

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia

Mob: 61+401692057

Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org

Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online
ISSN 1440-9828



June 2013 No 698

Background to the Magna Carta

[Andrew Joyce](#) May 19, 2013

The first point to bear in mind in that Magna Carta was a document produced by the nobles and presented to the monarch — in this case, King John. In this sense we should bear in mind the tensions between the nobles and the King over one chief issue — the role of Jewish usury in enabling land transfer from the nobility to the monarch. The relevant clauses are as follows:

* (10) If anyone who has borrowed a sum of money from Jews dies before the debt has been repaid, his heir shall pay no interest on the debt for so long as he remains under age, irrespective of whom he holds his lands. If such a debt falls into the hands of the Crown, it will take nothing except the principal sum specified in the bond.

* (11) If a man dies owing money to Jews, his wife may have her dower and pay nothing towards the debt from it. If he leaves children that are under age, their needs may also be provided for on a scale appropriate to the size of his holding of lands. The debt is to be paid out of the residue, reserving the service due to his feudal lords. Debts owed to persons other than Jews are to be dealt with similarly.

So obviously these clauses weaken the ability of Jew and Crown to recoup either debt or interest on loans. It doesn't prevent moneylending etc., but certainly we could agree that the position of Jew and King would be weakened. We must then ask, firstly, why was this necessary? And secondly, why did it suddenly disappear a year later in the 1216 charter? On the first point, as I state in [my article on medieval Jewry](#), the relationship at this time during the Crown and the nobles was tense indeed, and the Jews were a very important factor in this tension. King John, whose actions had brought about the need for the Magna Carta, was profligate, incompetent, and utterly beholden to his Jews and their ability to provide him with seemingly

unlimited funds for his misadventures on the Continent.

He was also merciless in taxation. In 1207 he raised over £60,000 from the Christian population — a vast sum in that time period. He also levied a much more lenient tax on the Jews. (Patricia Skinner [Jews in Medieval England, 42] writes that their tax was "onerous but not devastating.") But suspecting that Jews were understating their income and wealth, John innovated by demanding that lists of all their debts be maintained and held at the Royal Treasury — he then reserved the right to purchase any of these debts that he liked the look of.

This was the beginning in earnest of the process of land transfer from the nobles to the Crown (and facilitated by Jewish usury) that I mentioned in my article. Nobles would borrow from Jews, John (or his agents) would monitor repayments on the treasury rolls — and if anyone looked like they were getting into trouble with repayments and might forfeit, John would buy the debt from the Jew and reap the land for himself.

Obviously over time this created a great deal of antagonism against Crown and Jew. Monarchs had done this on a smaller scale before, but John was utterly reckless. Skinner writes that by 1207, John "brought into his hands the largest single cache of Jewish debts since 1186; he also ordered the exchequer to begin seizing the lands of debtors." To the remaining debtors, it was clear they were going to lose their lands and possessions to either King or Jew. Both were seen by the nobles as inseparable, and so when the Magna Carta rebellion broke out "Jews and Jewish property were among the principle targets" (Skinner, 44).

This is the primary reason why the clauses on Jews were introduced in the first place in 1215. On the question of why it was changed only a year later: firstly, John died and was succeeded by

the boy King Henry III prior to the issuance of the second charter. In total, nineteen clauses were eliminated from the first (Runnymede) Magna Carta, and the two relating to Jews and usury were among them. The boy King himself did not have anything to do with this; it was the circle of elites around him. They wished to restore order in the country and, traditionally, treatment of the Jews was a reliable barometer for Crown authority — if the Jews were left alone, then the Crown was in a solid position because it was on Crown authority alone that they remained safe. In times of transition and weak royal authority, the Jews were among the first to be attacked, because the gloves could safely come off so to speak.

For the small circle of elites around the boy king, making the Jews safe (and wealthy) was thus a priority. As part of their negotiations with the barons they pressed for and achieved:

- 1) the elimination of the two clauses on Jews;**
- 2) the release of all Jews captured by the barons;**
- 3) the renewal and reinforcing of royal safeguards for all Jews;**
- 4) the return of bonds to Jews for collection;**
- 5) an order for port officials to permit all foreign Jews entry to England;**
- 6) the establishment of a separate Jewish Exchequer;**
- 7) special policing units established specifically for the purpose of protecting the Jews of Lincoln, Oxford, Gloucester and Bristol;**
- 8) the exemption of Jews from the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council that all Jews should wear an identifying badge;**
- 9) the exemption of Jews from all episcopal courts;**
- 10) the active enforcement by Royal sheriffs of all debts owed by Christians to Jews (Skinner, 44).**

This was an astonishing amount of freedom and protection. It's unfortunate that more is not known about the background and motivations of the circle of advisers around the boy King. I strongly suspect that among them were people with direct financial interest in Jewish economic activities, or maybe even a few crypto-Jews.

