



ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

"There Is Nothing Wrong about Being Money Grubbing!" Milton Friedman's Provocative "Capitalism and the Jews" in Context, 1972-88

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

"There Is Nothing Wrong about Being Money Grubbing!" Milton Friedman's Provocative "Capitalism and the Jews" in Context, 1972-88 / Vallois, N; Chassonnery-Zaigouche, C. - In: HISTORY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. - ISSN 0018-2702. - ELETTRONICO. - 53:2(2021), pp. 313-345. [10.1215/00182702-8906033]

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/905224> since: 2022-11-21

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1215/00182702-8906033>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

(Article begins on next page)

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Vallois, N., & Chassonnery-Zaïgouche, C. (2021). “There Is Nothing Wrong about Being Money Grubbing!” Milton Friedman’s Provocative “Capitalism and the Jews” in Context, 1972–88. *History of Political Economy*, 53(2), 313-345.

The final published version is available online at:

<https://doi.org/10.1215/00182702-8906033>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

“There is nothing wrong about being money grubbing!”

**Milton Friedman’s provocative “Capitalism and the Jews” in context
(1972-1988)**

Nicolas Vallois¹ & Cléo Chassonnery-Zaïgouche²

Introduction

At the end of his talk before a Jewish student association, Milton Friedman concluded that antisemitism “was based on the notion that Jews were money-grubbing, grasping, selfish, keepers”. He teasingly adds: “But there’s nothing wrong with being money-grubbing!” (Friedman, 1976, 43’). The sentence was received with applause and laughing. The conference was based on an earlier unpublished presidential lecture Friedman gave before the Mont Pèlerin society in 1972, entitled “Capitalism and the Jews”. Before this lecture, Milton Friedman briefly exposed the arguments of his essay in a letter to the society’s secretary, Ralph Harris:

I have long been interested in, and have given a number of unwritten and unpublished lectures on, “Capitalism and the Jews”— the theme being that a) no people owe so much to capitalism; b) none

1 CRISEA, University of Picardie Jules Verne. Corresponding author, email: nicolas.vallois@u-picardie.fr

2 CRASH, University of Cambridge. We are indebted to Jenny Fichmann for her crucial research assistance with archival work. We also thank Steve Medema, Aurélien Goutsmedt, Guillaume Noblet, Justine Louergue, Thomas Delcey, Marius Kuster and the members of the REHPERE team for their helpful comments on various versions of the paper. The usual caveats apply.

have done so much to destroy it by writing and political actions.³

Friedman was quite uncertain about choosing this theme for his presidential address: the subject of “Capitalism and the Jews” was “capable of being a delicate subject”. “The natural topic would be monetary policy domestic and international” confessed Friedman to Harris. He therefore asked Harris his “frank reaction”.⁴ Harris liked the idea very much but stressed that “the chief ground for doubt seemed the possibility of embarrassing Jewish members and friends”. Harris consulted fellow society member Arthur Seldon “who personally approved as much as [he] did” but recommends Friedman to have “further sounding”.⁵ Friedman probably presented an outline of his speech to George Stigler who expressed skepticism about the main thesis while encouraging him to carry on his research.⁶

The subsequent history of the essay seems to have confirmed Friedman’s initial doubts. After the conference, *Capitalism and the Jews* circulated as a reprint (Friedman, 1972). As Friedman confessed later on, he chose not to publish his text at the time because, “talking with a number of people about it [...] they suggested that they were not persuaded by it” (quoted in Elzinga, 1985, p.459). Friedman clearly understood that *Capitalism and the*

3 Friedman to Ralph Harris 29/09/71, Box 87 Folder 1, MFA.

4 Friedman to Ralph Harris 29/09/71, Box 87 Folder 1, MFA.

5 Ralph Harris to Friedman 23/11/71, Box 87 Folder 1, MFA.

6 Stigler to Friedman 12/10/71, Box 220 Folder 7, MFA.

Jews was not a scholarly article. Ten years after the Mont Pèlerin society meeting, the essay was published in three non-academic venues. First published in a 1984 issue of the neoconservative *Encounter*, the literary and political review of Irving Kristol (Friedman, 1984), the text was reprinted as a chapter in a publication of the Fraser Institute on “Morality and the market” (Friedman, 1985); and, later, in the columns of the libertarian *Freeman* magazine (Friedman, 1988a).

Friedman made it clear in the very beginning of his 1972 talk that he was led to examine Jewish economic history for “obvious personal reasons”. Labeled an “intellectual deviant” and “traitor” to the supposed leftist tradition within Jewish intellectual circles (Friedman, 1972, p.3), Friedman was on an intellectual crusade to demonstrate that the Jews, among other minorities, had always benefited from capitalism and should therefore favor non-interventionist policies.

Such an apology of capitalism and economic freedom was not a novelty in Jewish intellectual history. In the 17th-18th century, an intense discussion developed about Jewish participation in commerce and its beneficial or detrimental effect on Christian society. Various Jewish authors defended the idea that Jewish concentration in commerce was particularly useful for the state and the economy, arguing therefore in favor of toleration and Jewish political emancipation (Karp, 2008; Reuveni, 2014). Later on, in the second part of the

19th century, economic self-imagery in European Jewish intelligentsia became characterized by a positive association between Jews, trade, and economic freedom. Jewish economic elites were seen as the pillars of modern capitalism and as fulfilling a secular “industrial mission” (Penslar, 2001, pp.144-158).

Yet Friedman produced a radically different stance. While previous accounts had praised Judaism and the Jews for inspiring capitalism and fostering economic development, thereby defending Jewish political emancipation, Friedman had praised capitalism for emancipating the Jews (in the sense of non-discriminating) and fostering Jewish economic development. The main argument was not about Judaism, it was about the free-market. Targets and audiences were also different. Jewish intellectuals in the 17th-19th century were trying to convince Gentiles that Jews were “economically useful” and could be therefore “good citizens”. Friedman’s lecture was not about changing Gentiles’ perception of Jewish economic behavior, but rather influencing Jewish self-perception and political stance toward capitalism, while providing general principles concerning the fate of minorities in capitalism.

In some sense, Friedman’s agenda was a success, because Jewish intellectuals – including Friedman himself – are known to have played an important part in the buildings of neoconservatism in the US (Murray Friedman, 2005). This is the reason why we claim that *Capitalism and the Jews* is an important piece to document the rise of neoconservatism, particularly within

Jewish intellectual circles. We therefore argue that *Capitalism and the Jews* has to be read within the surrounding political and polemical context of its writing and publication. The 1972 lecture was the occasion for Friedman to build an alliance with non-economist intellectuals such as Kristol, who were concerned with non-economic aspects of political conservatism, and in particular with the issue of minorities in a market society. Studying *Capitalism and the Jews* in its historical context therefore contributes to recent scholarship on the history of the complex relationships between conservatism and free-market ideas (Burns, 2010; Burgin, 2012; Hamburger and Steinmetz-Jenkins, 2018). It also provides a case study in the history of economic thought on discrimination and minorities.

