidents. The distinction between the two can be subtle and the subject of much debate. Clearly, it would not be acceptable to define all anti-Israel activity as antisemitic; but it cannot be ignored that contemporary antisemitism can occur in the context of, or be accompanied by, extreme feelings over the Israel/Palestine conflict. Discourse relating to the conflict is used by antisemitic incident offenders to abuse Jews; and anti-Israel discourse can sometimes repeat, or echo, antisemitic language and imagery. Drawing out these distinctions, and deciding on where the dividing lines lie, is one of the most difficult areas of CST’s work in recording and analysing hate crime.

CST received reports of 686 potential incidents during 2015 that, after investigation, did not appear to be antisemitic and were therefore not included in the total of 924 antisemitic incidents. These 686 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 2015 that were reported to CST but were not recorded as antisemitic include the following:

- **London, July**: Stickers of the Palestinian flag with a “Boycott Israel” slogan were seen on a London Underground train.
- **London, September**: A car bearing an
Israeli flag was vandalised by anti-Israel protestors at a demonstration.

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 be the reason why the incident is accepted or rejected as antisemitic. Incidents that equate Israel to Nazi Germany would normally be recorded as antisemitic, whereas those that compare Israel to, for instance, apartheid South Africa, normally would not be. 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.
A total of 176 antisemitic incidents, over a third of the incidents in Greater London, were recorded in the borough of Barnet, which has the largest Jewish community of any local authority in the UK. There were 57 antisemitic incidents recorded in Hackney, 43 in Camden, 27 in Westminster, 21 in Haringey, 16 in Tower Hamlets, 13 in Redbridge and 12 in Brent. In Greater Manchester, 116 antisemitic incidents (51 per cent of the Greater Manchester total) were recorded in Salford. There were 45 antisemitic incidents recorded in the Borough of Bury and 40 in the Borough of Manchester.

Outside Greater London and Greater Manchester, CST received reports of 226 antisemitic incidents from 82 locations around the UK in 2015, compared to 278 incidents from 89 different locations in 2014. There were 34 antisemitic incidents in Leeds, compared to 27 in 2014; 29 in Hertfordshire (of which 18 were in Borehamwood), compared to 35 in 2014; 13 in Liverpool, compared to 27 in 2014; 11 in Birmingham (14 in 2014); and 6 in Bradford (9 in 2014). Going by Police region rather than specific locations, and in addition to the figures already given for London, Manchester and Hertfordshire, CST recorded 48 antisemitic incidents in West Yorkshire (41 in 2014), 13 in the West Midlands (17 in 2014), 13 in Merseyside (27 in 2014), 12 in Avon and Somerset (2 in 2014) and 10 in Essex (5 in 2014). CST also recorded 15 incidents in places that fall under the jurisdiction of British Transport Police, which includes the national rail network, the London Underground, Docklands Light Railway, the Midland Metro tram system, Croydon Tramlink, Sunderland Metro, Glasgow Subway and the Emirates Air Line cable car (compared to 4 such incidents in 2014).

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, 58 per cent of antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in Greater Manchester targeted individual Jews in public, compared to 37 per cent of the incidents recorded in Greater London; whereas 16 per cent of incidents recorded in Greater London targeted Jewish organisations, events or communal leaders, compared to 6 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 102 such incidents in Greater London in 2015 (22 per cent of incidents in
Greater London, compared to 16 in Greater Manchester (7 per cent of incidents in Greater Manchester). One hundred and three antisemitic incidents (22 per cent) recorded in Greater London showed some form of political motivation, compared to 32 incidents recorded in Greater Manchester (14 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”.11 Applying this definition to the 924 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in 2015 reveals that 482 incidents, or 52 per cent of the total, showed evidence of being mission incidents. This does not mean that, in every case, the offender embarked on a lengthy and planned course of action in order 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 2015 include:

- **Hertfordshire, January:** Two girls were seen hiding behind a car, waiting for girls from a local Jewish school to walk past. As they did so, the offenders shouted “Jew, Jew, Jew” at them.

- **London, February:** A white male entered a kosher bakery and said “I hate you f**king Jews, I want to kill the lot of you”.

- **London, March:** A Jewish girl was in a fast-food restaurant when a male of South Asian appearance approached her, called her a “f**king Jew” and spat at her.

- **Lancashire, May:** A visibly Jewish man was on a tram when a man banged on the outside of the tram window and shouted “Dirty Jew” at him.

- **Manchester, June:** A visibly Jewish man was in a supermarket when a South Asian man approached him shouting “Bloody Jews, I want to kill you, I’m going to hit you with a spade, I’m going to bury you”.