The whole episode is extremely suspect. It bought the Jews some time, and it did reinforce for a while the impression of royal strength. However, Henry grew to be just as avaricious and over-ambitious as his predecessor. His partnership with the Jews only ratcheted the tension higher than ever. Jews certainly felt the pressure rising and some turned to cypsis to avoid conflict (Skinner, 51 describes a "flood of Jewish conversions" during the period 1230–1250s, but many Christians suspected insincerity). Henry's government collapsed in 1258, and his son Edward came to the throne. Edward saw the writing on the wall, banning Jewish moneylending altogether in 1275. Seeking a way to placate his increasingly annoyed barons, and ridding himself of a now fairly useless population, he sent the Jews on their way in 1290.

The removal of the clauses was thus an attempt to patch up a ship that had been coming apart at the seams for some time — the Crown-Jew alliance. The breaking up of this alliance by the barons is something that England should be forever grateful for, given the fate of other nations in which the alliance of Crown and Jew persisted for many more centuries — Poland being a prime example.

<http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2013/05/background-to-the-magna-carta/>

Why the Magna Carta anniversary celebrations will be missing two crucial paragraphs

Francis Carr Beqbie, May 19, 2013

If there is one thing our elites enjoy it is giving each other a big pat on the back and the extravagant celebrations planned for the 800th anniversary of the Magna Carta will give them lots of opportunities to do just that.

There may still be eighteen months to go before the actual anniversary itself but the commemoration [events](#) are well underway to mark the day in 1215 that King John was finally brought to heel by the barons and where limited

government and Western constitutional freedom was born.

In Britain the BBC will broadcast TV documentaries, dramas and radio programmes, and the event is to even have its own opera and specially commissioned symphony. The occasion will be marked by commemorative stamps and the Royal Mint will issue a special £2 coin. In America high-powered lawyers and constitutional experts will be chewing over the meaning of it all at banquets, dinners, lectures and exhibitions in Boston, Washington and Philadelphia and 800 U.S. [lawyers](#) are expected to make the pilgrimage to Runnymede beside the Thames where the document was sealed.

Across the English-speaking judicial world no single document is probably more venerated than the [Great Charter](#). The Founding Fathers embedded it into the 1791 Bill of Rights in the shape of the [Fifth Amendment](#) that says no-one "can be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law". And today it is regularly cited in newspaper editorials, political debates and Supreme Court judgments. But amidst all the self-congratulation about habeas corpus, the right to trial by jury and how it's wisdom shines down the through the ages and still has much to teach us, one awkward question should be asked, however churlish it might seem..

Why have clauses 10 and 11 been airbrushed from history? These were the ones inserted in the [original charter](#) to protect widows and underage heirs specifically from Jewish moneylenders by restricting the recovery of debt out of the deceased debtor's estate.

But they are nowhere to be found in the official Magna Carta Trust [website](#) nor the US National Archive [website](#) which instead features the text of the later — and much shorter — 1297 version. The [two clauses](#) in the original 1215 Great Charter are:

10. If one who has borrowed from the Jews any sum, great or small, die before that loan be repaid, the debt shall not bear interest while the heir is under age, of whomsoever he may hold; and if the debt fall into our hands, we will not take anything except the principal sum contained in the bond.

11. And if anyone die indebted to the Jews, his wife shall have her dower and pay nothing of that debt; and if any children of the deceased are left under age, necessaries shall be provided for them in keeping with the holding of the

deceased; and out of the residue the debt shall be paid, reserving, however, service due to feudal lords; in like manner let it be done touching debts due to others than Jews.

You can, as they say in the British civil service, see the problem. While unremarkable in their day these short paragraphs are pretty incendiary stuff now and a headache for the organisers of the Magna Carta Trust — Patron: Her Majesty The Queen — which obviously wants to avoid causing offence to the richest and most powerful ethnic group in the legal profession.

Of the forty or so distinguished members of the [advisory board](#) of the Magna Carta Trust about a quarter are Jewish and they include:

US Supreme Court Justice **Stephen Breyer**;

John Bercow, Speaker of the British House of Commons;

David W. Rivkin, Secretary General of the International Bar Association and a member of President Obama's finance committee;

Stephen Zack, former president of the American Bar Association and chairman of the ABA's Magna Carta committee;

David Rubenstein, private equity billionaire and philanthropist; Rubenstein who founded the Carlyle Group and purchased one of the few remaining Magna Carta charters.

The organisers will also wish to avoid putting noses out of joint with the [American Bar Association](#) which is planning to drag 800 of its members away from the expensive shops, hotels and fleshpots of Chelsea and Kensington on a pilgrimage to the rolling meadow by the Thames where the ABA erected the impressive domed monument that has sat on there since 1957.