We take therefore a different perspective from Jeff Lipkes' recent article on Friedman's *Capitalism and the Jews* published in this journal (Lipkes, 2019). Lipkes examines the content of the essay and its historical rectitude and focuses mostly on one of Friedman's reference – Werner Sombart. Lipkes' objective is to reassess Sombart's contribution from the point of view of recent scholarship on Jewish economic history.⁷ Our objective is to study Friedman's audiences.

⁷ Our article and Lipkes' deal therefore with two separate topics. We nonetheless disagree with Lipkes on two points. First, we deemphasize the relative importance of Sombart as an intellectual influence for Friedman. Also, we regard Friedman's personal relation to Judaism and the Jews as a decisive issue, especially to understand his audiences, while this question is mostly left aside in Lipkes' article. Last but not least, it should be noted that we regard Lipkes' treatment of his own topic -and his methodology-, as highly questionable, especially his endorsement of controversial literature on [xxx](#). Because these issues are beyond the scope of our study, we provide a critical analysis of Lipkes' article in a blogpost accessible [here](#) <> and

While providing elements on criticisms Friedman received, we aim at understanding his political and intellectual motivations when lecturing and writing about *Capitalism and the Jews* and how it relates to his different publics.⁸

Besides the several versions of *Capitalism and the Jews*, our main sources are Friedman's papers (essentially the reprint of the conference and audio recording of the lecture as well as correspondence on *Capitalism and the Jews*).

1. The making of the 1972 Presidential Lecture: Friedman's political agenda

1.1. 'Capitalism and the Jews': A recurrent theme in Friedman's works and a polemical lecture

In his article on *Capitalism and the Jews*, Lipkes very briefly summarizes Friedman's argument in two short pages and focuses mostly on Friedman's reference to Sombart (Lipkes, 2019, pp.197-199), before discussing the historical rectitude of Friedman's propositions. Yet Sombart is one of Friedman's references out of many others that are equally important to understand *Capitalism and the Jews*. It is worth noticing first that Friedman

in a forthcoming substantial academic comment.

⁸ On the economists' audiences in the historiography of economics, see Medema (2019). More generally on economists as public intellectuals, see Mata and Medema (2013).

started his 1972 presidential lecture not with Sombart's argument, but with a general remark on the "climate of opinion".

In the beginning of his speech, Friedman provides a critical and harsh assessment of the Mont Pèlerin society's achievements since its foundation. He observes that there had been a decrease in political collectivism in the post-war period, but "the favorable trends in the world of affairs were not paralleled in the world of ideas". The intellectual climate remains overwhelmingly collectivist. Hence the idea that the society largely failed its mission, its members being "unsuccessful in persuading intellectuals everywhere of [the society's] views" (Friedman, 1972, p.2). The alleged attitude of the Jews toward capitalism is introduced by Friedman as a particular case of this general climate. He then develops what he perceives as a paradox: "first, the Jews owe an enormous debt to free enterprise and competitive capitalism; second, the Jews, for at least the past century, have been consistently opposed to capitalism and have done much on an ideological level to undermine it" (p.2).

In the rest of the essay, Friedman analyzes each one of the two propositions of his paradox separately. According to Friedman, Jews have "benefited" from capitalism and free competition—these two expressions being used as synonyms—because this system is "color-blind": "where there is free competition, only performance counts" (p.4). He sees Jews as having been most prosperous throughout the history of the Diaspora in the most capitalistic places

and times whereas it is “no accident that Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia, the two most totalitarian societies in the past two thousand years [...] also offer the most extreme examples of official and effective antisemitism” (p.6). In more recent times, Friedman argues Jews’ activities flourished in sectors that have the freest entry such as law, accountancy, the movie industry and that they are under-represented in state-regulated sectors such as large industry or banking. A last justification comes from Israel, a country Friedman writes, which has developed mainly from private initiative rather than collectivist politics. Of the two traditions he “observes” in Israel – the “ancient one, going back nearly two thousand years, of finding ways around governmental restrictions and the “modern” one, going back a century, of belief in “democratic socialism” and “central planning” (p.8) – the first has proved to be stronger despite “all the talk of central control” (p.8).

The second aspect of the paradox—the “anti-capitalist mentality of the Jews”—is justified by a few examples of Jewish anti-capitalist thinkers (Marx, Trotsky, Marcuse) and more generally by Jewish political behavior (the preference of Jews for the Democratic Party in the US, and their over-representation in communist and socialist movements).

Friedman then seeks to solve the paradox. He first rejects the explanation proposed by sociologist Lawrence Fuchs that a “leftist mentality” would be the direct consequence of Jewish religion and culture (pp.9-10).

Friedman then analyzes Sombart's controversial thesis (Sombart [1911] 1913) that Judaism actually created capitalism (pp.10-12). As Friedman acknowledges himself, Sombart's book has been commonly interpreted as antisemitic in the post-World War II context: it had "a highly unfavorable reception among both economic historians in general and Jewish intellectuals in particular".⁹ But Friedman adds "there is nothing in the book itself to justify any charge of antisemitism", and interprets it in the end of the essay "as philosemitic", as "Sombart's assignment to the Jews of a key role in the development of capitalism" is in Friedman's perspective "high praise" (p.19). Despite its controversial flavor, these quotations and interpretations from Sombart are actually not as important in Friedman's essay as Lipkes' brief summary suggests (Lipkes, 1999, pp.197-199). The paragraphs on Sombart occupy only two pages out of 22 in the reprint of Friedman's conference, plus the additional final sentence on Sombart's alleged philosemitism (Friedman, p.19). This amounts to less than 10% of the total word count in the different versions of the essay. More substantially, in Friedman's general argument, Sombart's thesis is

⁹ Friedman's understanding of Sombart's book as "philosemitic" was very polemical and controversial in the postwar context, as he recognized himself explicitly. In the first part of the twentieth century, Werner Sombart was one of the most influential and famous social scientists in Germany and elsewhere, and went then "from fame to near oblivion" (Grundmann and Stehr, 2001) because of his explicit endorsement of National Socialism in 1933, though he seems to have distanced himself from the Nazi regime later on (Gioia, 2014). The problem of Sombart's relationship to Nazis was known among economists. Following Sombart's death in 1941, obituaries in the *American Economic Review* and *Journal of Political Economy* mentioned critically Sombart's ambiguous attitude toward National Socialism (Rogin, 1941; Harris, 1942). Sombart's thesis about the Jews and modern capitalism was largely abandoned in academia (see for instance Rivkin, 1952; Kisch, 1951).

only one possible explanation for Friedman's paradox, and even if it had to be accepted, the paradox persists: if the Jews have created capitalism, why the "anti-capitalist mentality"?

After Fuchs and Sombart, Friedman considers two more balanced views, which he concedes, have only a limited validity to explain the paradox. Equally important as Sombart's arguments is Nathan Glazer's claim in *The Social Basis of American Communism* that the Jews' over-representation among intellectuals explain also their over-representation among anti-capitalists, since intellectuals would be relatively more inclined to anti-capitalist tendencies (Glazer, 1961). Thought to be more credible than Fuchs' thesis, Friedman's "impression" is that Jewish intellectuals are significantly *more* anti-capitalist than other intellectuals (p.13). He found another explanation in Werner Cohn's unpublished PhD dissertation (Cohn, 1956). According to Cohn, secularization and emancipation of the Jews has been a major component in the program of leftist parties since the early political revolutions in Europe; these parties being framed as a "natural choice" for Jews, contrary to right-wing parties. Yet, Friedman argues that the explanation does not work in the US, where "the elite Puritan element was [...] pro-Semitic" (pp.15-16).