- **London, July:** A Jewish man was walking home from synagogue when a car containing three white men pulled up alongside him and one of the men called out to ask for directions to Golders Green station. When the victim began to reply, the man shouted “F**king Jews” and the car drove off.

- **Bournemouth, August:** A car drove past a visibly Jewish man a few times and the white male occupant asked if he was Jewish before shouting “Jews” and “Get out of Bournemouth”.

- **London, August:** A visibly Jewish man was walking to synagogue when two black men approached him and started shouting antisemitic abuse and threatening him. One made a Nazi salute and both appeared to have been drinking alcohol.

- **Manchester, November:** A group of around 10 South Asian youths were walking through an area with a large Jewish population, shouting “Allah Akhbar” and “Get the Jews” while throwing stones and other objects at people.

The 482 mission incidents recorded by CST in 2015 can be further broken down by type of incident. The nine examples given above are all what can be referred to as ‘mission-direct’, which involves direct, face-to-face contact.
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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 swastika was daubed on the wall of a Jewish school.

- **Nottingham, January:** A synagogue received a handwritten letter that read “Dear Yids why don’t you f**k off home? But you have not got a home you stole the Palestinians home-land you b*****ds. Bring back the gas ovens for you b*****ds don’t stop at 6 million”.

- **Liverpool, February:** A Jewish student received an email that read “Please shut the f**k up. Cheers, Hitler”.

- **London, March:** A man phoned a Jewish organisation and said “Effing Jews”, “I will round up all the Jews as Hitler did”.

- **London, April:** An antisemitic message was posted to the website of a Jewish newspaper. It read “In the future we will see bigger and much more significant meetings of Holocaust Realists. Mark my words, the days of Jewish bullying and oppression of the innocent will soon come to an end.” It then gave the website address of a neo-Nazi organisation.

- **London, August:** A handwritten letter was sent to a synagogue that read “You Jews are a disgrace to humanity. Murderous! May you all die in Hell!”

- **Bristol, October:** A Jewish man received a message in Arabic and Hebrew on Facebook. The message translated as “I will be today in your house and burn you and your family down. Palestine is my land and you have no right to live on it. No matter where you burn just wait for us and you will be stabbed. Your place has been scheduled, see you in hell.”

- **London, December:** A non-Jewish Member of Parliament received a Christmas card that read “Do you still believe in Holocaust?” “Do you still believe in Father Christmas?” Inside, a handwritten message read “No Jew can be Prime Minister of England no MP can be a Jew Policeman… We are all in a Holocaust on the White Race people of USA, Russia, Europe…”

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:** A tweet read “I’d say the Zionists were responsible for the most deaths by far during & after the war. The Gas chambers were a lie.”
• **London, January:** Three white men were heard singing “Gas, gas, gas the Jews” on a London Underground train on Holocaust Memorial Day.

• **Manchester, March:** Graffiti reading “Jews are dogs” was written on the pavement in an area with a large Jewish population.

• **Birmingham, June:** An Amazon user using the name “Dieudonne” posted a series of antisemitic, Holocaust denying reviews on Amazon. Comments included “You Jews have got to keep this monstrous lie going, haven’t you… so you can justify IsraHell, so you can keep playing the ‘anti semitic’ card, to deflect from all your ongoing financial scams and other criminal behaviour, to cover up the real perpetrators behind both World Wars, the real perpetrators behind 9/11 and all the wars in the Middle East, to cover up the real genocide (by guess who?) of the German people, the Russians, The Palestinians, The Ukrainians, The Armenians etc etc”.

• **London, August:** A Twitter user in London tweeted a series of antisemitic tweets, including “All Zionist Nazis Capos can go to hell & burn to death over & over again” and “It shows how filthy Zionist jew you are sick and brainwashed by your filthy Talmud & Rabbi who harass ur masters”.

• **London, September:** A black man on a bus was heard to shout “F**k all the Jews”, “F**k America”, “Jews out of Palestine” and “Jews kill babies”.

• **Halifax, October:** Graffiti reading “F**k Da Jews” was written on a wall in a public place.

• **Manchester, December:** Graffiti reading “Kill the f**king Jews” was found near to a Jewish premises, in an area with a large Jewish population.

The final type of mission incident that made up the 482 mission incidents in 2015 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 2015 include:

• **London, January:** A Jewish woman was in a hospital waiting room when she overheard two women of Far Eastern appearance talking loudly about “bloody Jews”, a phrase they used numerous times.

• **London, February:** A Jewish man received an online delivery at his home. The delivery driver, not realising that he was Jewish, said that his next delivery was to a Jew and that all Jews are aggravation and obsessed with money.