There is a partial explanation for the omission of the offending clauses. Like all statutes, the Magna Carta underwent a series of revisions and was superseded by other charters drawn up in 1216, 1217 and 1225 and later. Only in the original was there a specific reference to Jews (see Andrew Joyce's "[Background to the Magna Carta](#)").

The Magna Carta charter bought by David Rubenstein, on display in the U.S. National Archives, for instance, makes no mention of the Jews but it was produced in 1297, seven years after the Jews were expelled from England. Nevertheless it is still a fact that the 800th anniversary in 2015 is a commemoration of the most important Charter, the original toe-curlingly politically incorrect one.

So what relevance has any of this for today? In the narrowest of senses, very little because practically nothing from the Great Charter is still on the statute books in Britain today.

But more broadly it does shine a light into our medieval history and specifically the role played by the Jews in medieval England. In recent years there has been a concerted attempt to depict Jews as a peaceful open community pursuing a wide variety of occupations.

But as Andrew Joyce has so brilliantly [shown](#) in the Occidental Observer this is no more than a fiction concocted to hide the less salubrious truth. For the Jews of medieval England were occupied entirely as moneylenders and enjoyed great privileges and the special protection of the King. Not only were they exempt from the usury ban on Christians, they were able to move about the country without paying tolls and special weight was attributed to a Jew's oath, which was valid against that of 12 Christians.

But the protection of the King depended purely on their revenue-raising abilities. It has been said that just as the Jews could soak the wealth from a land the King could squeeze it from them. The

money raising powers of the Jews were an important element on his side in the struggle between Crown, barons, and municipalities which makes up the constitutional history of England. But as could be expected this earned them the hatred of the general population and this often found violent expression. The Jews were seen as very much the King's creatures and to take against the moneylenders was to take against the King.

What is interesting about clauses 10 and 11 is how prosaic and matter of fact they are. They deal with the technical issue of how an underage heir's estate can be protected from the deprivations of moneylenders until he reaches his majority. There are no diabolical fantasies of blood libel or any religious content at all. It is just business that is at issue, but underlying the dry prose is anger at Jewish moneylending.

In more recent times some people have chosen to place a generous interpretation that the Jews were not being singled out at all. That is because there is also a phrase "Debts owed to persons other than Jews are to be dealt with similarly" in the original.

In fact much popular anger remained against Jewish extortionate financial practices—so much so that when King Edward returned from the Crusades in 1274 he discovered so much land dispossession that he decided to take action with the [Statute of Jewry](#). This outlawed usury altogether and tried to entice Jews into the community by granting them a licence to farm. They were also encouraged to make a living as merchants, farmers, craftsmen or soldiers.

Unfortunately when the 15-year trial period had elapsed, it was discovered that the Jews had covertly continued their moneylending and other sharp practices such as coin-clipping. In 1290, King Edward I issued an [edict](#) expelling all Jews from England. The expulsion edict remained in force for the rest of the Middle Ages, the culmination of over 200 years of conflict on the matters of usury.

<http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2013/05/why-the-magna-carta-anniversary-celebrations-will-be-missing-two-crucial-paragraphs/>

Op-Ed: How Did 150,000,000 Europeans Come to Hate Israel?

Giulio Meotti, Friday, May 17, 2013 8:44 AM

George Orwell, in "1984", described the "Two Minute Hate". It has come to pass - against Jews.

"The Jewish religion is under attack in Europe", declared the Conference of European Rabbis president Pinchas Goldschmidt. Many polls (such as the study on behalf of the German Social Democratic Friedrich Ebert Foundation) bring an iconic number measuring the disaster: 150,000,000 Europeans have a delegitimizing and demonizing view of the State of Israel and its citizens.

For a large sector of Europe, the cities, skyscrapers, hospitals, cinemas, and schools on that tiny sliver of land named "Israel" are merely real estate that will be restored to Islam once this malefic Jewish form is swept away.

This is a popular mobilization against Israel in the "Raus mit Uns" spirit. 150,000,000 Western citizens believe that Zionism is a misconceived project to be brought to an end as soon as possible. It is

the consequence of the Palestinian-Islamic psychological war (note: the European Union has just contributed 20 million euros to the payment of salaries and pensions for April of nearly 76,000 Palestinian Arabs).

See what happened to Europe's Jews in little more than a week.

*In Hungary, where Adolf Eichmann obsessively hunted down all the Jews, a wave of fascist Judeophobia is poisoning the social cohesion and the head of the Raoul Wallenberg Association was injured in anti-Semitic attack.

*A Labour party member in the UK, Nazir Ahmed, resigned after anti-Jewish remarks made on television.