Friedman's main explanation of the paradox comes from the "Jewish reaction to the Jewish stereotype". Jews have always suffered from the antisemitic stereotype of themselves as "money-grasping, cunning, selfish and

greedy” (p.17). Hence, criticizing free-market and lauding the State became a way to convince themselves and antisemites of their generosity and altruism. Friedman concludes the “anti-capitalist ideology of the Jews” has always been opposed to their self-interest. Yet, in the West where the conflict is more potential than real, they could preach socialism as an ideal “while enjoying the luxuries paid for by their capitalist inheritance” (p.21).

When looking closely at *Capitalism and the Jews*, it appears that the presidential lecture was the result of Friedman’s long-term curiosity about Jewish economic history. Here we disagree with Lipkes who argues that “there is little evidence of any interest [of Friedman] in Jews and Judaism prior to 1972” (Lipkes, 2019, p.195). Lipkes’ article begins with the claim that “a trip to Israel in April 1972 to deliver the Horowitz Lecture inspired Milton Friedman” to reconsider the “paradox” of *Capitalism and the Jews* (Lipkes, 2019, p.193). This claim is refuted by several pieces of evidence. During the Mont Pèlerin lecture, Friedman’s actual statement was: “I was first led to this explanation of the anti-capitalist mentality of the Jews by my experience in Israel”, “after several months there” (Friedman, 1972, p.18). Yet it is almost certain that he was not referring here to his experience in Israel in 1972, but rather to an earlier trip in 1962. As stated in his autobiography written with his wife Rose, Friedman had visited Israel three times prior to the 1972 Mont Pèlerin Society meeting: in 1962, 1969 and 1972. His first visit in 1962 was the

longest and was the only one to last several months (Friedman and Friedman, 1998, pp.460-463).¹⁰ This is further confirmed by the Horowitz lecture that Friedman gave in Israel in 1972, where he acknowledged: “when I was here ten years ago, I summarized my conclusions about the Israeli economy by saying that two Jewish traditions were at war in Israel” (Friedman, 1973-b, p.56).¹¹ Additional evidence of Friedman’s interest in the subject before 1972 comes from a 1969 article in the Israeli newspaper *Maariv*. During Friedman’s second visit to Israel, an Israeli journalist reported that “Professor Friedman wishes to prepare an in-depth study regarding [the question of] why the vast majority of Jews are [...] in general among the leading socialist warriors” (Har Gil, 1969, p.18).¹²

The various ideas, arguments and examples developed in *Capitalism and the Jew* appeared even before Friedman’s visits to Israel. The first occurrence can be traced back indeed to *Capitalism and Freedom*, a series of lectures organized by the Volker fund in 1956, later typed and edited by Rose Friedman in 1962 (Blundell 2013). The example of the Jews’ benefits from capitalism opens the chapter on “Capitalism and Discrimination”. Then comes

¹⁰ In 1969, Friedman stayed two weeks in Israel (*Lamerkhav*, 1969). In 1972, Friedman came to Israel to deliver the Horowitz lectures (Friedman and Friedman, 1998, p.463).

¹¹ David Horowitz was a former head of the Bank of Israel. It should be noted that Lipkes also mentions in a footnote of his article that Friedman’s insight about “two traditions at war” was inspired by “an earlier stay in Israel, in 1962”. Yet in a somewhat contradictory way, Lipkes still holds that Friedman did not show interest in the subject before 1972 (Lipkes, 2019, p.194).

¹² We thank one of the two anonymous referees for having pointed out to us these last two references. We borrowed his or her translation for the article in *Maariv*.

the same paradox as in *Capitalism and the Jews*: “in spite of this historical evidence, it is precisely the minority groups that have frequently furnished the most vocal and most numerous advocates of fundamental alterations in a capitalist society” (Friedman, 1962 [1982], pp.108-9).

After 1972, each time Friedman writes or speaks about Israel or topics pertaining to Israel, he frequently uses his main idea—the paradoxical Jewish attitude toward capitalism. The exact same arguments were repeated in an interview for *Playboy* Magazine in 1973 (Friedman, 1973-a), in a commencement talk delivered at Hebrew University of Jerusalem in 1977 (Friedman, 1977-c), in a Newsweek column on “Israel’s Other War” (22 August 1977, p. 57), when speaking in Richard Heffner’s talk show *The Open Mind* in 1977 (Heffner, 1977), in a television interview in Israel (quoted in *The Sentinel*, 1977), and at a conference at the B’nai B’rith Hillel Foundation in Chicago in 1976 (Friedman, 1976). Friedman also recalled the same arguments about Israel and socialism in his Opening Address in a 1988 Symposium on American-Israeli Economic Relations (Friedman, 1988b).¹³ Yet the 1972 Lecture was not the result of Friedman’s purely private curiosity. Behind *Capitalism and the Jews* were also political aspects that motivated him to choose this particular topic for his Mont Pèlerin society Presidential Address.

¹³ It should be noted that most of these post-1972 references are known and acknowledged by Lipkes. Our critic against Lipkes is thus aimed at his chronological account before 1972, and not after 1972.

1. 2. Lecturing about culture and values: a bait for “big names”

Whereas Lipkes relates Friedman’s argument mostly to Sombart’s text, we suggest that this focus does not grasp the motivation of Friedman at all. Friedman very likely had a second-hand knowledge of Sombart, and more generally of Jewish economic history, as he acknowledged himself. The reference to Sombart was probably motivated by polemical intentions – a classical gesture for Friedman in his non-academic interventions – but does not explain why Friedman chose *Capitalism and the Jews* as the theme of his presidential lecture. Archival material reveals that Irving Kristol played a more important role than Sombart to explain Friedman’s motives.

In 1972, for its 25th anniversary, the Mont Pèlerin society was back on the Swiss mountain that gave it its name. The society was however a different one. From 25 in 1947, the membership has grown to 372 members in 1972, and the intellectual leadership has passed from Hayek to Friedman (Burgin 2012, Chapter 5 and 6, pp. 207-213). The small gathering of peers coming from different disciplines paved the way to a crowd of mostly libertarian-oriented economists and businessmen. Friedman had been president for two years and was eager to attract non-economists as members, and to revitalize the intellectual profusion of the first years of the society. Friedman was thus looking

for new alliances and extended influence. As part of this general agenda, Friedman invited Irving Kristol to participate as a speaker. Kristol, at the time Henry Luce Professor of Urban Values at New York University, was a prominent public intellectual whose personal trajectory, from a young Trotskyist within the 'New York Intellectuals' circle to the "standard-bearer" of neo-conservatism (Steinfels 1979, p.85), changed direction after his disillusion with what he framed as the cultural consequences of the 'War on Poverty'.

