Revision: 22 January 2017
October 16, 2017
September 19, 2017
Eve of Rosh Hashanah 5778

Evaluating Contemporary Antisemitism:

A Framework for Collaborative Conceptualization, Measurement and Assessment

Steven W. Popper[a], Dan Shalmon[b], Charles Asher Small[c,] Mala Tabory[c], and Tal Wolfson

a) Jewish People Policy Institute, b) University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, c) Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy

NOT CLEARED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

This document has not been formally reviewed, edited, or cleared for public release. It should not be cited without the permission of the authors.

Table of Contents

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Abbreviations

ADL	Anti-defamation League
BDS	Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions
CST	Community Security Trust
EU	European Union
FRA	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
SPCJ	*Service de Protection de la Communauté Juive* [Jewish Community Protection Service]

Executive Summary

If rising antisemitism has become a serious problem for Jewish communities, then it deserves to be taken seriously.

This may appear a curious statement. There are academics and several organizations working to record, deter and help prepare for antisemitic acts and speech. Some of their efforts are localized while others have a wider geographic spread. Their annual reports and specific studies and programs of education and outreach are often of excellent quality and represent most of what we know of current antisemitism.

What we lack is a unifying framework for assessing what we know collectively (and what we don't know.) We lack **consistent terminology** and focus; a forward-leaning, **policy-oriented** posture to guide information gathering by illuminating what we still need to learn; **greater participation** by more communities potentially under threat; and a means to **unify, organize and disseminate** the work of those working in these fields. As a result, our assessment of antisemitic words and acts is a patchwork even within single countries. What is required is collaboration, wide-spread engagement and the ability to be mutually supportive and leverage the knowledge we gain.

An Agenda for Analyzing and Resisting Antisemitism

This paper seeks to make two contributions toward more useful and effective understanding of and posture toward antisemitism. The first of these is to offer a draft of a consistent framework for categorization of the knowledge we possess in all forms and to characterize its empirical bases as well as potential value. Among other things, doing so also would make us become clearer both on what knowledge we lack and why it would be valuable to collect and assess.

State leaders, such as in France,[1] have come to recognize in antisemitism a threat to their entire society through its effects on Jewish communities. The fundamental interests under threat include:

- Physical security of Jews as individuals;
- Physical security of Jewish communities;
- Ability to exercise individual rights of citizenship such as freedom of movement and an absence of other *de jure* or *de facto* restrictions;

---

[1] https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2015/01/french-prime-minister-warns-if-jews-flee-the-republic-will-be-judged-a-failure/384410/

- Ability to communicate political beliefs and engage in political activities;
- Ability to establish and maintain Jewish communal institutions;
- Ability to engage freely in legal economic activities;
- Ability to engage in Jewish religious rites and practices.

These specific values under threat imply four main components in the draft framework. The first two include measures of antisemitic **attitudes** and antisemitic **actions**, currently the most common focus for measurement of antisemitic incidents and phenomena. To this we add a third component, measuring **direct effects** on Jewish individuals and communities. The final component is seeking to measure potentially powerful effects on the **attitudes and sense of well-being** of Jews.

The parallelism among these four sets of phenomena is purposeful. "Balancing the books" provides cross-checks as well as indications of what important bodies of data or reporting are being missed and so is a guard against the common trap of analyzing only what is most readily measured – looking for the proverbial lost keys under the lamppost -- and not what a consideration of community interests would suggest ought to be measured. The draft framework proceeds from policy considerations but also incorporates needs and concerns of researchers as well as needs of governmental bodies and law enforcement authorities that represent and protect Jewish communities.

Roadmap for Action

The second intention is in many ways more challenging. That is to spur a collaborative effort of building a meaningful, expansive and dynamic knowledge base of service to all. We see five different projects for engaging diverse contributors.

Framing and conceptualization

As with any other policy issue, effort spent in framing the context is rarely time wasted. We see three principal tasks for working groups to pursue.

Perspectives. Framing around too narrow a perspective may be to turn a blind eye to the importance of antisemitism's consequences. What, for example, do we need to understand about "antisemitism without Jews" in the worlds' most dynamic region, East Asia? What are the implications of recrudescent antisemitism for non-Jews? Such question widen the scope but also provide a more comprehensive lens and potentially broaden the base for collaborative effort.

Dynamics. A conceptual framework must take cognizance that the relationships between different categories are not static and insulated but rather dynamic and interconnected. When do antisemitic attitudes become precursors of antisemitic acts? To

i

think in terms of dynamics, transitions and lines of mutual influence is to prepare the way for policy thinking.

Definitions. How do definitions differ among countries, within international organizations and in key cultural institutions such as universities, media and so forth? A common taxonomy could make cross-country and multi-year comparisons more meaningful but is not easy to address. This is one of the most crucial tasks for a framing project.

Measurement design

A team of experts representing the communities of research, governance and practice should produce a detailed structure of measures within the draft framework to guide those who contribute to and make use of such information. This may proceed in a manner combining the best aspects of top-down and bottom-up design by proceeding from the end backwards: initially identify questions and actions we wish to inform. Objectives, rather than availability of data or ease in construction of indicators should guide the design.

Data collation and database design

Our research community needs infrastructure: data repositories, data-sharing tools and a set of standards for database design. Data collectors and analysts should have common identifiers for geographic units, formats for dates and times, file formats, etc. Choices must be made for data warehousing. A collective commitment to identifying and pursuing sufficient funding to maintain a data collation and access system will be needed.

New data acquisition, characterization and analysis

Of the five projects this is the most advanced, widely conducted and requires the least agenda-setting and integration. Yet, the other four projects create the potential for mutual awareness and visibility on how individual research and data collection efforts might interact. Greater visibility could bring new researchers and organizations into the field. The value and importance of this joint enterprise would be made more palpable. Finally, the increased visibility and credibility derived from interdisciplinary and international coordination might also enhance support for specific projects.

Building a community of practice

A principal objective should be to encourage and support greater engagement within and by communities. Only a handful of countries monitor and collect data at a national level or publish such information. It should be a goal to expand the scope of measurement practice already performed in the US, France and the UK and improve practice in Jewish

communities (Germany, Hungary, Ukraine, etc.) where monitoring is more intermittent. It will take skill and forethought to create such community efforts.

Next Steps: A Work Plan

Where and how to begin? We propose a work plan for the initial stages of the effort.

Task 1: Consultation defining first set of measures. The projects of Framing and Conceptualization and Measurement Design should involve active circulation of drafts to potentially interested parties, publication, workshops and briefings to collect a diversity of input and reactions at an early stage.

Task 2: Test application of measures against available data. Populate the emerging framework with data collected in test cases to inventory what is available, demonstrate the framework, and identify how to improve analysis.

Task 3: Select indicators and recommend applications. The first two tasks will have developed only the raw material for research and policy analytical tool-building. One of its uses may be to select from among the measures a few that may be designated as indicators—those data series that may convey important information on current and emerging trends. Creating a dashboard would bridge the realm of analysis with that of application which the proposed effort is intended to enable.

This paper is by no means the last word. It is intended as the beginning of a process that would prove both broad and deep.

0. A Note to Readers

This paper reaches out to several audiences: scholars of antisemitism, professionals within NGOs that gather data and generate reports, individuals in communities either affected by or concerned about rising antisemitism, community members and organizations seeking to provide warning and protection, and civil authorities and international agencies concerned with preventing physical harm or civic disenfranchisement stemming from antisemitic words and deeds. We therefore seek to provide the potential readers with a guide to what follows.

In the first section of this paper, we lay out its basic tenets and goals. In the second we provide a policy-based rationale not only for more systematic measurement and analysis of antisemitism but also for determining what we should seek to measure to gain greater comprehension and to better inform meaningful action. We present a draft framework for conceiving of a comprehensive, integrated and collaborative project of measurement. These two sections should be of interest to all of the intended audiences.

The third and fourth sections are likely to be of most interest to those involved either in scholarship or other direct measuring and knowledge-creation activities. We discuss in greater detail the draft framework and advocate an integrated approach to measurement, analysis of information gathered, and greater sharing of both. These two sections, one focused on measurement and the other on the resulting data, are central to the purpose of stimulating greater collaboration among workers in this field as well as more systematic approaches to the measurement and assessment of antisemitism. In short, these chapters are addressed to potential direct collaborators in an integrated effort that they will direct themselves.