*A scientific genius, Stephen Hawking, embraced the racist boycott of the State of Israel.

*The *BBC* planned a "documentary" claiming that the Jewish exodus from Jerusalem was a myth.

*Dozens of French mayors rallied for the liberation of the Palestinian terrorists.

*A Scottish Christian document erased the Jewish links with to the holy land.

*In the French town of Villeurbanne, a rabbi and his son were stabbed.

It was an ordinary week of anti-Semitism in Europe.

The threat against Israel's existence has become strategic in Rome, Berlin, London, Paris, Budapest, Amsterdam and Stockholm. Indiscriminate hatred against the Jews pervades European parliaments as much as in the Muslim madrasses. The call for Israel's destruction echoes through Europe's schools and mosques, textbooks and newspapers, TV series and pseudo "documentaries". It is today's greatest manipulation of opinion, of the kind immortalized

by George Orwell in 1984 as a "Two Minute Hate": Europe's publicists, civil servants and educators incite violence directly when they describe Jews as "bloodsuckers", "colonialists", and many similar epithets. One step at a time, Europe is subverting the legitimacy of the Jewish people once again.

I have always felt an affinity with European intellectuals. But, it is with pain and surprise that I witness, one lifetime after Hitler's Holocaust, the willingness of all too many to collaborate in the monstrification of the Jews.

This is how Europe built an anti-Semitic public opinion of 150,000,000. This is how Israel has become an expendable myth among the European educated classes.

"Peace" can come only with the recognition in the Middle East of Israel as a national state of the Jewish people; the addition of the State of Israel to all the maps used in schools in the Islamic world; the elimination of the extensive anti-Israeli propaganda campaigns in the Muslim media and schools; the

promotion of interactions among scientists, scholars, artists, and athletes; the abandoning of the delegitimization of Israel at the United Nations; the outlawing of terrorist groups devoted to the killing of Israelis and the destruction of Israel; the end of the economic boycott against Israel; the institution of full diplomatic relations with Jerusalem as Israel's indivisible capital; and last but not least, the proclamation of theological fatwas prohibiting the murder of "infidels".

Europe is working hard to prevent all these necessary steps. Because according to Europe's mainstream, "peace" will prevail when Israel is dismantled, just like tranquility will prevail in the "Holy Land" when Zionism has been eliminated.

Europe is witnessing the creation of a majority according to which Israel is a superpower with extraordinary military power and wealth and as a committed and merciless enemy of humanity.

Europe's public opinion has been persuaded to believe that Israel is a state that ought to be dismantled

forthwith. Europe's population count today is 730,000, 000 citizens. What would happen if the anti-Semitic worm infected the mind of all of them?

Can Israel really remain immune from that eruption of psychotic anti-Jewish illness?

The writer, an Italian journalist with Il Foglio, writes a twice-weekly column for Arutz Sheva. He is the author of the book "A New Shoah", that researched the personal stories of Israel's terror victims, published by Encounter.

His writing has appeared in publications, such as the Wall Street Journal, Frontpage and Commentary. He is at work on a book about the Vatican and Israel.

<http://www.israelnationalnews.com/Articles/Article.aspx/13313#.UJnQk7V7Lac>

Global anti-Semitism report:

Iran denied Holocaust again

US State Department report says 2012 saw sharp rise in anti-Semitism worldwide:

Egyptian president said 'amen' during anti-Jewish prayer,

and Iran's Ahmadinejad said 'horrendous Zionist clan' ruling major world affairs

Yitzhak Benhorin, 05.20.13, 20:51, [Israel News](#)

WASHINGTON – US Secretary of State John [Kerry](#) presented the 2012 International Religious Freedom Report, which indicates a sharp rise in displays of anti-Semitism worldwide.

According to the report, [Holocaust](#) denial and glorification remained troubling themes, and opposition to Israeli policy at times was used to promote or justify blatant anti-Semitism.

"When political leaders condoned anti-Semitism, it set the tone for its persistence and growth in countries around the world. Of great concern were expressions of anti-Semitism by government officials, by religious leaders, and by the media, particularly in Venezuela, [Egypt](#), and [Iran](#). At times, such statements led to desecration and violence," the report states.

In Venezuela, the State Department's report noted, the government-controlled media published numerous anti-Semitic statements, particularly in relation to opposition presidential candidate Henrique Capriles, a Catholic with [Jewish](#) ancestors.

Separately, during an anti-Israel protest in November, a group of individuals gathered outside a synagogue chanting anti-Jewish slogans and throwing fireworks.



Regularly vilified Judaism. Ahmadinejad (Photo: EPA)

In Egypt, anti-Semitic sentiment in the media was widespread and sometimes included Holocaust denial or glorification.