• **London, March:** A Jewish man was in a taxi when the driver, not realising he was Jewish, starting ranting about how England used to be nice until “the bloody Jews” took over.

• **London, April:** A Jewish woman was in a restaurant when she overheard a woman with an East European accent at a nearby table talking about how “the Jews rule the world” and saying that Jews own the media and are all rich.

• **London, September:** A Jewish family were having dinner in a restaurant when they overheard a woman at a nearby table saying that she hates Jewish people more each day, and that “all Jewish people should be shot”. The Jewish family protested and after an argument, the offender left the restaurant.
• London, October: A Jewish man was in a tyre shop when he overheard a white male customer saying “It’s all the Yids’ fault” and “It’s all the Yids and Muslims who have come here and taken all the money.”

In contrast to these ‘mission’ incidents, 211 incidents, or 23 per cent of the 924 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST in 2015, 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”.12 Examples of opportunistic incidents from 2015 include:

• London, January: A Jewish woman was on a London Underground train on her way to work when 4 male youths of South Asian appearance saw that she was wearing a bracelet with Hebrew letters on it. One youth grabbed her wrist and held it while others called her a “filthy Jew” and spat at her.

• Manchester, January: A visibly Jewish man was walking on the Sabbath when a white male shouted from a passing car, “Jew how do I get to Hitler’s house?”

• Liverpool, June: “F**king Jewish C**t” was shouted at a Jewish man by the occupant of a passing vehicle.

• London, August: A Jewish family were in a park and a group of ten-year-olds with one adult and a dog were nearby. One of the ten-year-olds said “Set the dog on those Jews”.

• London, September: A visibly Jewish man was walking in a hurry down a street and a man who he passed laughed at him and said “Late to the showers?”

• Manchester, September: A visibly Jewish man and his son were walking to synagogue past some stationary traffic. A woman in the back of a taxi shouted “F**k the Jews” and “Kill the Jews” at them as they walked past. The man told the driver that he should control his passenger. The driver said “It’s nothing to do with me” and when the victim said “Yes it is”, the driver replied “F**k off Jew”.

• London, October: A Jewish school boy was walking home from school when a teenage boy ahead of him shouted “F**king Jew” and said “You f**king Jews do not belong in this country”.

• London, October: Two visibly Jewish boys got on a bus and two teenage girls who were already on the bus said “What are you looking at? F**king Jews”.

One hundred and twenty-three incidents, or 13 per cent of the overall total of 924 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”13. Examples of aggravated incidents recorded by CST in 2015 include:

• Manchester, April: A Jewish man was trying to manoeuvre his car through a narrow space when another driver, who was waiting for him, wound down his window and shouted “What’s taking you so long, you f**king Jew”.

• London, May: A Jewish woman was in traffic when the driver in front threw an empty drinks can out of his window. The Jewish woman beeped at him to protest and the driver, a black male, put his hazard lights on, got out of the car and shouted “F**king Jewish people” at her.


• **London, May**: A Jewish man was crossing a road when a motorist turned the corner without indicating. The victim shouted at the motorist, who replied “Shut your f**king mouth you dirty Jew boy”.

• **Leeds, July**: A Jewish woman was driving her car down a narrow road when she found herself in a stand-off with another car coming the other way. She leant out of her window and asked “Do you expect me to reverse onto a main road?” The offender replied, “Typical of you people, you dirty Jewess”. The Jewish woman said “What did you say?” and the offender replied “You heard me you dirty Jewess”.

• **London, August**: A woman who lives in a shared block was told to “Drop dead you f**king Jewish b*tch” by a neighbour who wrongly believed that she had made a complaint about noise levels.

• **Manchester, September**: A landlord used his keys to enter a tenant’s flat, and the tenant said “Why did Hitler not get rid of all you Jews when he got the chance?”

• **London, December**: Two women were crossing a road to get to a synagogue. A male driver stopped his car to let them cross and then shouted “A thank you would be nice, you f**king Jew”.

**INFORMATION COLLECTION AND SUSPICIOUS BEHAVIOUR**

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, synagogues, shops, museums and other buildings in Copenhagen, Paris, Brussels, Toulouse, Kansas City, Mumbai and elsewhere attests to the importance of this work. It is well known that terrorist actors 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 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.14 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 both received prison sentences. In addition to this threat from violent jihadist terrorism, there is evidence of efforts by British neo-Nazis to plan and execute terrorist attacks against minorities here in Britain, including against the Jewish community.