The fifth section lays out what is again intended as a first draft, subject to consultation and review, of a preliminary agenda for bringing about more systematic measurement, greater collaboration, and enhanced benefit derived from the efforts of workers in the field of antisemitic study. This, too, will be of greatest interest to those who might actually take part in such a collaboration. However, one of the purposes of working toward an agreed-upon approach and greater systemization is for the professionals collaborating on this effort to generate a sense of what may constitute "best practice" in tracking the presence and phenomena of antisemitism. We pursue this goal in the interest of lowering barriers to entry for those communities that do not yet engage in active monitoring of their local environment. We advocate a collaboration that grows not only by gaining membership from those already working in the field but by expanding that number by making it easier

for others to follow protocols demonstrated in practice. Therefore, this final section is worthy of the attention – and critical evaluation and feedback – of all readers.

I. An Agenda for Analyzing and Monitoring Antisemitism

If rising antisemitism has become a serious problem for Jewish communities, then it deserves to be taken seriously.[2]

This may appear a curious statement. There are talented scholars as well as dedicated workers in several organizations working to record, prepare for and deter antisemitic acts and speech. Some of their efforts are localized while others have a wider geographic spread. We receive from them annual reports as well as specific studies and programs of education and outreach. Most of this work is of excellent quality and represents most of what we know of current antisemitism.

On 19 September 2016, a group of scholars, professionals and community representatives met in Paris to discuss contemporary antisemitism.[3] A reinvigorated antisemitism has emerged as one of the hallmarks of contemporary political and social discourse. As such, it is a phenomenon deserving close study. Comprehending the drivers of antisemitism's resurgence may shed light on broader phenomena transforming the democracies of Europe, North America and elsewhere, but it is also a phenomenon worthy of detailed analysis in itself. At present, the resurgence is far from pandemic. Yet, for Jewish communities increasingly concentrated in the urban centers of the democratic West, the trend clearly must be monitored and potential courses of action explored to understand how best to staunch the contagion or limit its effects.

One finding from the Paris meeting was the need to address shortcomings in the realm of measurement and data. Despite the efforts of individuals and several outstanding organizations, we lack a unifying framework for assessing what we know collectively (as well as highlighting what we don't know.) We lack consistent terminology and focus. We lack a forward-leaning, policy-oriented posture to guide information gathering by illuminating what we still need to learn. We need greater participation by more communities potentially under threat. And we would benefit from a means to unify, organize and make widely available information derived from the work of those active in these fields. As a result, our assessment of antisemitic words and acts is a patchwork even

---

[2] The authors benefited from thoughtful comments on an earlier draft of this paper provided by, *inter alia*, Andrew Baker, Jonathan Boyd, Edward H. Kaplan, Vladimir (Ze'ev) Khanin, Daniel Mariaschin, Sergio DellaPergola, Joanna Perry, Richard Steinberg, Ami Tavory, Mark Weizman and Michael Whine. This notwithstanding, the views we have expressed should be ascribed solely to the authors who are also responsible for any remaining errors in fact, perspective or logic.

[3] They gathered under the joint auspices of the Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy (ISGAP; https://isgap.org/) and Israel's Ministry for Diaspora Affairs.

within single countries. What is required is collaboration, wide-spread engagement and the ability to be mutually supportive and leverage the knowledge we gain.

The desire for greater consistency, coverage and integration of monitoring activities comes from practical rather than purely academic concerns. Precisely because the Jewish people has true enemies who wish to do individuals and communities harm, paranoia is a luxury it can ill afford. This situation instead requires a better understanding of the nature and origins of renewed antisemitism to determine where true danger may lie. Beyond the need for better scholarly understanding of the phenomenology and etiology of antisemitism, antisemitism monitoring must be relevant to governmental and NGO policies, actions, and interests. At best, this would mean developing a capacity to distinguish between that that must receive high-priority governmental and Jewish communal attention, that which is disturbing but not threatening, and threats which are more apparent than real. Academic scholarship and active measurement efforts have considerable potential for practical application if they can inform development of best practices for determining thresholds of danger, national and community-level protection, and active engagement measures.

This is not an easy task—if only because antisemitism may assume different guises and morph into different forms, compounding measurement challenges. Traditional methods for examining negative attitudes toward Jews do not provide a sufficiently broad or accurate picture of the situation. The survey-based tools used by organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) or the Pew Research Center, while thorough and systematic, give partial glimpses and at times can even be confusing or misleading. This is because they focus, each in their own way, on only selected portions of the antisemitism puzzle. Some organizations focus on public opinion. Others may concentrate on tracking the number of reported instances of violence or harassment against Jews. One organization, The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA,) examines how antisemitism is perceived by Jews. Each organization has defined its own metrics and categories, often differing from country to country. There is currently no integrative measurement that comprehensively addresses antisemitic attitudes, actions and their effects on their intended targets and victims.

Vision statement

Since concern is growing that antisemitism has already (or soon may once more) become a serious threat, Jews, the communities of which they are members and the authorities seeking to protect their rights as citizens should avail themselves of tools to better confront it.

Many analysts and organizations have endeavored, often with considerable accomplishment, to objectively measure and yield normative insight on past and contemporary antisemitism. That said, an effort that is at once more integrative and synergistic among these analysts and which incorporates a variety of disciplinary perspectives has the potential to achieve much more. A platform for those organizations currently at the forefront to more easily encourage and provide an example for individual and collaborative efforts of others still at the earlier stages elsewhere would benefit not only those newer entrants but the wider membership in such a community of practice.

In the shadow of recrudescent antisemitism in Europe and elsewhere, and in the light of EU governments' keen efforts to confront the phenomenon, one outcome of the 2016 Paris meeting was to envision an **integrative framework or dashboard** that will provide governments, local communal leaders, Israeli policy-makers and world Jewry with standardized measurement mechanisms to gauge the level of threat to Jewish communities, monitor and compare developments over time and across borders, facilitate decision-making, and assess the efficacy of policy interventions. Monitoring of this type would be based on a- systematically derived common understanding of taxonomies and definitions used to categorize incidents and their severity, as well as standardized measurement protocols. Doing so could substantially expand our collective knowledge base and its utility. Similarly, a system of metrics and measures aimed at improving both the academic and practical discourse on antisemitism could allow for more rapid and better-informed responses. The integration and collation of an expanding body of knowledge on the antecedents, forms and manifestations of antisemitism both in attitude and action, could also help address some of the most perplexing theoretical, empirical and practical questions antisemitism poses for the Jewish people. The existence of such an effort may even prove a direct or indirect spur to those communities that have not yet embraced or overcome obstacles to conducting regular measurement of antisemitic attitudes and actions.

Any movement in the direction of enhancing data gathering, reliability and more comprehensive approaches to understanding and monitoring antisemitism would be of value. Simultaneously, taking such a heroically all-embracing perspective could raise the prospect of framing a set of leading indicators of considerable value to Jewish communities and governments for whom this is more than a matter of intellectual curiosity. Such a vision would entail movement toward several key goals:

1. **Producing reliable data in every large community.** While some data from Europe and the United States are available about attitudes, incidents, and perceptions, this tri-dimensional data is not yet widely available from other Jewish communities -- and in no locale fully realized.

2. **Standardizing measurements.** For historical and policy reasons, each local organization and institution has developed its own system of measurement. What one organization defines as serious harassment is defined elsewhere as a minor incident. Consistent standards will have to be established through a consensus building process across diverse perspectives, including research centers and NGOs, local community stakeholders, international Jewish organizations, regional and national governments and existing Israeli governmental agencies that monitor and combat antisemitism.

3. **Establishing a monitoring methodology and means for deliberative assessment.** The movement from measuring to monitoring and towards practical action requires both a set of accurate gauges and a means to analyze incremental changes. This will then provide policy-makers with a more complex perspective to support a process of deliberation, priority-setting and action.

The purpose of this paper and the intention of its authors is to provide an initial basis for collaborative effort to establish and fulfill these goals. As such, it should be viewed as a first draft, an invitation for discussion, comment, suggestion and modification. Fundamental to the approach we advocate is the recognition that any viable effort on this scale must be the work of many hands and integrated effort. We hope to provide a venue for the many scholars, practitioners as well as government and community leaders to come together in a joint effort of construction.