The reported mentioned that on October 19, President Mohamed [Morsi](#) said "Amen" during televised prayers in Mansour after an imam stated, "Oh Allah ... grant us victory

over the infidels. Oh Allah, destroy the Jews and their supporters." Also in October, Muslim Brotherhood Supreme Guide Mohamed Badei made several anti-Semitic statements, including saying in a sermon that was also published online that "It is time for the Muslim (nation) to unite for the sake of [Jerusalem](#) and Palestine after the Jews have increased the corruption in the world...." He added that "Zionists only know the way of force."



Henrique Capriles (Photo: EPA)

The State Department's report said that in Iran, the government regularly vilified Judaism in 2012. President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad continued to question the existence and the scope of the Holocaust, and stated that "a horrendous Zionist clan" had been "ruling the major world affairs" for some 400 years, while Vice President Mohammad-Reza Rahimi publicly blamed the "Zionists" for spreading illegal drugs around the world.

In Tunisia, Salafists (fundamentalist Sunni Muslims) attacked synagogues and issued anti-Semitic messages, as did some imams during Friday prayer sermons. Certain Salafist imams preached anti-Jewish and anti-Christian messages, including calling for the killing of non-Muslim citizens. Police arrested five persons, including one police officer, for allegedly plotting to kidnap Jews in Zarzis in October for ransom.

In Ukraine, vandals desecrated several Holocaust memorials. In May, in Russia, vandals painted a swastika on a St. Petersburg synagogue's fence, and in July, vandals painted a swastika on a synagogue wall in Irkutsk.

"Even well into the 21st century, traditional forms of anti-Semitism, such as conspiracy theories, use of the discredited myth of 'blood libel,' and cartoons demonizing Jews, continued to flourish," the report said.

An anti-Semitic cartoon appeared in a major newspaper in Argentina, and a member of the Golden Dawn party in Greece read from the notorious Tsarist forgery, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, during a parliamentary session. In a worrisome sign, such anti-Semitic and xenophobic parties gained seats in parliaments, and a rise in violent attacks on Jews in Europe included several shocking incidents.

Hungary saw continued racist commentary by an openly anti-Semitic political party with seats in parliament, the Jobbik Party, and also witnessed an attack on a member of the Jewish community outside of a prayer house in Budapest. In France, an Islamist extremist killed a rabbi and his two children, along with another student, outside a Jewish school in Toulouse. While a number of governments took active measures to combat anti-Semitism, this pernicious evil continued to spread.

<http://www.vnetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L4382116,00.html>

Related stories:

[Rabbis: Act modestly to stop anti-Semitism](#)

[Report: Czech anti-Semitism fairly low](#)
[German FM vows to counter anti-Semitism](#)

US study shows global increase in anti-Semitism, Shoah denial **Religious freedom report from State Department cites concern about leaders of Venezuela, Iran, and Egypt condoning anti-Semitism, verging on 'desecration and violence'**

May 20, 2013, 10:03 pm

WASHINGTON (AP) — The State Department appointed a special envoy to monitor and combat anti-Semitism around the world Monday as a new report documents a global increase in incidents of anti-Semitism and Holocaust denial.

Ira Forman, former CEO of the National Jewish Democratic Council, was named special envoy as the State Department released its annual report on religious freedom around the world. Forman replaces Michael Kozak, who had served in an acting role after Hannah Rosenthal stepped down last year.

The 2012 report on religious freedom said expressions of anti-Semitism by government officials, religious leaders were of great concern, particularly in Venezuela, Egypt and Iran. At times, such statements led to desecration and violence, the report said.

"When political leaders condoned anti-Semitism, it set the tone for its

persistence and growth in countries around the world," the report said.

In Venezuela, government-controlled media published numerous anti-Semitic statements, particularly in regard to opposition presidential candidate Henrique Capriles, a Catholic with Jewish ancestors, the report said.

In Egypt, anti-Semitic sentiment in the media was widespread and sometimes included Holocaust denial or glorification, the report said. The report cited an Oct. 19 incident in which Egyptian President Mohammed Morsi said "Amen" after a religious leader stated, "Oh Allah, destroy the Jews and their supporters."

The Iranian government regularly vilified Judaism, and vandals in Ukraine desecrated several Holocaust memorials, the report said. Vandals in Russia painted a swastika on a fence at a St. Petersburg synagogue and on a synagogue wall in Irkutsk.

"Even well into the 21st century, traditional forms of anti-Semitism, such as conspiracy theories, use of the discredited myth of "blood libel" and cartoons demonizing Jews continued to flourish," the report said.

Secretary of State John Kerry called the report a "clear-eyed, objective look at the state of religious freedom around the world," and said that in some cases, the report "does directly call out some of our close friends, as well as some countries with whom we seek stronger ties."

Kerry called the report an attempt to make progress around the world, "even though we know that it may cause some discomfort."