Kristol's lecture at the Mont Pèlerin society meeting was a plea against "economic thinking" and the failure of free-market thinkers to enter the culture wars. In Kristol's perspective, "economic thinking" implied non-interference toward individual preferences. Such non-interference was the basis of "liberal civilization", and was threatened by the New Left, whose main argument was, unlike the Old Left, no longer about strictly "economic" issues (e.g., central planning) but rather about the negative cultural dimensions of capitalism. Yet Kristol also deplored the fact that the Mont Pèlerin society has abandoned the war centered on values (Kristol, 1973, p.7-9). Kristol saw Friedman as the typical libertarian, retreating from the discussion on the "cultural perils of capitalism" (Burgin 2012, p.212).

Friedman may not have heard or read Kristol's lecture before his own address. Yet he was well informed of Kristol's intellectual agenda. Friedman

was sympathetic to Kristol's views (Burgin, 2012, p.211), and they both had been in touch through their contributions to the editorial page of the *Wall Street Journal* (Murray Friedman, 2005, p.181). Kristol's ideas had also been diffused through *Public Interest*, a review Kristol founded in 1965 with Daniel Bell. *Public Interest* offered a venue to criticisms of the Welfare State and the Johnson administration based on cultural arguments (Hamburger and Steinmetz-Jenkins, 2018).

Friedman knew that the question of values and culture was decisive for Kristol. Lecturing about *Capitalism and the Jews* was the occasion to engage a discussion on the cultural aspects of capitalism. Just like Kristol, Friedman insisted in his address on the necessity to change not so much the economy, but rather "the climate of opinion" (Friedman, 1972, p.3). The beginning of his lecture echoes Kristol's arguments that the New Left had "been intellectually defeated on its chosen battleground, i.e. economics" but was now launching a successful "assault on liberal society" on cultural values (Kristol, 1972, p.5). Friedman framed his agenda for the Mont Pèlerin society as a cultural issue: the society had been unsuccessful in moving the *intellectual opinion* in the right direction and in "persuading intellectuals everywhere" of their views (Friedman, 1972, p.3).

Friedman took various initiatives to attract Kristol to the Mont Pèlerin society meeting. As president of the society, he offered to finance both speakers

and wives' personal fees to "bait" a "big fish" such as Irving Kristol.¹⁴ Kristol initially refused but eventually agreed to deliver a talk after "much determined cajoling" (Burgin 2012, p.211) from Friedman. Yet Friedman's strategy was not successful, at least in the short-run. Kristol participated to the Montreux conference, but his lecture challenged Friedman's "economic thinking" (Burgin, 2012, p.211). After the 1972 conference, Kristol and Friedman exchanged letters about *Capitalism and the Jews*. Kristol offered harsh criticism of Friedman's essay. From Kristol's perspective, cultural problems such as those raised by Friedman in *Capitalism and the Jews* could not be addressed in purely economic terms. Interpreting Jewish mentality requires interpreting Jewish culture, values and religion: "the problem, I think, is that you know so much more about capitalism than you do about Jews. To my mind, there is simply no question but that Jewish "values" have played an absolutely crucial [...] role in causing Jews to be sympathetic to the left."¹⁵ Kristol had his own cultural interpretation.¹⁶

In the end, Friedman's strategy was rather limited. As a symbolic gesture, he deliberately chose to address a cultural problem instead of monetary

14 "The inviting of speakers with the condition that their wives also get hotel fare was a bait that Milton and I contrived for some of the big names like Popper or Kristol" (George Stigler to Ralph Harris, 15/03/1972, Box 18 folder 6, Mont Pelerin Society Records).

15 Irving Kristol to Friedman 16/10/72, Box 220 Folder 7, MFA.

16 Kristol highlighted to Friedman the importance of Jewish messianism, which he argued explained a large part of "Jewish leftism" (Irving Kristol to Friedman 16/10/72, Box 220 Folder 7, MFA).

policy for his presidential lecture. Yet he did not go further in this direction of studying carefully his own claims about Jewish cultural history. As he recognized himself after the conference, he did not possess the necessary skills in history and sociology to treat these complex cultural questions that were however central in the theme of *Capitalism and the Jews*: the paper “has led me way out of my ordinary field of specialization”, confessed Friedman to Nathan Glazer right after the Montreux gathering.¹⁷

1. 3. Theoretical influences: Glazer, racial conservatism and the economics of discrimination

A striking feature of *Capitalism and the Jews* is the weakness of many of its empirical claims. As Lipkes points out, Friedman’s broad generalizations have limited historical validity (e.g., conservative parties in nineteenth century Europe were not pro-market; Lipkes, 2019, p.199). More fundamentally, Friedman’s *method* in *Capitalism and the Jews* is particularly weak. The lecture consists mostly of what seem to be personal opinions and casual impressions on a subject about which Friedman is far from being knowledgeable.

Particularly significant in this regard is Friedman’s anecdote about his participation in a monetary conference. At the beginning of the lecture, Friedman recalls attending an International Monetary Conference in which

¹⁷ Friedman to Nathan Glazer 18/09/72, Box 220 Folder 7, MFA.

participants were either top executives in major commercial banks or intellectuals, including academics. Friedman estimates “roughly” that only 1% of the first group were Jewish, compared to 25 percent for the second. According to Friedman, this confirms the under-representation and over-representation of Jews in respectively monopolistic and free-market sectors of the society – “banking today is everywhere monopolistic” whereas “intellectual activity [...] is a highly competitive industry” (Friedman, 1972, p.5).

The simple figures brought here by Friedman seem to bring direct evidence for his argument but are actually much more complex to interpret from a historical perspective.¹⁸ Many cases in the text are loosely based on “impressions” and anecdotes that seem to serve the purpose of oral persuasion in a casual conversation. This casual dimension is also visible in the vague generalities about “Jews in the Diaspora” and “Jews in Israel” in the end of the paper: “Jews in the Diaspora were reputed to be excellent cooks; cooking in Israel is generally terrible” argued Friedman to support his claim that Israeli Jews are trying to do exactly the opposite of Jews in the Diaspora in order to differentiate themselves from “Jewish stereotypes” (Friedman, 1972, p.19).

Capitalism and the Jews could thus be understood as what Fleury and Marciano

18 Just to mention an obvious problem, beyond the anecdotal nature of the argument: Friedman provides no reason for his claim that universities are less monopolistic than the banking sector. It can be argued on the contrary that free entry has not been a universal characteristic of intellectual activity, especially in academia. In the US, there were many restrictions to the admission of Jews in the universities until the 1940s (Synnott, 1979, Karabel, 2005), elements Friedman perfectly knew from personal experiences and knowledge.

call “casual economic thinking”, referring to the discussion of the Becker-Posner blog. According to Fleury and Marciano, Becker and Posner were not interested on their blog in being “theoretically sound and correct” but in making short and striking arguments (Fleury and Marciano, 2013, p.271). We argue that this was also the case of Friedman with *Capitalism and the Jews*.