4

II. Framing Measurement to Reflect Policy Concerns

Although using available information to inform policy would appear to come only at the end of a process of data gathering, measurement, analysis and assessment, the ultimate purposes (and audiences) for any system of measurement must be the first consideration in its design. What goals are to be served by a better understanding of antisemitic beliefs, intentions and acts? What aspects of the research agenda are best served by particular types of data? What are the potential avenues for operational and policy actions, both for defense and engagement? What do we need to know to be effective in policy decision making?

We would wish, at a minimum, to comprehend the range of available alternative policy interventions, assess potential outcomes from each and, most importantly, determine the criteria for choosing among candidate short-term actions to better achieve long-term goals. Rooting the architecture of a measurement framework in these questions may then both inform measurement efforts and make the resulting measures more useful for the several purposes we seek to achieve. Clearly, this is a reciprocal process: measures will inform answers to questions as much as the questions themselves will inform the framework of measurement.

Beyond the academic project of understanding the origins and development of antisemitism, an initial starting point for thinking about the goals of its measurement might be that we care about its impact on its intended victims. Therefore, one perspective is that of Jewish communal needs: aside from the detestable essence of the phenomenon itself, to what extent does antisemitism affect Jewish collective well-being and interests?

This is not the sole perspective possible. State leaders, such as in France,[4] have come to recognize in antisemitism a threat to their society as a whole. While aspects of antisemitism are arguably *sui generis*, one may also place this form of hatred within a larger context of concern over the rise or racism, bias and radicalized violence. And scholars will, of course, bring their own needs and questions. But as a starting point, we can begin by enumerating interests threatened by militant or attitudinal antisemitism.

These main concrete interests would include:
- Physical security of Jews as individuals;
- Physical security of Jewish communities;

---

[4] https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2015/01/french-prime-minister-warns-if-jews-flee-the-republic-will-be-judged-a-failure/384410/

- Ability to exercise individual rights of citizenship such as freedom of movement and an absence of other *de jure* or *de facto* restrictions;
- Ability to communicate political beliefs and engage in political activities;
- Ability to establish and maintain Jewish communal institutions;
- Ability to engage freely in legal economic activities;
- Ability to engage in Jewish religious rites and practices.

The proposed draft framework below proceeds from such considerations but seeks also to incorporate needs and concerns of researchers as well as needs of governmental bodies and law enforcement authorities that represent and protect Jewish communities. We offer it as a starting point, a basis for discussion, and a foundation upon which to build and elaborate.

Comprehensive Framework for Antisemitism Measurement

Table 1 provides an overview of a comprehensive draft framework for measurement of antisemitism.[5] The figure shows only the empty framework for ease of presentation. Table 3, below, will provide a fuller format with cells filled in to provide examples of the types of content they would contain. Considering first the rows of the framework, the framework has four main components.

Four Main Fields for Measurement

The first of these include measures of antisemitic <u>attitudes</u>. The second bloc focuses on antisemitic <u>actions</u>, including violent as well as non-violent behavior. This is the most common focus for measurement of antisemitic incidents and phenomena. It is understandable that this should be so: major concern with antisemitism arises when transgressive and problematic behavior contravenes laws or norms with the force of law. However, reliance on this perspective alone runs the risk of absolving individual Jewish communities of the responsibility to formulate an active posture: monitoring and responding to antisemitism is passively viewed as exclusively the responsibility of the "authorities." This attitude in itself can affect efforts to improve measurement and enhance communal awareness. Further, focusing on behavioral phenomenology without simultaneously gathering data on the extent, nature and expression of antisemitic ideas and attitudes eliminates the potential for fully addressing several questions raised above. Clearly, the interplay between attitude and action, though complex and difficult to tease out, is nonetheless important—especially if one of our goals is better and earlier signal

---

[5] This table is based on an earlier version developed by Dr. Dov Maiman appearing in "An Integrative Measure of European Anti-Semitism" (*Annual Assessment 2014-2015 [5775]*, Jewish People Policy Institute, 2015, pp. 95-101.)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

detection or implementation of potential protective or preventive initiatives before antisemitism's escalation from noxious beliefs to large-scale violent action.

Informed by the previous discussion of antisemitism's effects on its principal targets, a third component of this framework should be explicit consideration of <u>direct, physical effects</u> on Jewish individuals and communities and their <u>reactions</u> in the same vein. Monitoring behavior does play a role in this area and so this entails some "double entry book-keeping": to what extent may these measures be compared to those gathered for antisemitic incidents in the second bloc as a cross-check? Are important bodies of data or reporting missed when we seek to balance these books? Incorporating these measures in both blocs allows us to also speak to the intensity of antisemitic attacks and their potential impact. Though this appears to mirror image the preceding bloc, if the framework is designed explicitly to capture comprehensively the phenomenology of antisemitism, as well as the state of our knowledge, then this parallelism is purposeful.

The final component is a bloc that considers some of the most important impacts of antisemitism that fall short of traditional, virulent manifestations: <u>indirect, but potentially powerful effects</u> on the psyche of Jewish people, their beliefs, and attitudes. Some of the phenomena listed in the first bloc—antisemitic attitudes—will have connections to and influence the second and third blocs—antisemitic acts and direct consequences. By contrast, the final bloc considers indirect pressure such antisemitic attitudes and actions may have on Jews and their communities.

In presenting the draft framework in Table 1 we wish also to make explicit several principles underlying this approach:

- The fundamental unit of the framework is the individual measure (discussed in the next section.) Ideally, each such measure would appear as its own row. In this framing, we sought to distinguish between measures on the one hand and analyses on the other. This is sometimes a difficult distinction to make, but in general analyses are based on measures and that is the level we sought to address.

- Any formal representation of the complex construct that is our state of knowledge about antisemitism is just that – a representation and no more. The two-dimensional logical mapping in the table should not be taken as necessarily either the fullest nor most preferred embodiment of the envisioned tool and framework. It is intended only to give a sense of the several dimensions of relationships involved.

- Similarly, the framework's goal of conveying the sense of a comprehensive and integrated measurement structure should not be interpreted as requiring from all providers and all communities a similar level of comprehensiveness in their own efforts of tool application. Rather, the table is a device for navigation, for determining the relationship among different potential measures from different communities. This will be touched on below in the discussion of indicators.

7

- Some concepts will be considerably more difficult to address through measurement than others. The "holes" that will appear as a result when canvassing current measurement efforts will in many ways be as important as the cells we can fill at this time. They invite further discussion of what we need to know.
- Several rows show a hierarchy of aggregation so that those organizations measuring in gross categories, such as "physical attacks", may be included along with those whose measures discriminate between cases resulting in physical injury and those that do not.

Table 1. A Framework for the Measurement of Antisemtism

Metrics	Measures	Candidate Indicator?	Characteristics	Data Type and Access			Audience			
				Method	Format	Storage	Academy	Jewish Comm.	Govt.	Civil society NGOs; int'l agencies
Antisemitic Attitudes										
General sentiment										
Specific ideas about Jews										
Concern for welfare of Jews										
Characteristics of respondents										
Antisemitic Acts										
Expression										
Local target audience										
Hateful speech (specific target)										
Statement/expression										
Incitement/mobilization										
Harassment and intimidation										
Narrow-focused audience										
Hateful speech (specific target)										
Statement/expression										

9

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Behavioral effect of
   intimidation and exclusions

Property damage

Indirect economic
   consequences / loss of
   opportunity

Cost of physical injury

Indirect costs of health
   consequences

Deaths

Reactions

Reports to civil authorities

Direct countering actions

Political and legislative
   initiatives

Jewish Community Attitudes and Affect

Perception of manifestations of
   anti-Semitism

Sense of safety and security

Effect on 2nd & 3rd gen. Shoah
   survivors

Experience of Violence against
   Jews

Experiences of discrimination

Rights awareness

11

Comfort with Jewish identification

Happiness and sense of personal efficacy

Characteristics of respondents:

III.　　Metrics and Measures

This is the first of two discussions delving into technical aspects of the general framework presented in Table 1. This section touches on aspects of measurement. The emphasis is on the character of such measures. The next section is focused on the data collected during the process of measurement and its treatment.