When countries undermine or attack religious freedom, "they not only unjustly threaten those whom they target, they also threaten their countries' own stability," Kerry said at a news conference, calling religious

freedom a basic human right. Kerry urged countries identified in the report to take action to safeguard religious freedoms.

Besides anti-Semitism, the report also notes frequent government restrictions on religion and policies that make it hard for citizens to choose or practice their faith.

"Governments that repress freedom of religion and freedom of expression typically create a climate of intolerance and impunity that emboldens those who foment hatred and violence within society," the report said, singling out China, North Korea, Saudi Arabia, Russia and Cuba, among other countries, for criticism.

The report also cites the use of blasphemy laws to harass, detain and abuse government critics, especially in the Middle East and North Africa. In Saudi Arabia, the report cited incidents in which activists were arrested and

charged with apostasy and blasphemy, offenses that carry potential death penalties.

Kerry, who took office earlier this year after incidents highlighted in the report took place, thanked a "broad spectrum" of faith leaders, religious organizations and journalists who participated in the report, many at great personal risk.

"Governments around the globe continue to detain, imprison, torture and even kill people for their religious beliefs," Kerry said. "In too many places, governments are also failing to protect minorities from social discrimination and violence" against religious groups including Buddhists, Hindus, Jews, Christians, Muslims and Sikhs.

Abraham Foxman, national director of the Anti-Defamation League, said the appointment of Forman as anti-Semitism envoy showed that U.S. resolve to fight anti-Semitism is serious

and ongoing. The ADL is confident Forman "will play an important role in ensuring that the significant political will and diplomatic resources of the U.S. are brought to bear to urge foreign governments to take action" against anti-Semitism, Foxman said.

Copyright 2013 The Associated Press.

Related Topics

[anti-Semitism](#)

[National Jewish Democratic Council](#)

[Holocaust](#)

<http://www.timesofisrael.com/us-study-shows-global-increase-in-anti-semitism-shoah-denial/>

Monday, May 20, 2013 As of 8:44 PM EDT

***The Wall Street Journal* news department was not involved in the creation of this content.**

PRESS RELEASE – May 20, 2013, 8:44 p.m. ET

AJC Welcomes Appointment of U.S. Anti-Semitism Envoy to Confront "Global Increase in Anti-Semitism"

WASHINGTON, May 20, 2013 /PRNewswire-USNewswire/ -- AJC welcomes Secretary of State John Kerry's appointment of Ira Forman as Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, based in the State Department's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor.

<http://photos.prnewswire.com/prnh/20100816/AJCLOGO>)

"This appointment could not be more timely," said AJC Executive Director David Harris. "Anti-Semitism and related violence have been on the upswing worldwide, and continued U.S. leadership to combat it is urgently needed."

"Ira Forman has the knowledge, commitment and experience to focus government-wide attention on documenting and devising new ways to fight this ages-old scourge," Harris continued. "We welcome his appointment as a successor to former

Envoy Hannah Rosenthal and Interim Envoy Michael Kozak."

The appointment of Forman was made today as the State Department issued an annual report on international religious freedom, ominously concluding that 2012 brought "a continued global increase in anti-Semitism."

The Department's International Religious Freedom Report specifically points to violence and desecration that has resulted from an increase in anti-Semitism "by government officials, religious leaders, and the media, particularly in Venezuela, Egypt and Iran."

The Special Envoy provides input on anti-Semitism for these reports, which provides details on every country in the world, including a focus on anti-Semitic incidents, including personal and property attacks; government policies, court cases, and educational programs.

Forman previously served as Director of Congressional Relations for the Office of Personnel Management during the Clinton administration. He led the National Jewish Democratic Council for 15 years.

The post of Special Envoy was established by the Global Anti-Semitism Review Act of 2004, and is a part of the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL).

A wide range of AJC programs in the United States and its overseas offices work to combat global anti-Semitism.

SOURCE American Jewish Committee /Web site:

<http://www.ajc.org>

[http://online.wsj.com/article/PR-](http://online.wsj.com/article/PR-CO-20130520-911035.html?mod=googlenews_wsj)

[CO-20130520-](http://online.wsj.com/article/PR-CO-20130520-911035.html?mod=googlenews_wsj)

[911035.html?mod=googlenews_wsj](http://online.wsj.com/article/PR-CO-20130520-911035.html?mod=googlenews_wsj)

Pilot, AOPA are filing a request to probe inspection

Pilot Gabriel Silverstein confirmed that he is filing a Freedom of Information Act request to find out why authorities targeted him for an inspection this month. The filing is backed by

AOPA, according to this source. [The Atlantic online](#) (5/19)

Annals of the Security State, Gabriel Silverstein Division

We all notice the parts of security-overreach that affect us.