As a case of “casual economic thinking”, *Capitalism and the Jews* can be distinguished from Friedman’s academic contributions. Yet, the essay was not completely unrelated to academic works. It should be noted first that Friedman did some research to back up his claims. Besides anecdotes and impressions, Friedman quoted academic references in political science, sociology, history, and philosophy.¹⁹ Of particular interest for Friedman was Glazer’s article entitled “Social characteristics of American Jews, 1654-1954”, that contained many statistical data (Glazer, 1955). Friedman also quoted two books by Glazer (Glazer, 1957; 1961). Right after the Mont Pèlerin society meeting, Friedman asked several scholars for comment. It is worth noticing that Glazer was the only recipient of Friedman’s reprint to give a positive assessment of Friedman’s essay.²⁰ In his reply to Friedman, Glazer considered

¹⁹ These references include Wilson and Banfield, 1964; Fuchs, 1956; Cohn, 1956 ; Rivkin, 1971 and Arendt, 1951.

²⁰ Right after the conference, the reprints of the lectures circulated beyond participants to the Mont Pèlerin society meeting. Lipkes provides the exact list of the recipients to whom a reprint was sent: Nathan Glazer, Martin Bronfenbrenner, Stanley Fischer, Irving Kristol, Edward K. Offenbacher, George Stigler, Anna Schwartz, Leo Rosten, Edward Banfield, and Herbert Frankel. The last four recipients either did not reply or Friedman did not retain their answers. (Lipkes, 2019, pp.195-196).

Capitalism and the Jews as an interesting essay and gave Friedman an additional reference on the topic, that Friedman discusses in his next letter to Glazer.²¹

It can be hypothesized that Glazer's positive reading of Friedman's casual discussion on a topic Glazer knew very well can reasonably be explained by Friedman and Glazer's common theoretical interest and political convictions about the question of racial discrimination and minorities.²² Both Glazer and Friedman were eager to provide an intellectual criticism of what they saw as the intellectual basis of the civil rights movement. Beginning in the mid-1960s, and crystalizing in the book *Affirmative Discrimination* published in 1975, Glazer's thought became increasingly critical of affirmative action policies. Friedman changed his mind on civil rights evolving from a mild support in the early 1950s to a belief that market incentives were a better and faster road to racial integration than any legislation.²³ But both Friedman's and Glazer's basic

²¹ Nathan Glazer to Friedman 22/09/72, and Friedman to Nathan Glazer 11/10/72, Box 220 Folder 7, MFA.

²² Glazer was at the time a sociologist from Harvard University. Like Kristol, Glazer had evolved from Trotskyism to neo-conservatism. Glazer was also a regular contributor to Kristol's review *Public Interest* (Hamburger and Steinmetz-Jenkins, 2018). See Dorman (2000) and the film "Arguing the World" for oral history of four of the "New Intellectuals".

²³ Unearthed by Burgin in Friedman's correspondence with Machlup in 1952, Friedman demonstrated a "genuine concern with civil rights and a preference for politicians who emphasized the issue" (Burgin 2012, p.202). His beliefs that private alternatives to government-administrated school would foster integration was the main argument in his criticism of forced desegregation. In *Capitalism and Freedom* (1962, p.113), Friedman compared Roosevelt's Fair Employment Practice Committee's types of legislation, banning discrimination in Federal employment and in contracting for war work, to "the Hitler Nuremberg laws and the laws in the Southern states." The *Crimson* report his objection to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 from his intervention at Harvard the same year. *The Crimson*, "Friedman Clarified", May 12, 1964,

argument was the same: affirmative action in universities and businesses went beyond mere non-discrimination, hence beyond the meaning of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the initial intent of the Congress.²⁴ It also violates states' rights to self-govern as well as business freedom. This type of argument was the basis of "racial conservatism" in the late 1960s—which consist in "oppos[ing] federal intervention on racial issues while supporting the principle of equal opportunity" (Burstein, 1998, xxxiii).

Friedman's views on economic discrimination against the Jews was also probably inspired by the work of the historian Arcadius Kahan, a specialist of Russian and Jewish economic history. Though no archival evidence were found, Kahan and Friedman were very probably familiar with each other: both were colleagues in the same department during more than twenty years.²⁵ Friedman's *Capitalism and the Jews* bears some common features with Kahan's research.

Source : <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/1964/5/12/friedman-clarified-pt-to-the-editors-of/> [26/08/2020].

²⁴ While converging on Nixon's Administration having distorted Congress's intent, Friedman did not seem to fully adhere to the intent of the Congress in the first place. He advised one of the main opponents to the passage of the Civil Rights Act, Barry Goldwater. Burgin reports Friedman's only criticism to Goldwater was that he should have made his position known earlier in the campaign. Goldwater's perspective on the non-interference to states' rights was "excellent" and a true manifestation of "equal treatment of all, regardless of race". Friedman's interview in Chesly Manly, "U.C. Economic Experts Advise Goldwater" in the *Chicago Tribune*, p.8, quoted by Burgin (2012, p.202).

²⁵ Born and raised in Vilna, Kahan migrated to the US in 1950 (Mohrer and Web, 1998, p.146) and was brought to the University of Chicago, first as a research associate. He joined the College faculty and the department of economics in 1962 (Weiss, 1985, p.ix). Kahan's papers at YIVO (YIVO Archives. Papers of Arcadius Kahan, RG 1156) do not include any correspondence. In any case, the Kahan-Friedman correspondence is probably non-existent, since Kahan and Friedman were colleagues at Chicago.

One of Kahan's important ideas was indeed that anti-Jewish discrimination in Russia had strong and negative effects on both Jews and Russians (Kahan, 1986). Conversely, argued Kahan, "by not requiring that the commodities produced have any labels other than the price tag the free market works against discrimination" (Kahan in Gross, 1975, p. 83). More generally, Kahan used what he referred to as "economic analysis" to portray the Russian Jew as a "rational economic man" (Frankel, 1986, p.xii).²⁶

Beside Glazer and Kahan, another important academic influence on Friedman's essay was Becker's taste-based model of discrimination.²⁷ Friedman took from Becker a simple argument on individuals' sovereignty *vis-à-vis* the government: even if a majority of individuals see a preference as discriminatory, the government must remain neutral. Government should not impose the tastes of the majority on a minority. From this perspective, competitive forces will eliminate discriminatory practices. This argument is to be found in the chapter of *Capitalism and Freedom* devoted to discrimination (Friedman, 1962, 108-119) with direct references to Becker. Friedman used

²⁶ In an article about Soviet Jews, Kahan explicitly referred the "economic" methodology in his analysis to Friedman: "such opportunities were not granted without a price, or as my colleague Milton Friedman says, 'There ain't such thing as a free lunch'" (Kahan, 1986, pp.196-197).

²⁷ Friedman was involved in the supervision of Gary Becker's dissertation on "The Economics of Racial Discrimination" defended in 1955. At a personal level, Friedman strongly supported Becker's career and put all his authority in favor of the publishing of *The Economics of Discrimination* in 1957, after the University of Chicago Press first rejected the book (see Fleury's account of the incident, 2012, p.20-21). Friedman also supported Becker for membership at the Mont Pèlerin society (Friedman to Ralph Harris, 11/12/67, Box 85 Folder 7, MFA).

Jewish economic history as a confirmation of his personal views about economic discrimination in general: his remarks on the Jews are often repeated to apply to all minorities.²⁸ For this reason, *Capitalism and the Jews* can be compared to the *Capitalism and Freedom* of the early 1970s. Another reason is its provocative tone when, for example, Friedman compares Roosevelt's Fair employment practices legislation to the Hitler Nuremberg laws (Friedman, 1962 [1982], p.113).²⁹ The underlying narrative about the historical role of capitalism for minorities is exactly the same.