Metrics, Measures and Indicators

The first three columns of Figure 1 are labeled 'metrics,' 'measures' and 'candidate indicators.' These are terms often used interchangeably in common parlance. However, we use them in the framework to convey three different concepts in evaluation efforts.

We use the term **metrics** to indicate 'what we would ideally like to know.' For example, there are several metrics that might be informed by data on antisemitic acts. Ideally, we would like to know the extent, frequency and intensity of verbal or internet-based harassment., These metrics represent aspirations and as such may be difficult to assess and evaluate directly in practice.

In fact, we may find that—outside a few instances—the metrics appearing in the rows of the Table 1 matrix remain ideals difficult to assess through direct observation. We therefore need to frame one or more practical, operational **measures** for each metric. These may be only proxies for the ideal as a consequence of limited data availability, constraints on collection, or difficulty in operationalizing inherently fuzzy concepts. For example, attitudinal or cognitive metrics like "general sentiment" of non-Jews toward Jews, that is the nature and prevalence of antisemitic attitudes, are inherently broad and might be measured in a variety of ways. The mapping of measures to metrics may not be one-to-one. We may find that only by combining several measures can we compensate for their individual deficiencies and approximate an underlying ideal metric.

Making a distinction between metrics and measures also becomes something of a cross-check on evaluation activities. The distinction between the ideal and the practical may prevent us from resembling the proverbial drunk who searches for his lost keys under the lamp post rather than the dark alley in which he dropped them. Data may be more readily available in some areas than in others. We do not wish to gather data on what is most readily measured only to lose sight of the need to also maintain focus on what a conceptual framework rooted in community needs suggests ought to be measured. Highlighting the distinction also conveys forcefully that the framework ought not to be a static construct. It is intended to be aspirational. By explicitly deriving from first principles metrics of greatest value and only afterwards looking for their practical measures, we retain analytical

humility, spotlighting shortfalls in our data and knowledge. We may find that the measures we need are not ready to hand and that we may need to rethink our priorities and patterns of information gathering. This, too, is a boon to the collective enterprise, its individual collaborators and the audiences served by evaluation.

The third column identifies measures that may serve as candidate **indicators**. While one may identify many measures to shed light on metrics of interest, some may warrant more emphasis than others. This may be a consequence of the importance of the phenomena they capture or because we have reason to believe that they convey information of direct, intrinsic value, or indicate future trends. This column asks us to consider: were we to construct a "**dashboard**" by giving only a few measures prominence, or allocate scarce monitoring and data-gathering resources with little prior knowledge, which measures might we select?

In the doctor's office, the measurement of patient blood pressure and temperature is routine because of the value of these data as indicators of general system health. Perhaps we can collectively determine which measures of antisemitism may fulfill similar functions. This may well be a judgment best made only over a period of time and after the Table 1 framework becomes more fully populated, but giving this future judgment explicit attention *ex ante* may affect how we think about the framework, its construction and future utilization. These as yet empty cells not only invite participants to fill them with a subset of measures from the prior column but, more importantly, to characterize the reasons why a specific measure is proposed—or currently used—as an indicator of antisemitic attitudes, actions, direct and indirect effects on their targets. The 'pulling and hauling' over the utility of these indicators may simultaneously help in assessment of existing data and the design of future monitoring efforts.

The concept of indicators becomes especially important in widening a community of practice beyond those countries, localities and organizations currently engaged in measurement. Rather than having communities or organizations confront a full panoply of potential measures, such as that implied by the extensive framework in Table 1, it should be feasible to instead recommend several such measures as indicators. These would serve to convey a sense of the areas toward which limited resources might be directed.

Data Types

We will discuss the core issues of data types, collection, scrubbing, standards, availability, and database construction and management in greater detail in the section below. We provide first a quick overview of their treatment within the Table 1 framework to complete the tour of the measurement architecture we envision.

The fourth of the columns is a placeholder standing for several ways in which measures appearing in the rows of the framework may be typified and characterized. These have

been collapsed into a single column in the table for ease of presentation. They may be seen in greater detail in Table 3, below. Such characterization would include, at a minimum, publication in which presented, definitions used, precise questions, source of data, regularity of appearance and geographic locality.

The three central columns in the Table 1 framework explicitly consider that data aspects of measurements: what method was used to gather data, what format they may be found in, how and where they are stored, and the terms by which they may be accessed. Data are of key importance but only in service to the larger purposes for which we have established a system for assessment. Once more, the matrix format draws attention to the relationship between data, measurement and, ultimately, through metrics to the policy purposes data may support. By laying out the framework this way, data and the associated issues receive the centrality they deserve without becoming the sole focus or the driver.

Our discussions have revealed several categories of relevant data:

- **Opinion/attitude survey data**—both surveys of Jews and non-Jews are relevant
- **Event data**—this would include incidents documented by governments, community organizations, and individuals, as well as data extracted from media reports
- **Other behavioral data**—this could include Google Search or online purchasing behavior, data on emigration/immigration, voting records, donations to political causes or charities, etc.
- **Experimental data**—created in a controlled environment, this data describes responses to 'treatments' that might mimic real world stimuli or policy interventions
- **Institutional data**—this includes the characteristics of laws related to discrimination or hate crimes, the legal status of neo-Nazi or other anti-Jewish organizations, restrictions on Holocaust denial or, conversely, laws and policies that suppress unflattering historical truths. The characteristics of national and local governments would be another example.
- **Media, communication or social media-based data**—this might include information on the visibility of the Jewish community, the tone of media coverage discussing issues affecting the Jewish community, the prevalence of antisemitic themes or ideas in news or social media, manifestos of political parties that may target or seek the support of the Jewish community, etc.
- **Demographic data**—the health, size, age and spatial distribution of the population
- **Legal analyses**.

At present, some of these data types are more common than others. They also entail different levels of commitment, cost, potential frequency and each possesses a distinctive set of advantages and drawbacks. Survey and event data appear to be the default for many communities and research groups. The demography of the Jewish people has long been a subject of research. There are some existing data—collected by projects with more general aims such as assessing the qualities of national constitutions or hate crime laws—on

institutional characteristics, but so far as we are aware, none of these have been adapted specifically for the study of antisemitism and most if it is at the national rather than local level. Media monitoring and other computational data collection methods are in their infancy. Experimental research related specifically to antisemitism also appears to be relatively thin on the ground.

Identifying Audiences

Remaining cognizant of the reception of the evaluation process while in the midst of its development is consistent with our goal of creating an approach that is as explicit, comprehensive, and integrated as possible. It follows that identifying potential recipients of both raw measurements and the resulting assessments is a useful and important exercise.

The last four columns of Figure 1 identify four types of potential audiences: academics, Jewish communities, governments and their agencies, and finally a single category for civil society/NGOs and international organizations such as the OECD, EU, etc.

The academic audience will be largely interested in gathering data that will more conclusively describe current or historical conditions, as well better understanding underlying drivers of antisemitism. Theirs is the project of elucidating hypotheses and rigorously testing alternative theories of causation to better understand the genesis of antisemitic attitudes, and how and why attitudes affect Jewish targets and/or lead to destructive behavior.

The academic project is also of potential value to the second audience—Jewish communities that may be potential targets. Their concerns may be divided into two parts. The first is identification of signals and early warning. What needs to be taken seriously and when? What precursors, when observed and measured, should condition communal expectations? The second part is, of course, what to do about developing risks. Different measures may best inform each of these decisions—prediction and the design of interventions are related, but distinct enterprises. Under these circumstances, we might ask what types of actions or postures may serve to hedge against or mitigate the risks facing Jewish communities currently targeted by antisemitism, and what types of 'shaping' actions[6] may reduce the propagation of antisemitic attitudes or reduce the propensity for antisemitic actions. While Jewish communities—being small parts of larger societies—may not possess sufficient hard and soft power to confront unfavorable developments directly and with equivalent force, they are more likely to be able to engage in and support

---

[6] We borrow this terminology from the foreign policy community. For an explicit example, see: Reveron, D. A. (2007). Shaping and Military Diplomacy. Article, US Naval War College. http://faoa.memberlodge.org/resources/Documents/apsa07_proceeding_210193.pdf

"nudges."[7] These are small actions which, for reasons well-grounded in behavioral and cognitive science, can have out-size effects.