14. 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
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 380 such incidents reported to CST in 2015, more than double the 161 such incidents reported to CST in 2014. There are several possible explanations for this large increase in reports of this kind of activity. One explanation would be that the amount of potential hostile reconnaissance targeting the UK Jewish community has increased in line with the increased terrorist threat faced by the whole of UK society. Another explanation would be that, following terrorist attacks against Jewish communities in Paris and Copenhagen at the beginning of 2015, heightened Jewish communal concern about terrorism in the UK has led to an increase in reports of potential hostile reconnaissance affecting Jewish locations. A third explanation would be that this rise in reports is the consequence of an increased number of security guards at Jewish buildings in the UK. This expansion itself reflects heightened Jewish communal concern about terrorism, and has been made possible by the expansion in 2015 of government funding for security guarding at Jewish communal locations. Whereas there has been government funding for security guards at Jewish voluntary aided state schools since 2010, in March 2015 the Prime Minister, speaking at the CST annual dinner, announced that this funding would be extended to provide security guards at private and independent Jewish schools, synagogues and other sensitive or vulnerable Jewish buildings. It is also possible that the large increase in reports of this kind was caused by a combination of two or more factors.

Of the 380 incidents of potential Information Collection and Suspicious Behaviour reported to CST in 2015, 118 involved the photography or videoing of Jewish buildings, while in 51 cases suspicious people tried to gain entry to Jewish premises. These incidents are not categorised as antisemitic by CST as many 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.
IMAGES OF ANTISEMITISM ON SOCIAL MEDIA

Antisemitic tweet with link to Jewish newspaper, London, August 2015

Antisemitic tweet sent to Jewish person, London, August 2015

Antisemitic tweet relating to Jewish politician, London, September 2015

Antisemitic Facebook post sent to Israeli organisation in London, December 2015

Antisemitic tweet sent to Jewish communal leader, London, September 2015
### ANNUAL ANTISEMITIC INCIDENT FIGURES

#### Antisemitic incident figures by category, 2005–2015

<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>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>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</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>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage and Desecration</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>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</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>91</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Behaviour</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>896</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</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>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>459</strong></td>
<td><strong>598</strong></td>
<td><strong>561</strong></td>
<td><strong>546</strong></td>
<td><strong>931</strong></td>
<td><strong>646</strong></td>
<td><strong>609</strong></td>
<td><strong>650</strong></td>
<td><strong>535</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,179</strong></td>
<td><strong>924</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Antisemitic incident figures by month, 2005–2015

<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>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>53</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</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>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</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>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</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>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</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>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</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>65</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</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>316</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</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>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</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>105</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</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>87</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</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>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</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>56</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>459</strong></td>
<td><strong>598</strong></td>
<td><strong>561</strong></td>
<td><strong>546</strong></td>
<td><strong>931</strong></td>
<td><strong>646</strong></td>
<td><strong>609</strong></td>
<td><strong>650</strong></td>
<td><strong>535</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,179</strong></td>
<td><strong>924</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Antisemitic incident figures, full breakdown, 2015

<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>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>924</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.
ANTISEMITIC INCIDENTS

2015 – in numbers

NUMBER OF INCIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INCIDENT CATEGORIES

- Extremist Violence: 685
- Literature: 82
- Assault: 76
- Threats: 65
- Damage & Desecration: 4
- Abusive Behaviour: 12

Note: The numbers in the diagram are approximate and may vary slightly from the table data.
17% of incidents took place on social media

3% of incidents took place on public transport

2% of incidents were football-related

2% of incidents were linked to students, academics or the Union of Jewish Students

PERPETRATORS

- Male (where gender is known): 82%
- Described as South Asian: 21%
- Described as East or South East Asian: 1%
- Described as European: 57%
- Described as Arab or North African: 8%
- Described as Black: 13%

Locations:
- Greater London: 472
- Greater Manchester: 226
- Hertfordshire: 29
- Birmingham: 11
- Elsewhere: 139
- Leeds: 34
- Liverpool: 13

ACT NOW:
DON’T IGNORE IT!

REPORT to the Police:
In an emergency 999
In a non-emergency 101

THEN CALL CST
London 020 8457 9999
Emergency 24hr 0800 032 3263
Manchester 0161 792 6666
Emergency 24hr 0800 980 0684

www.cst.org.uk
	CST UK
Community Security Trust
Registered charity in England and Wales (1056239) and Scotland (SC0000362)
**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](http://www.cst.org.uk)
- **TWITTER** [@CST_UK](https://twitter.com/CST_UK)
- **FACEBOOK** [Community Security Trust](https://www.facebook.com/CommunitySecurityTrust)

**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
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