[JAMES FALLOWS](#) MAY 19 2013, 11:30 AM ET



This is Gabriel Silverstein. Unlike me, he is involved [in commercial real estate](#) and investment banking, and once worked at Morgan Stanley. Like me, he is an amateur pilot who likes to fly the Cirrus SR-22 small airplane -- and, as I will soon be doing, he recently was flying his Cirrus from the east coast to the west and back again with his spouse, on business, making a number of business-related or refueling stops along the way. At two of these stops this month, he and his airplane, and his [husband Angel](#) who was traveling with him, drew the attention of security officials who "happened" to be at the small airports where he landed. One stop, at an otherwise deserted site in Oklahoma, was perfunctory -- but a few days later, in Iowa, a group of police were apparently waiting for the plane and surrounded it after it landed. They inspected it, with a dog, and took two hours to look through every part of the plane and all of the onboard baggage and possessions, before letting the Silversteins go. According to [a fascinating account](#) on the AOPA (Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association) site:

Silverstein, the pilot in command, raised objections and was given three options: wait inside the FBO [the "Fixed Base Operator," the little office that exists at most small airports] or wait quietly outside, or be detained in handcuffs. An instrument-rated private pilot and AOPA member, Silverstein is also an active real estate investment banker who has never committed a crime, he said.

You can get more details at the AOPA site or in the opening minutes of the accompanying video, below, produced by my friend Warren Morningstar and featuring an interview with Silverstein.

Because several aspects of this story seemed so strange, before mentioning it I wanted to check it out a little more. I found a number for Silverstein (whom I do not know) and reached him on his cell phone yesterday while he was getting ready to board a commercial airline flight.

He confirmed that the AOPA story was accurate, and that he was filing a Freedom of Information Act request, with AOPA as a backer, to find out why he was apparently targeted for a pre-emptive, invasive inspection as he traveled around in perfectly legal fashion. To put this in perspective: it is as if you pulled over at one of the stops on I-95 on the east coast or I-5 on the west, only to find your car surrounded by cops and federal agents who held you for two hours and insisted on looking at every single item in your possession. Also for perspective: the prospect of "ramp checks" by FAA officials, who can show up to make sure that all your certificates, inspections, and other paperwork is in order, is theoretically possible at any moment but in practice is rare. (I am tempting fate to say this, but in 15+ years of active flying it has never happened to me.)

"I find it hard to believe that two inspections in four days was completely coincidental," Silverstein told me yesterday. "When I commented to the homeland security guys at the second, more invasive, inspection that this had happened a few days before, they didn't seem fazed by that at all. It seems strange that after a first inspection they would immediately feel the need for another."

There are more, great-but-terrible details in the AOPA report -- including references to two previous heavy-handed security measures involving

small-plane pilots. One, as [reported here](#) a few months ago, involved a 70-year-old glider pilot who was handcuffed and jailed for 24 hours for gliding over a nuclear power plant that was not marked with any restrictions on air space. In normal-world terms, this is like being arrested for driving down what looked like a normal street. The [other involved](#) two of the most familiar and Mister Rogers-ish benign figures in the aviation world, John and Martha King, who in 2010 were handcuffed and held at gun point by police for no apparent reason.

(Actually, because police mistakenly thought they were flying a stolen plane.) To anticipate an objection: we all notice security-state intrusions when they affect our own. For me that includes journalists, in the recent [AP-phone records case](#), and now pilots. But I am not special-pleading here: I am offering data points from (generally very privileged) realms I happen to know about, for the light they shed on the larger over-reach of the security state. And at least I'm consistent. Seven years ago, in [an Atlantic cover story](#), I was arguing that the time had come to "declare victory" in the benighted, [open-ended](#) global war on terror, and try to restore some of the sane balance that keeps free societies free.



Left to Right: Cynthia Nixon, Marjorie Hill, Angel Silverstein, Gabriel Silverstein

<http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2013/05/annalsofthesecuritystategabrielsilversteindivision/276011/>

The Large Families that rule the world

Translated from the Portuguese version by: Lisa Karpova, Pravda.Ru, 18.10.2011



Some people have started realizing that there are large financial groups that dominate the world. Forget the political intrigues, conflicts, revolutions and wars. It is not pure chance. Everything has been planned for a long time.

Some call it "conspiracy theories" or New World Order. Anyway, the key to understanding the current political and economic events is a restricted core of families who have accumulated more wealth and power.

We are speaking of 6, 8 or maybe 12 families who truly dominate the world. Know that it is a mystery difficult to unravel.

We will not be far from the truth by citing Goldman Sachs, Rockefellers, Loeb's and Lehman's in New York, the Rothschilds of Paris and London, the Warburgs of Hamburg, Paris and Lazards Israel Moses Seifs Rome. Many people have heard of the Bilderberg Group, Illuminati or the Trilateral Commission. But what are the names of the families who run the world and have control of states and international organizations like the UN, NATO or the IMF?