Another important theoretical influence in Friedman's rhetoric about minorities was the question of professions as "non-competing groups" on the labor market. This relates to an earlier interest of Friedman. His dissertation written with Simon Kuznets and entitled "Income from Independent Professional Practice" was a detailed empirical study of the relatively higher incomes in independent professions (such as physicians, dentists, lawyers and certified accountants). Friedman and Kuznets argued that such incomes were due to occupational licensure that allowed independent professions to reduce competition (Friedman and Kuznets, 1945)³⁰. Another influential academic

²⁸ See for instance Heffner, 1977; quotation at 46'45; Friedman, 1976, at 23'; Friedman, 1985-b, p.446.

²⁹ Besides *Capitalism and the Jews*, Friedman also told the Israelis on more than one occasion that fixed exchange rate regimes had been invented by the Nazis to prevent outflows of Jewish capital (e.g., Har Gil, 1969, p.18).

³⁰ The dissertation was published as an article in 1939 and then as a book in 1945. Kuznets worked later on Jewish economic history and wrote several essays on this topic. Kuznets' studies in Jewish economic history have been recently edited (Kuznets, 2017).

contribution in this domain was Reuben Kessel's 1958 paper which circulated widely at Chicago. Entitled "Price Discrimination in Medicine", it was a case-study of discriminating monopoly in the medical profession. Kessel's results showed similarly to Kuznets and Friedman that the medical profession, as a whole, and in the case of a specific national organization, was acting as a monopoly and discriminating against minorities, especially the Jews.

Friedman had a superficial interest in the economics of discrimination; he took from this burgeoning field only what served his rhetorical purpose. A very important literature using wage differences to measure discrimination was developing, alongside new theoretical arguments, starting in the late 1960s. Later on, Friedman did not engage with the important literature on discrimination and affirmative action being published in economic journals in the 1970's.

In the early 1970s, Friedman received a lot of criticism by (sometimes very close friends, and) specialists of the subject. The weak empirical evidence was criticized.³¹ Also noted was his lack of precise definition for "capitalism".³² Stanley Fischer also pointed out that the dichotomy between "freedom" and "collectivism" was far too general.³³ Friedman was criticized for being ignorant

³¹ See for instance the handwritten comments on Friedman's reprint: paragraphs are annotated with strong negative comments such as "irrelevant", "has changed", "no". The comments are signed in a following note by the nickname of "Josi" that we hypothesize Josi is Joseph Ben-David, an Israeli sociologist and a close friend to Friedman.

³² See for instance anonymous letter to Friedman undated Box 220 Folder 7, MFA.

³³ Fischer to Friedman 10/10/72, Box 220 Folder 7, MFA.

of cultural issues. His choice to deliberately and polemically consider Sombart a relevant reference was largely commented. In the margins of *Capitalism and the Jews* reprint, sociologist Joseph Ben-David already pinpoints the Sombart reference as “non-sense – not worth quoting”. He recommended that Friedman “Leave S. [Sombart]. Take Katz, Baer”.³⁴ In later version of the text, Friedman did not incorporate these criticisms or add nuances, precisely because the objective of his paper was not to write an academic piece on Jewish history but a pamphlet in favor of free market directed to specific audiences.

2. Beyond and After the Mont Pèlerin Society meeting: Building New Audiences

2.1. A Personal Matter

Friedman made it clear that discrimination was a personal matter for him, as a non-leftist Jew.³⁵ Friedman personally experienced discrimination in 1940-1941 (Lampman, 1993).³⁶ Though Lipkes claims that *Capitalism and the*

³⁴ More precisely, he recommends *Tradition and Crisis* by Jacob Katz (Katz, 1961 [2000]). Baer refers probably to historian Yitzhak Baer (“Capitalism and the Jews”, Box 220 Folder 7, MFA). On the Sombart problem, see also the anonymous letter to Friedman undated Box 220 Folder 7, MFA.

³⁵ This double identity is also put forward in his correspondence on gender discrimination with Carolyn Bell in the early 1970s. Friedman wrote that he felt “very much concerned with two [...] issues of discrimination on university campuses: one, between Jew and non-Jew; and second, between different political views, in particular what has come to be called liberal and conservative” (Friedman to Carolyn Shaw Bell 01/08/73, Box 20 Folder 34, MFA).

³⁶ Friedman was not fully aware of every element at the time, and Lipkes reports that according to David Friedman, Milton’s son, his father did not attribute his ousting to antisemitism (Lipkes, 2019, pp.221-222). Yet Friedman realized the problem later after reading Lampman’s inquiry (Weintraub, 2014, p.120). See also Friedman and Friedman (1998, p.58, p.100).

Jews “is worth considering for the light it sheds on the view of [Friedman’s] heritage”, he very rapidly dismisses the importance of Friedman’s personal relationship to Judaism. Friedman was indeed not an observant Jew.³⁷ However, he and his wife were concerned by the fate of the Jews, particularly in the Soviet Union.³⁸ Friedman made regular donations to United Jewish Appeal (UJA), the main Jewish philanthropic organization.³⁹ He was also familiar with American Jewish “pop culture”, as his participation at the University of Chicago in “The Great Latke-Hamantasch Debate” indicates. Participants in this ironic debate discuss the relative merits of Latke (a traditional Jewish dish served at Hanukah) and Hamantasch (cakes served during the feast of Purim); Friedman provided a humoristic contribution using equations and formula.⁴⁰

The Friedmans were second generation-immigrants, who were – unlike

³⁷ After a “fanatically religious phase” at the age of 12, Friedman dropped religion completely (Friedman and Friedman, 1998, p.23; Ebenstein, 2007, p.9). His wife Rose came from a more observant background but she “came at a young age to look on religious belief as superstition” (Friedman and Friedman, 1998, p.40). Both Rose and Milton were neither part of a Jewish Community nor frequented a synagogue on a regular basis; their children were educated non-religiously, the Friedman family celebrated Christmas and not Jewish holidays (Friedman and Friedman, 1998, p.82). The couple married religiously at Rose’s request, to please her parents, after Milton long refused to do so (Friedman and Friedman, 1998, p.23). Lipkes’ conversations with Friedman’s daughter and son suggest that their father never spoke with them on this subject, and claimed to be agnostic (Lipkes, 2019, p.195).

³⁸ Friedman collected numerous references on the situation of Jews in the Soviet Union. His papers contain a box entitled “Soviet Jewry”, filled with surveys, press and academic articles (Box 205 Folder 6, MFA). The material was requested by Friedman to the Academic and Professional Committee on Soviet Jewry (Harold Lerner to Friedman undated, Box 205 Folder 6, MFA.) In their autobiography, Milton and Rose recall that during their trip to the Soviet Union, they went for Rosch Hashana in a synagogue in Moscow, and felt deeply saddened by the situation of Russian Jews (Friedman and Friedman, 1998, pp.287-289).