Governments are also prime potential audiences for evaluation and assessment of antisemitism. Nearly all of the developed countries where Jews reside governments take seriously their responsibility to provide security to all citizens, including Jews.[8] Even with the best of will, however, until there are sudden eruptions—such as a series of terrorist attacks—the visibility of antisemitism and mobilization of public opinion—are usually low. In some countries, Jews and their communal organizations prefer not to call the attention of authorities to incidents in which they are targeted. This leads us to a second reason why governments are an important audience: not all regimes possess the best of will. In the absence of a widely-accepted system for reporting and measuring antisemitism, these governments may too easily plead ignorance or refute claims of inaction. Coupled with widely-accepted norms against antisemitism, robust data collection and dissemination would enable effective 'naming and shaming campaigns' by reducing the plausibility of claims of ignorance and raise the potential stakes for sustained denial.[9]

The last column includes non-governmental entities with orientations and missions consistent with confronting antisemitism and reducing its influence and effects. At the local and national levels, this would include anti-discrimination and civil society organizations. At the international level, it would include organizations like the OSCE, Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) or Organization of American States (OAS), which lack direct governmental responsibilities but seek the diffusion of principles and practices that militate against discrimination and threats to ethnic and religious communities. In the complicated calculus of determining the significance of potential threats and crafting appropriate responses, these bodies could potentially play an important role by supporting communal or governmental actors. Their scrutiny—or potential involvement—may also help cajole recalcitrant governments.[10] Having a common, widely-accepted data base and means for assessment may serve to make such potential allies more aware of conditions and also provide a foundation for discussion and

---

[7] See, for example, *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness* by Richard H. Thaler and Cass R. Sunstein (Yale University Press, 2008).

[8] Noteworthy are the Council of Europe, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and its commissions especially the General Policy Recommendations No. 9 on Antisemitism, and reviews of member States' work on antisemitism when they carry out country visits. Also vital is the requirement of European Union Member States to criminalize incitement and holocaust denial, contained in the 2008 Framework decision, on which they are now inspected.

[9] For evidence that these campaigns can achieve significant effects even in extreme cases, see: Krain, M. (2012). J'accuse! Does naming and shaming perpetrators reduce the severity of genocides or politicides? 1. International Studies Quarterly, 56(3), 574-589. http://discover.wooster.edu/mkrain/files/2012/12/jaccuse.pdf

[10] Kim, D. (2013). International nongovernmental organizations and the global diffusion of national human rights institutions. *International Organization*, *67*(3), 505-539

action. This would enhance the potential for concerted actions even if efforts are not formally coordinated.

Taxonomy and Definitions

The last consideration of the possibility for greater coherence across diverse stakeholders and actors seeking to combat antisemitism are questions about the basis for achieving this coherence. An important element must surely be consistency of terms, definitions and taxonomies. This may prove to be the most daunting challenge of all.

Different organizations and actors approach antisemitism from different perspectives. No single perspective is sufficient to accomplish the task at hand. As previously discussed, governments frequently view it from a law enforcement perspective and so the vocabularies they use are attuned to the legal requirements for defining crimes and enabling arrest and prosecution. This may leave a number of issues unaddressed, particularly the latency between attitude and action, and the possibility of preventive action. Moreover, legal definitions vary across jurisdictions; what constitutes a crime in some countries (for example, Holocaust denial) is not actionable in others. Some non-legal standards must be applied if the concepts included within a framework for evaluation are to be comprehensive and widely applicable.

A degree of consistency will also be a boon to analysts because it would render data from different countries and localities comparable, greatly enhancing the potential for scientific evaluation and hypothesis testing and expanding the empirical base. Estimates validated by robust cross-national comparison would, in turn, better-inform practitioners and advocates. For Jewish communities with limited data, consistency could prove an asset as they work towards better data collection and monitoring. Being able to refer to a more widely-accepted set of definitions within a consistent taxonomy would make it easier to plan and implement such activities. It would also diffuse what best practice in the form of a consistent set of concepts and measures, with a clear framework that defines their interconnections and importance.

The lack of such a system to date should not be ascribed to a failure of due diligence or recalcitrance on the part of organizations and agencies currently conducting antisemitism evaluation. On the contrary, it is understandable as each such organization or community sought to understand and react to their own specific concerns. This state of affairs is less purposeful and desirable when antisemitism is no longer on the wane but has now become a recrudescent—and perhaps globalized—social force. The need for a less fragmented approach is the same as the rationale for this paper's entire conceptualization: if antisemitism is once more a serious transnational problem, then it needs to be dealt with seriously and internationally. A common frame of reference for identifying and speaking

18

about the components of antisemitic thought and action would be an important step in that direction.

IV.   Data Collection, Access and Quality Control

Although none of our experts believe there is sufficient high-quality data on antisemitism globally, nevertheless a great deal of information does exist. Unfortunately, these data have been created in an uncoordinated manner by many different organizations with distinct collection methods and standards. Each organization stores its data independently, and much of it has never been made available for analysis to external scholars or analysts. For example, the European Union FRA's last published survey on the prevalence of antisemitism is five years old. [ref] A new round of survey, expanded to additional States andStates and experts is in progress. Those data are planned for publication in 2018, but will nevertheless be limited in focus. [The findings have been published in this report along with a technical report on the survey, as well as a survey data explorer is available on the website of the Agency. There will indeed be a second round of the survey, with results expected to be published during the course of 2018. Henri Nickels Sept. 6, 2017] [11] By contrast, relatively poor-quality data on national ethno-religious demographics made available by scholars at Harvard and Stanford have been cited more than 5,000 times. [12] WomanStats, an open-access portal with hundreds of thousands of largely crowd-sourced observations on the status of women around the world has had a dramatic influence on scientific research and has affected policy debates in the US Congress, the UN, the US Department of Defense, CIA and World Bank. [13] We should aspire to create similarly powerful data on the Jewish people and antisemitism.

At the outset, a community of researchers, community data-collecting organizations and scholars interested in antisemitism could mutually profit from engaging in a forthright dialogue about data access. Ideally, a core group of scholars and community organizations would initially share data amongst themselves. Full public access could occur incrementally and would follow meticulous documentation and quality control of existing data. Some data will never be fully accessible—individual households and survey respondents cannot be identified, for example. Some community organizations may be initially reluctant to share their data. These issues are not at all unique to the Jewish community, however. Data

---

[11] FRA Survey: Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU Member States: experiences and perceptions of antisemitism, FRA, 2013, http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/discrimination-and-hate-crime-against-jews-eu-member-states-experiences-and

[12] See Google Scholar citations counts for: Alesina, A., Devleeschauwer, A., Easterly, W., Kurlat, S., & Wacziarg, R. (2003). Fractionalization. *Journal of Economic growth*, 8(2), 155-194. And Fearon, J. D. (2003). Ethnic and cultural diversity by country. *Journal of economic growth*, *8*(2), 195-222.

[13] The project is here: http://www.womanstats.org/ For an assessment of impact, see: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WomanStats_Project#Users_and_role_of_the_database

collected in war-torn areas and on victims of violent crime as well as census and health records all face similar issues. Careful anonymization, restrictive terms of access, licenses, and login credentials can be used to resolve these issues and build confidence in skeptical communities.[14]

The science of measurement requires that data, methods, metrics and models be accessible for external review and replication. The accumulation of knowledge through replication and modification of prior studies is the *sine qua non* of science as such. There is a growing consensus among social scientists that replicability is synonymous with transparent data and analytical code.[15] Open data access is now a requirement for the Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, PLoS journals as well as top-tier journals in economics and political science. This emerging norm affects research topics—like anti-Semitism—where data is fragmented or inaccessible. Since top-tier scholars seek to place research in outlets with requirements for open data, they will avoid research domains where data is unpublishable.

Moreover, this emerging consensus is built on sound logic. When data are not shared, the marginal cost of a new study is equal to the cost of prior work; new data is precisely as difficult to create and analyze as the prior data. Flaws in prior studies may go unnoticed if the data are not reviewed. By contrast, when scholars can access data freely, they can easily execute new analyses of existing data or integrate it with additional measurements. This creates economies of scale. Science can function as a competitive 'market' as publication and grant-making processes give analysts incentives to correct others' mistakes and build on prior successes. Making data accessible enables 'crowd-sourcing'—many hands make light work. Analyses and techniques that the creators of data would never have considered are implemented elsewhere, and knowledge can advance efficiently. [Requires clarification]

Skepticism flourishes when data are inaccessible; several recent scandals and systematic reviews have created widespread distrust of social science data—particularly when it makes strong or controversial claims.[16] It may go without saying that the capacity of studies on antisemitism to persuade skeptics and policymakers may be affected by the very antisemitism that is the object of its study; accessible data signals that there is 'nothing to hide' as well as placing markers that are difficult to ignore or refute.