To try to answer this question, we can start with the easiest: inventory, the world's largest banks, and see who the shareholders are and who make the decisions.

The world's largest companies are now: Bank of America, JP Morgan, Citigroup, Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley.

Let us now review who their shareholders are.

Bank of America:

State Street Corporation, Vanguard Group, BlackRock, FMR (Fidelity), Paulson, JP Morgan, T. Rowe, Capital World Investors, AXA, Bank of NY, Mellon.

JP Morgan:

State Street Corp., Vanguard Group, FMR, BlackRock, T. Rowe, AXA, Capital World Investor, Capital Research Global Investor, Northern Trust Corp. and Bank of Mellon.

Citigroup:

State Street Corporation, Vanguard Group, BlackRock, Paulson, FMR, Capital World Investor, JP Morgan, Northern

Trust Corporation, Fairhome Capital Mgmt and Bank of NY Mellon.

Wells Fargo:

Berkshire Hathaway, FMR, State Street, Vanguard Group, Capital World Investors, BlackRock, Wellington Mgmt, AXA, T. Rowe and Davis Selected Advisers.

We can see that now there appears to be a nucleus present in all banks: **State Street Corporation, Vanguard Group, BlackRock and FMR (Fidelity)**. To avoid repeating them, we will now call them the "**big four**"

Goldman Sachs:

"The big four," Wellington, Capital World Investors, AXA, Massachusetts Financial Service and T. Rowe.

Morgan Stanley:

"The big four," Mitsubishi UFJ, Franklin Resources, AXA, T. Rowe, Bank of NY Mellon e Jennison Associates. Rowe, Bank of NY Mellon and Jennison Associates.

We can just about always verify the names of major shareholders. To go further, we can now try to find out the shareholders of these companies and shareholders of major banks worldwide.

Bank of NY Mellon:

Davis Selected, Massachusetts Financial Services, Capital Research Global Investor, Dodge, Cox, Southeastern Asset Mgmt. and ... "The big four."

State Street Corporation (one of the "big four"):

Massachusetts Financial Services, Capital Research Global Investor, Barrow Hanley, GE, Putnam Investment and ... The "big four" (shareholders themselves!).

BlackRock (another of the "big four"):

PNC, Barclays e CIC. Who is behind the PNC? FMR (Fidelity), BlackRock, State Street, etc. And behind Barclays? BlackRock.

And we could go on for hours, passing by tax havens in the Cayman Islands, Monaco or the legal domicile of Shell companies in Liechtenstein. A network where companies are always the same, but never a name of a family.

In short: the eight largest U.S. financial companies (JP Morgan, Wells Fargo, Bank of America, Citigroup, Goldman Sachs, U.S. Bancorp, Bank of New York Mellon and Morgan Stanley) are 100% controlled by ten shareholders and we have four companies always present in all decisions: **BlackRock, State Street, Vanguard and Fidelity**.

In addition, the Federal Reserve is comprised of 12 banks, represented by a board of seven people, which

comprises representatives of the "big four," which in turn are present in all other entities.

In short, the Federal Reserve is controlled by four large private companies: BlackRock, State Street, Vanguard and Fidelity. These companies control U.S. monetary policy (and world) without any control or "democratic" choice. These companies launched and participated in the current worldwide economic crisis and managed to become even more enriched.

To finish, a look at some of the companies controlled by this "big four" group:

Alcoa Inc.

Altria Group Inc.

American International Group Inc.

AT&T Inc.

Boeing Co.

Caterpillar Inc.

Coca-Cola Co.

DuPont & Co.

Exxon Mobil Corp.

General Electric Co.

General Motors Corporation

Hewlett-Packard Co.

Home Depot Inc.

Honeywell International Inc.

Intel Corp.

International Business Machines Corp

Johnson & Johnson

JP Morgan Chase & Co.

McDonald's Corp.

Merck & Co. Inc.

Microsoft Corp.

3M Co.

Pfizer Inc.

Procter & Gamble Co.

United Technologies Corp.

Verizon Communications Inc.

Wal-Mart Stores Inc.

Time Warner

Walt Disney

Viacom

Rupert Murdoch's News Corporation.,

CBS Corporation

NBC Universal

The same "big four" control the vast majority of European companies counted on the stock exchange.

In addition, all these people run the large financial institutions, such as the IMF, the European Central Bank or the World Bank, and were "trained" and remain "employees" of the "big four" that formed them.

The names of the families that control the "big four", never appear.

http://english.pravda.ru/business/finance/18-10-2011/119355-The_Large_Families_that_rule_the_world-0/