³⁹ Friedman to H. Lichtman 11/03/80, Box 197 Folder 1, MFA

⁴⁰ A reprint of Friedman’s speech is to be found in Cernea (2006), pp.71-72..

their parents – non-observant and highly assimilated to American culture, yet still culturally attached to the Jewish community in general. Such a trajectory is actually very typical of Eastern Jewish immigrants in the US, who followed a pattern of rapid socio-economic advancement, resulting in partial or full abandonment of rituals, acculturation to American culture and secular attachment to Jews and Judaism.⁴¹

Friedman also expressed a personal interest in Israel politics. In 1952, he was approached to participate in an economic advisory team in Israel; he had to turn down the offer but told Don Patinkin: “it broke my heart to refuse the request, since I would love personally to spend a few months in Israel for all kinds of reasons that you can readily understand” (Friedman to Patinkin, 02/04/1952, cited in Leeson, 1998, p.438). Friedman had also a good knowledge of Israel’s political and social situation, through his early correspondence with Don Patinkin in the 1950s and later on with sociologist Joseph Ben-David, and his three trips to Israel prior to the Mont Pèlerin society meeting (cf. *supra*). It could be objected that Friedman was interested in Israel, not necessarily in Jews and Judaism. Yet later on, answering a question about his support to the newly elected Likud government, Friedman said: “I have a very strong, personal sympathy and interest in Israel. I am Jewish by origin and culture, I share their

⁴¹ This pattern of socio-economic progress is a well-documented phenomenon: see Kuznets, 1972, 1975, chapter 10 in Kahan, 1975; Chiswick, 1983, 1993, 2010; Lederhendler, 2009. For general references on American Jewish history, see Sarna 2004; Diner, 2004.

values and beliefs, I share the admiration [...] for the miracles that occurred in Israel” (Heffner, 1977, quotation at 50’).

Pointing out the contradiction of what he referred to as “Jewish leftism” was also a way for Friedman to persuade his own community of his belief in the virtues of the free-market. Friedman’s lecture at University of Chicago Hillel in 1976 offers the opportunity to understand how Friedman meant to convey his arguments in the context of a Jewish audience.

2.2. Playing with cultural stereotypes: *Capitalism and the Jews* in the context of a Jewish audience

In 1976, the B’nai B’rith Hillel Foundation, a Jewish student organization, asked Friedman to give a lecture at the University of Chicago. The talk was moved to a larger auditorium, as Friedman had won the Nobel Prize in between the invitation and the event.⁴² Friedman used the same text as the 1972 “Capitalism and the Jews” as the basis for his talk. Such a choice was risky. As seen before, *Capitalism and the Jews* was polemical and filled with controversial statements. Despite being “at home” at the University of Chicago, he was not “at home” at Hillel: Friedman was not a regular member nor did he

⁴² The audio recording is available at: <https://www.law.uchicago.edu/recordings/milton-friedman-capitalism-and-jews>. Quotes in this subsection are made from this audio file, referred as Friedman, 1976.

ever participate in the Hillel community or in any another Jewish organization in Chicago. At the very beginning of his lecture, he highlighted the tradition of “variety and diversity and independence at the University of Chicago” and warned his audience of the controversial nature of his talk: “Now, [on] the views which I am going to express tonight on the subject of Capitalism and the Jews, will I think beyond that tradition? And I’m not sure that Hillel will be entirely happy about inviting me to express those views” (Friedman, 1976, 7’). Yet, the audio recording of the conference shows that Friedman’s lecture was an overwhelming success. The crowd was laughing and applauding throughout the talk. This is further confirmed by a letter written by Daniel Leifer, at the time Rabbi at Hillel Chicago, a week after the conference: “It was also a fine and stimulating talk. Students at Hillel have been discussing it throughout the week. I personally enjoyed it and learn from you”.⁴³ During the following discussion with his audience, Friedman got the usual attacks about his role as a political advisor in Chile (Friedman, 1976, 1’04’). Yet he was not questioned about his use of Jewish stereotypes.

A first reason for the success of the 1976 lecture at Hillel was Friedman’s ability to establish a cultural proximity and connection with his audience. In the beginning of his lecture, right after his warning, Friedman said: “But after all, the Jews also have a tradition of tolerance and diversity. As you

⁴³ Rabbi Daniel Leifer to Friedman, 22/10/76, Box 220 Folder 7, MFA.

know, it is an old Jewish saying that if there are two Jews in any community there are always three synagogues” (Friedman, 1977, 7’). This sense of cultural proximity confirms our interpretation that Friedman consciously chose not to speak and write about *Capitalism and the Jews* in an impersonal tone. Personal involvement was also reflected by Friedman’s concern for antisemitism. He argued in a long digression that antisemitism was at the heart of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York’s unwillingness to save the Bank of United States in 1930 (Friedman, 1976, 17’). Friedman also mocked the “popular fiction” that Jews control the bank (Friedman, 1976, 16’).

A second reason for the “warm response” to the 1976 lecture at Hillel was Friedman’s sense of humor and ability to play with Jewish stereotypes. The content of the 1976 talk at Hillel shows *no* substantial changes compared to the reprint of the Mont Pèlerin society lecture. Yet Friedman did not recite line by line, and made numerous digressions, that mostly consisted in jokes and funny remarks. As suggested by his performance in the TV show *Free to Choose*, Friedman was a gifted orator who knew how to amuse his audience (Burgin, 2012). Friedman also knew that many of his claims were excessive and highly polemical, but always found a way to communicate it with humor and self-irony. For instance, at the end of his talk, Friedman mocked his own statement about cultural differences between Israeli Jews and Jews in the Diaspora: “and now, to add the absolutely final capstone to this demonstration... The Jews in

the Diaspora were marvelous cooks!” (Friedman, 1976, 47’).

Self-irony allowed Friedman not only to make people laugh, but more fundamentally to suggest that he was deliberately exaggerating his own views, and thus authorized to flirt and play with stereotypes. This was the case for instance of the alleged “Jewish intellectuality”, introduced and explained by Friedman, here again in a humorous tone: “Jews have been disproportionately intellectual... if you are a persecuted minority, more subject to being forced to flee from where you are, you’d want to accumulate your capital in forms in which you can take with you. And the best way to do it is obviously as [an] intellectual. [...] That’s why they [the Jews] accumulated brains! And I can see that all of you being in the process of making that kind of capital accumulation” (Friedman, 1976, 32’-34’). Friedman’s argument about “investing in brains” is a common cultural explanation for the alleged superiority of the Jews in intellectual occupations, which can be easily dismissed.⁴⁴ Even if it might be seen as a virtue or a praise, the belief in Jewish superior intelligence, like any

Commenté [SPI]: “Is this an accurate transcription? I’d expect ‘forms in which you can take with you’ to be either ‘forms which ...’ or ‘forms in which you can take it ...’ and ‘obviously in intellectual’ to be ‘intellect’ and ‘I can see that all of you being in the process’ either ‘I can see all of you’ or ‘I can see that all of you are’”

Commenté [CCZ2R1]: J’ai revérifié pour les trois.