---

[14] For example, see: https://today.law.harvard.edu/voices-syria-unique-survey-offers-inside-look-worn-torn-country-people/ For a more general overview by a leader of the effort to make data available and transparent, see: King, G. (2011). Ensuring the data-rich future of the social sciences. *Science*, *331*(6018), 719-721.

[15] Herndon, J., & O'Reilly, R. (2016). Data Sharing Policies in Social Sciences Academic Journals: Evolving Expectations of Data Sharing as a Form of Scholarly Communication. *Databrarianship: The Academic Data Librarian in Theory and Practice*.

[16] Want to Fix Science's Replication Crisis? Then Replicate (WIRED 2017) https://www.wired.com/2017/04/want-fix-sciences-replication-crisis-replicate/

A quick review puts the dearth of high-quality, accessible data on antisemitism in stark relief. The Harvard Institute for Quantitative Social Science (IQSS) Dataverse—the premier repository for social science data—has only handful of datasets on antisemitism, none of which were collected by Jewish organizations, all of which are limited to the US. Even so, these datasets have had an out-sized impact—although most are more than 20 years old, they have been used in some of the most prominent scholarly studies on American antisemitism. An open-access dataset on global patterns of discrimination against ethnic and religious groups—which includes only a handful of sketchy observations related to Jewish populations—has more than 6,000 downloads and 500 academic citations since 2011. Because these data are already in circulation, the status of the Jewish people is already included in published work—with data that many of our experts would regard as suspect. The problem is that superior but inaccessible data will not supplant freely available but lower-quality material.

In light of inadequate data or research, the data used by FRA for its 2013 survey has since been utilized by JPR and other research institutes for further analysis, indicating its robust nature. Likewise, the forthcoming FRA survey on antisemitism has been widened to include additional states, and the list of questions has been extended while retaining the original questions to enable comparison.

Generating a holistic toolkit for measuring the prevalence and correlates of antisemitism requires the collection, integration, storage and management of several types of data. These associated issues might be placed in three broad areas:

- Curation and management of existing data;
- Creating widely-accepted best practices and principles for data collection and dissemination;
- Collection of new data based on consensus best-practices and gaps identified by studies of prior data.

A scientific community focused on the study of antisemitism should seek:
- A survey of the types and quality of existing data for measuring patterns in antisemitism that will enable us to develop improved measures for the future;
- A consensus on best practices for creating data that encompass the incidence and severity of antisemitism across time and space;
- A centralized, searchable, and accessible repository for experts to work with data on antisemitism, refine and adjust their methods and models;
- Broader engagement with antisemitism-related data and analyses. Our research agenda should be credible and interesting to highly-qualified researchers in respected positions across academia and government.

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Experts make strong claims only when supported by strong data. An assessment of data quality must precede any serious experimentation with measurement models. There are two practical reasons for this. First, it is inevitable: a consensus rule-of-thumb is that more than three quarters of the work in complex projects involves data preparation and cleaning. One either does this work intentionally and preemptively at the front end or runs the risk of doing so on the back end—with the added cost of lost credibility and potential harm caused. Second, it is difficult to debate the validity of models or metrics and their resulting inferences when the quality of the underlying data is in doubt. Optimal model selection requires knowledge of the underlying data. A flawless model will produce errant results if it is fed flawed data.

A shared research agenda requires consensus-based criteria for evaluating data. Initially, we will need to perform a survey of existing data—determining what we is available and evaluating its strengths and weaknesses objectively. A central repository—the Jewish equivalent of WomanStats—might follow that project's lead with respect to its 'crowd-sourced' data. They offer clear, fair, and precise assessments of data quality and coverage.[17] Each kind of data—survey, experiment, event, etc.—has its own unique quality and coverage issues. Specialists in each data type can work to develop a consensus on metrics for data quality. This could then become a template for data 'manifests' to assess the quality of a given contributed dataset. These documents are customarily distributed with open-access datasets when quality is variable.

A survey of existing data is also important because it will affect the agenda for future collection and the viability of metrics and measures. We need to know about the existence (or absence) of data, as well as its quality. Costs of data collection vary across data type, and some types cannot be collected retrospectively (for example, if you skip a year in opinion data collection, asking about it the following year is not a good solution). Certain measures may be very important, but also very costly to collect, or historical data to support them might be sparse. This will also give us a better understanding of gaps in existing data that would drive future outreach or project development efforts.

While developing criteria and performing evaluations of existing data, our community of experts can craft a set of best practices to be shared with community groups and researchers looking to improve their efforts or develop new data collection efforts. A consensus on these methods will enable us to ==**create a truly transferable toolkit**==. If data collected in different places and times are superficially similar but fundamentally diverge with respect to collection methods, concepts, and quality, we will not be able to measure antisemitism across time and space. Perfect data and perfect technical harmonization are,

---

[17] See: http://www.womanstats.org/disclaimer.html

23

of course, unobtainable in practice, but as aspirations they are important goalposts for a serious research community.

V.   Roadmap for Action

We conclude by laying out a roadmap for realizing the vision of an effective collaboration by scholars, analysts, policy planners and communities to create superior insight into the phenomena of, and potential countermeasures to, antisemitism. We first define five different projects to be pursued by engaging diverse contributors to the effort. In the previous sections of this paper we "set the table" for each – not by providing the intended final word but rather in the spirit of providing stimulus for action. These constitute the working elements of the overarching vision we propose. We then offer specific suggestions of practical next steps for moving forward along the projects and realizing the larger vision

We first provide brief outlines of the five projects below. Doing so is intended to be taken neither as agnosticism towards nor dismissal of work already currently undertaken by academics, governments or practitioners in the community. Far from it: these efforts make possible the course we propose. We offer the collection of identified projects, rather, in the spirit of being as comprehensive as possible to frame an integrated, systematic and collaborative approach.

Five Projects: Systematic Measurement and Assessment of Antisemitism

- *Framing and conceptualization*

Antisemitism suggests itself as a subject worthy of study, measurement and analysis not only for its intrinsic academic interest. As discussed above, it has profound implications for politics and society in general and for Jewish communities and individuals in particular. As with any other policy realm, effort spent up front in framing the issues and context for subsequent analysis is rarely time wasted. On the contrary, absent such preliminary reflection, a good deal of effort may be expended with less than the full measure of potential insight received.

Perspectives

The most obvious effects of antisemitism may presumed to be found in impacts upon its targets: Jews, Jewish communities and Jewish participation in a nation's political, economic, social, legal and cultural life. This is the usual framing. To frame solely around this perspective, however, may be to turn a blind eye to the importance of antisemitism's consequences. We have provided another framing already: looking not solely at attitudes toward Jews but also of Jews themselves regarding their circumstances.

Even so, a framing that encompasses other perspectives is desirable. What, for example, is important for us to understand about the phenomenon of "antisemitism without Jews" in East Asia, one of the most dynamic regions in today's world? What are the implications of recrudescent antisemitism for non-Jews? For example, the 20th century forms of political antisemitism can be traced to the politics of Dr. Karl Lueger, Vienna's very popular turn-of-the-century mayor (his statue is still to be found in a prominent placed before the city's *rathaus*). Lueger himself does not appear to have been a classic antisemite. When chided for his large number of Jewish friends and associates he famously replied, "*Ich entscheide wer ein Jude ist.*"[18] No matter what his personal feelings might have been, he recognized the political force that could be mobilized with antisemitic tropes and rhetoric. Such "antisemitic" politics may begin with the Jews but their general force and impact may be considerably wider and have implications far beyond those localized on Jewish communities or for those seeking to protect Jewish citizens.

To be sure, this widens the scope of inquiry. But at the same time, it also provides a more comprehensive lens and potentially a more sustainable and broadly based effort. Stakeholders will not be equally interested in all aspects of the phenomenology of antisemitism, yet a successful framing should fully encompass the widest range of potential pursuits. This has the potential to make the study and assessment of antisemitism less isolated from larger questions of policy at the community, regional, provincial, and national levels. Perhaps paradoxically, it is also important to better understand what is distinctive and possibly *sui generis* about antisemitism. To the extent that the resurgence of anti-Jewish speech and acts is part of a larger phenomenon of bias directed against many "others" in society, this perspective has considerable relevance.

Dynamics

Framing and conceptualizing the issues and factors comprising antisemitism requires yet another paradox to be maintained. While a conceptual framework should be sufficiently comprehensive to contain reference to the many drivers, venues, forms and effects of antisemitism, a pigeon-holing approach should be resisted. That is, we may for convenience look at attitudinal markers of antisemitic belief on the one hand and actual attacks on the other, or at economic, political or cultural consequences. These are convenient labels we use to compartmentalize knowledge and phenomena. They provide an intellectual convenience but should not be taken as accurate representations of the reality we wish to understand. The relationships between these different categories are not static and insulated but rather dynamic and interconnected. This realization should be one of the constituents of a framing of the problems at hand.

---

[18] "I decide who is a Jew."

To give an obvious example, it is probably useful to distinguish between attitudinal antisemitism ("I don't like Jews, I don't want to come in contact with them, and I think they are on balance a negative element in our society,") and activist antisemitism ("Measures must be taken against Jews to suppress their influence, reduce their presence in our society and limit malign Jewish effects on the world.") But, of course, they are related. Antisemitism of the first type is relevant in and of itself and by virtue of its effects. A framework for measurement and analysis, however, must also make provision for gaining insight into the potential for transmutation of the first seemingly 'passive' type into the second as well as how it provides an enabling factor or imparts motive force to more militant, active forms of antisemitism. While the militant manifestations of antisemitism most directly affect immediate Jewish collective and individual interests, passive attitudinal forms will inevitably ~~effect~~affect Jewish community perspectives.

This distinction highlights just one of many questions we might be able to address if we had better information and tools. To think in terms of dynamics, transitions and lines of mutual influence is to prepare the way for policy thinking:

- For Jewish communities ~~or Jewish~~or Jewish people as a whole:
  a) To what extent are Jewish well-being and interests affected by current and projected levels of antisemitism?
  b) How can we best aid Jewish communities to avoid the gradual acclimatization and desensitizing effect that often accompanies a transition between attitudinal and active, militant antisemitism?[19]
  c) Uncomfortable as it may be to confront, is there a threshold level of antisemitism that serves to maintain a Jewish community?[20]
  d) What adaptive, shaping or hedging actions are available to reduce or eliminate the effect of antisemitism on Jewish community and Jewish collective well-being and interests?
  e) To what degree should individual Jewish communities, Jewish people or Israeli policies and actions in areas seemingly-unrelated to antisemitism be tempered by consideration of the potential indirect effects on antisemitic growth and activity?
- Many of these parochial framings have correspondence with concerns for the broader society and governance. In addition, several others have greater relevance for that higher level perspective:

---

[19] Nominally, the implicit policy since the *Shoah* has been zero tolerance and public statements branding antisemitic statements and actions as such while as a practical matter there is a background level of antisemitic expression and action, varying by locale that is endured, if not accepted.

[20] One may contrast the medieval European experience with that of the Jewish communities in China during the same period.

a) Is the "old" antisemitism of the Right correlated more with attitudinal antisemitism while the "new" manifestations on the Left are more strongly correlated with militant action? Are Right/Left distinctions meaningful in this context?
b) Is it possible to identify threshold levels of antisemitism, both attitudinal and action-oriented, that would signal a society's circumstances have passed from one qualitatively distinct state-of-being to another (e.g., a Jewish community or a political environment that is "secure," "threatened," endangered"?)
c) What actions or policies can we recommend (drawing upon best practice) for affected communities?

Cognizance potential effects that cascade across categories within the framework is an important element to build into its conceptualization. Doing so would make us recognize the types of policy choices that might be better informed to the extent that our measurement of antisemitism approximates the ideal.

Definitions

Who is an antisemite and what constitutes antisemitic thought and deed? How do definitions differ among countries, within international organizations and in key cultural institutions such as universities, media and so forth? In France or Germany, Holocaust denial is a chargeable offense. In the U.S., it is an exercise of constitutionally protected speech. The pro-Palestinian Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement speaks in the language of rights, law and social justice. Simultaneously, it often conveys its messages in forms of accusation long associated with anti-Jewish hate speech.

It would clearly be useful for communities that lead in active monitoring—e.g., the U.S., U.K., and France—to consider carefully the type of data their institutions collect and whether that which is less amenable to measurement should nevertheless become more of a concerted focus.[21] To some extent, that effort would be facilitated by generating a common taxonomy to render cross-country and multi-year comparisons more tractable and meaningful. But is this necessarily true across all issues touched upon by manifestations of antisemitism? The question is not an easy one to address simply but should be taken on as part of the framing project—indeed, in many ways, this is one of its most crucial tasks.

The best and most reputable agents for determining what is to be done and for carrying out the necessary changes would be major organizations that already represent the tall poles holding up the tent of data gathering and evaluation. Major Jewish community

---

[21] This already occurs as, for example, when the CST and SPCJ have conferred on their time frame, style and scope of incident measurement.

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

organizations within the United States, the United Kingdom, France and elsewhere charged with monitoring antisemitism, as well as highly regarded international organizations such as FRA, are best placed to design, guide and conduct a process for reconciling definitions and statistical time series that are already being used by each.

This is not to say the task laid out in this paper would be an easy one nor without considerable challenges. But the existing experts represent the best opportunity for bringing the prospect into realization. As difficult as it may be to do so, this commonality and transmissibility of terms and accepted definitions represent an important link in establishing a recursive loop of data, information, analysis, action, and assessment that would provide increasing returns to scale and enhance the potential of the resulting comprehensive data to affect positive outcomes all across the stakeholders in the fight against antisemitism.

- *Measurement design*

The third section of this paper discussed the role of measures and expanded upon the design for a framework accounting for different aspects of the measurement function presented in Table 1. Among the five roadmap projects, this design project comes immediately after (and should be made subordinate to) the project of conceptual framing. It is intimately bound with the project that follows, the practical architecture and engineering of a database facility, either virtual or localized. Having made this point, realistically all three are really aspects of a larger thrust and may usefully be considered concurrently rather than sequentially.

As with the problems associated with the framing project, the measurement design project could usefully be made a joint effort. The format presented in Table 1 or any other starting point should be the basis of specific effort by a team of volunteer experts representing the communities of research, governance and practice. Their collective effort should be to produce a more sophisticated and detailed version representing their collective thought and interaction. This can then be presented to those who may be expected to contribute to and make use of such information. The intent is to proceed in a manner that draws the best aspects of top-down and bottom-up design. Recognition of value added and delivered rather than imposition by decree (a recourse of notoriously dubious utility within the Jewish world) will determine how ubiquitously a proposed measurement strategy is adopted.

There are several big-picture ideas that should undergird any such effort. The first is to **proceed from the end backwards**: initially identify questions we wish to address and actions we want to inform. The second is a corollary of the first: rather than availability of data or ease in construction of indicators, **objectives should inform the design** of

29

measurement frameworks. Some measures revealed by this approach will come more ready to hand than others.

Finally, the effort should aim to **broaden its own base of contributors**, a theme touched on more fully below. Certainly, broader coverage and gathering of information throughout the globe should be one of the goals, in contrast to the extreme patchiness prevalent today. The elucidation and presentation of the framework should serve as an implicit invitation to non-traditional data collectors to contribute. Although not specified in Table 1, a valuable contribution by those seeking to move the measurement project forward would be to embed in the design of the framework a consideration of from where and by whom the information to construct the measures might be obtained.

- *Data collation and database design*

Several data integration and data curation challenges are discussed above. Our research community needs infrastructure: data repositories and data-sharing tools, and a set of enforceable standards for database design. Some of these standard-setting issues are basic: data collectors and analysts should have common identifiers for certain kinds of characteristics: geographic units, formats for dates and times, file formats, etc. Data will need to be archived, and some data may require considerable cleaning or the creation of additional documentation before it meets baseline standards.

Some technical choices must be made: there are several competing tools for data warehousing. Academic social scientists tend to use the IQSS Dataverse to store model code and datasets, and it can integrate some nice web-based analytical and visualization tools like Two Ravens. The Anti-Defamation League recently partnered with a new entrant in this market—data.world—to warehouse their data. Data.world is more popular with the software development community and incorporates features like chat, cooperative code writing, and enables 'crowd sourced' analysis of data in ways Dataverse does not. GitHub is a popular repository for data science and programming experts. Our community may be data-heavy and software-light at this stage, but insofar as we might seek to develop tools in future—i.e., software for detecting antisemitic discourse in local newspapers—a developer-friendly environment is something to consider.

Infrastructure creation, data collation and cleaning of this type creates a 'public good' for the research community. As such, it is subject to a typical dilemma: it is in everyone's interest to accomplish work , but it is burdensome for any one individual member of our community to take the challenge on. A collective commitment to identifying and pursuing sufficient funding to maintain a data collation and access system will be needed.

- *New data acquisition, characterization and analysis*

Data acquisition and assessment constitutes the core work of a collaborative effort to monitor manifestations of antisemitism and determine their implications. This work is, has been, and will be ongoing. Of the five projects it is the most advanced and widely conducted. While coordination and collaboration are always of potential value, as the bread and butter of both individual researchers and the organizations most prominent in this field, new data generation requires the least agenda-setting and integration of effort.

That having been said, there are at least three ways in which pursuing the overall agenda of the full five projects may benefit efforts to gather and analyze information. First, while there are already many workers in these fields, placing their efforts within a larger framework creates the potential for **mutual awareness** and enhances the potential for concordances and collaborations. It would become clearer to those already engaged in these tasks and others how individual research and data collection efforts might interact.

This greater visibility could have the additional effect of bringing **new researchers and organizations** into the field. Especially if informed by the grand conceptual framing and linkages to empirical and policy challenges advanced here, the value and importance of this joint enterprise would be made more palpable. More hands would make for lighter work and could considerably enhance our store of knowledge and in doing so support the gain of wisdom.

Finally, the increased visibility and credibility derived from interdisciplinary and international coordination might also enable researchers to pursue **additional sources of support** for their projects.

- *Building a community of practice*

Both implicitly and explicitly, the five-project agenda requires and intends to support a network of mutually-reinforcing effort among scholars, practitioners and local communities. Seamless communications might be the ideal but the practice should at least include the facilitation of discourse and provision of entry points and means for collaboration. This would be a goal not only across these three sectors but within them as well. Each is in itself a complex ecology of many actors and interests.

Certainly, a principal objective of this endeavor should be to encourage and support greater engagement within and by communities. Only a handful of national Jewish communities actively pursue an agenda for monitoring and data collection or make such information widely available. We would do well to jointly discover where barriers exist elsewhere and how national and local (often political) dynamics can undermine confidence and efforts in this area.

Some combination of a lack of capacity, focus, and reluctance to raise their profile contribute to these zones of relative shadow, where researchers gain only glimpses.

31

Providing a standard and pursuing means for mobilizing activity could bring a fuller range of antisemitic phenomenology into our ken. Specifically, it should be a goal to expand the scope of measurement practice already performed in the US, France and the UK. Another goal would be improved practice in sizable Jewish communities where monitoring is more intermittent or even non-existent.

This goal of community-building in multiple directions and across different kinds of research and data-collecting communities will not be easy to achieve. This is why it is a project in itself and not necessarily an expected consequence of the other efforts. Once more, all the projects are in many ways precursors to and in others consequences of the others. It will take both skill and forethought to effect the creation of such community bonds while retaining full cognizance of the needs of individual workers, their organizations and their respective countries.

Next Steps: A Work Plan

These five projects will necessarily be the work of diverse hands. They will require both crowd-sourcing of effort by many and the exercise of intellectual and community leadership. No one individual or organization will be sufficient in itself, and yet their absence could dampen the effort to pursue the projects we have outlined. What is required is a widely shared recognition that if antisemitism is to be taken seriously and cooperatively as a major issue of the day for Jews, their communities, and their fellow citizens and friends, it must be approached seriously as well.

But where and how to begin? We propose a work plan for the initial stages of the effort. It may begin with a small set of participants, but additional entrants as the process unfolds would be desirable. Clearly, the five listed projects are intended to be expansible (including more players, communities and elements for measurement) and recursive (prior work may be reviewed, expanded or revised based on insights gained later.

Task 1: Consultation defining first set of measures

The first two of the five projects (Framing and Conceptualization; Measurement Design) are very much on the table at the outset. This task should include a multiplicity of efforts including active circulation to potentially interested parties, publication, workshops and briefings to present the vision but more importantly collect a diversity of input and reactions at an early stage. In Table 1 we offered a framework; it is currently empty of content. The initial list of potential metrics needs to be widely agreed to and a first set of measures and proxies for each such metric proposed.

Task 2: Test application of measures against available data

The intent of first devising the measurement framework is to put us in a position to assess the adequacy of our existing data and determine what more we need to seek and collect. This is in contrast to an approach that first collects data that only afterwards is assessed for what it may tell us. After completion of Task 1, this second task would populate the emerging framework with data. The purpose is to conduct an inventory of what data are available, create and demonstrate a system for its inventory rooted in a statement of fundamental concerns, and simultaneously, identify the data and proxies that might be required for improved analysis. We would ask: what more information would we need to be able to develop at least one measure for each of our chosen metrics?

Once this has been performed for a test case country or community, the effort can expand to assess other countries. Are there communities where the data missing from the test country can be found? If so, this aids in inferring what might constitute a model of best practice that might become more widely adopted and applied.

Tables 2 and 3 present a demonstration of this effort. They are designed solely to provide proof of principle and are by no means intended to be either comprehensive or dispositive. Quite the opposite: They were constructed with the deliberate intention of being provocative. While providing a demonstration of how the framework presented in this paper may actually be put to practice, they also invite elaboration, revision and supplementation by others. Table 2. maps several regularly published documents into the Table 1 framework with each appearing as a column. This selection is both limited and non-comprehensive. The intent was merely to provide a guide for efforts by others to use the framework as a tool for their own purposes. Table 3 provides detailed results of an initial mapping using Table 1.[22]

Task 3: Select indicators and recommend applications

This is a task of consolidation. It would also be based on a consultative model and would be implemented by the same means as Task 1. While the latter will necessarily begin with a number of participating analysts and institutions, in Task 3 the goal will be to make participation as broad as possible.

Beyond the goal of sharing and ratifying the findings of the first two tasks, this effort will also involve normative evaluation of approaches for drawing upon the resulting evolving base of measures. The first two tasks will have developed only the raw material for research and policy analytical tool-building. The very richness of the data itself stands as an invitation to scholars and policy analysts to extract findings and draw informed

---

[22] In addition to the rows shown in Table 1, Table 3 also have rows beneath several of four main blocs of measures for "meta-data", that is collateral data collected on the nature of incidents, the characteristics of perpetrators, etc.

inferences. Individual finding and assessments may still be debated, but the resource will exist to question them diligently and systematically.

One of the first such uses may be to select from among the many measures contained in the growing database a smaller number that may be designated as indicators—those data series that may convey important information on current and emerging trends. The goal of the effort proposed in this paper is not to be predictive per se. That ambition would require considerably more reflection and effort.[23] Yet, the underlying principle upon with these data will have been collected and curated is for them to be applied in ways that may serve larger purposes outlined discussed above. Creating a dashboard of candidate indicators may be one small step in going beyond the conceptual, measurement and data harmonization ambitions that are the focus of this paper into the realm of application and extensions that the proposed effort is intended to enable. It will also provide a template of best practice for other communities to employ in designing their own efforts.

---

[23] There is the potential for a Big Data approach to finding systematic relationships between attitudes, incidents and phenomena of greatest concern to Jewish communities. But the term would also apply to analytical efforts seeking, for example, to better elucidate the "stages" of the disease of antisemitism and the tendency of the process to go to its end stages or to more practically focused efforts to define what level, prevalence and forms of antisemitism may be deemed as rising above an unacceptable level of comfort and threat.

Table 2. Characterizing a Selection of ~~Antisemtism~~Antisemitism Assessments into the Table 1 Framework

Formatted: Font: +Body (Cambria)

Table 3. Mapping a Selection of Measures from Table 2 into the Table 1 Framework