⁴⁴ For a logical critique of this argument, see Ayal and Chiswick, 1983, pp.862-862: the problem is that human capital investments are portable, because they are embodied in the person, but they are not necessarily transferable, especially if there is a risk of random murders or if human capital investments are country-specific (e.g. degrees, diploma). For this reason, a Jewish lawyer had less transferable assets than a Jewish stockholder in Germany in the 1930s. Friedman’s argument can also be criticized from a historical perspective: if American Jews had on average better educational attainments in the 1970s (Chiswick, 1993), statistical studies in the early twentieth century showed the relatively high frequency of illiteracy among Russian Jews (Ruppin, 1906a). At the time, Jewish reformers and social scientists saw Jewish education in Eastern Europe -and in particular the *kheder*, the traditional school that provided almost exclusively for literacy in Hebrew for religious needs- as deficient and backward (e.g., Rabinowitsch, 1913; Lawin, 1905; on this matter, see Vallois, 2020).

stereotype, can be associated with both positive and negative meanings.⁴⁵ Half-jokes, half-truths: these statements also meant that Friedman (at least partially) endorsed the stereotypes he was playing with.

At the end of his talk, Friedman concluded that antisemitism “was based on the notion that Jews were money-grubbing, grasping, selfish, keepers” adding that “there’s nothing wrong with being money-grubbing!” (Friedman, 1976, 43’). This ironic play on Jewish stereotypes thus enabled Friedman to convey his essential message: “we”, as Jews, should be proud of being in favor of the free-market. In other words, it was a matter of turning the old prejudice into a positive quality.

Friedman’s interpretation of Sombart’s book as “philosemitic” falls in the same provocative rhetoric. The general idea of Jews as “inventors of capitalism”, one of Sombart’s views widely considered as antisemitic, and claimed that this idea was actually praise and should be a source of pride for Jews. No matter what Sombart exactly meant or wrote, Friedman firmly believed that the free-market and the Jews were good to one another. There were

⁴⁵ In his book on *The construction of the image of Jewish superior intelligence*, Sander Gilman argues that discussions over Jewish intelligence have their roots in debates about race and racial science in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. At the time, Jewish “intelligence” was not necessarily seen as a quality, and much more as a deformation, associated with nervous disease in particular (Gilman, 1996). The ambivalence of this stereotype is particularly visible in the economic domain. In debate over Jewish employment structure of the early twentieth century, Jews were sometimes praised for their “intellectual” achievements (e.g., innovation, entrepreneurial activities), but their excessive intellectual activities were also considered as a source of economic handicaps: e.g., lack of discipline, inaptitude for physical work, rebellion (Vallois, 2020).

no plain antisemitic intentions, but Friedman's intimate conviction involved (at least) partial subscription to the cultural stereotype that Jews and capitalism had specific affinities.

2.3. Friedman's cultural mission in Israel

Friedman's "cultural mission" among the Jews had not been restricted to Chicago, and extended to Israel too. Friedman had indeed a brief role in 1977 as an economic advisor to the Begin government, the first elected government in Israeli political history led by a right-wing party. This political experience in Israel was at best, mixed, but can be seen as a failure of influence. Right after Friedman's visit, the Israeli government launched an "economic revolution" based on free-market reforms; the revolution failed and the government abandoned the reforms by mid-1979. It seems that the Israeli government did not consult him regarding the detail of the "economic revolution", and that Friedman failed to actually implement his ideas (Schiffman *et al.*, 2017).

However, Friedman's activities in Israel were not so much about changing the actual economy, but rather the intellectual climate. After the 1977 events, Friedman remained active in the intellectual debates surrounding Israeli politics and economics. In particular, Friedman supported the activity of the conservative think-tank, the *Israel Center for Social and Economic Progress*

(hereafter ICSEP) in the 1980s.⁴⁶ Friedman's participation in the ICSEP was the natural extension of the agenda of his 1972 presidential lecture. As for Friedman, promoting free-market ideas in Israel was a way to counter-balance the second part of *Capitalism and the Jews*' paradox, i.e. the historical association of Jews with the Left. In a 1990 letter, Friedman regrets that right-wing think-tanks such as ICSEP were "greatly outnumbered and out-financed by the institutions that are on the other side of the picture. That is in turn simply a continuation of the historical tendency for Jews to be on the left".⁴⁷ Irving Kristol was also instrumental in the founding of the ICSEP.⁴⁸ Both Kristol and Friedman shared the idea that Israel had been ideologically "wrong" and should abandon its socialist bias. In a 1999 conference in Jerusalem, Kristol expressed regret that a conservative political tradition was lacking in Israel. The speech was subsequently published as an essay entitled "On the Political Stupidity of the Jews", and it contains many echoes of the paradox Friedman identified in *Capitalism and the Jews*.

The conventional narrative is that the Israeli economy went during its

⁴⁶ The ICSEP was funded by Daniel Doron, an Israeli political activist trained in economics. Doron translated *Free to Choose* in Hebrew in 1986. As suggests his correspondence with Doron, Friedman was very actively contributing to the activities of the Center. Friedman participated in fundraising (Friedman to Doron 22/09/86, 21/07/87, Box 200 Folder 2; Friedman to Doron 21/01/87, Box 200 Folder 3, MFA). At the demand of Doron, Friedman wrote laudatory blurbs that are still displayed at the front-page of the Center's website (<http://icsep.org.il/>).

⁴⁷ Friedman to Tab Taube 12/03/90, Box 197 Folder 3, MFA.

⁴⁸ Friedman to William Simon 14/03/90, Box 197 Folder 3, MFA.

history from government intervention and “Statism” to market economics (Ben-Porath, 1986; Kleiman, 1997; Ben-Basat, 2002). Though this evolution in Israel did probably not result from a conversion of state elites to Friedman’s economics and to the narrative told in *Capitalism and the Jews*, Friedman’s provocative rhetoric mirrors some political evolutions in the Jewish world. The informal political alliance between the Jews and the Left described by Friedman as an obvious fact, has been described in more accurate terms by historians and sociologists (Lipset and Everett, 1971; Liebman, 1969; Mendes, 2014; Jacobs, 2017). This alliance between the Jews and the Left is considered to have broken apart in the 1970s (Mendes, 2014; Jacobs, 2017). When Friedman first framed his paradox, the gradual transition of the main US Jewish organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) or the American Jewish Committee (AJC) toward conservatism was already underway. These organizations played an important role in the fight for civil rights and against discrimination in the postwar period (Svonkin, 1997; Murray Friedman, 2005; Mendes, 2014; Jacobs, 2017). The “informal alliance” between Jewish organizations and anti-discrimination struggles is seen to have gradually collapsed in the late 1960s, following the Six-Day War and the Yom Kippur War. It could thus be argued that Friedman’s *Capitalism and the Jews* coincided with the rise of Jewish conservatism and the dissolution of Friedman’s paradox.

2.4. 1980s publications of the essay: Friedman and neoconservative audiences

The unusual long delay between presenting, writing and actual publishing *Capitalism and the Jews*, as well as the venues where it eventually got published -*The Encounter* in 1984, *The Freeman* in 1988 and the collective book under the auspice of the right-wing Fraser Institute (1985)-, confirms our interpretation that Friedman's ultimate goal was not to produce an academic piece of intellectual history but rather a short essay to argue a long-standing argument about free-market to new audiences.

The first venue after the Hillel conference was a two-day symposium in Vancouver on "morality of the market" held in in August 1982 and organized by the Fraser Institute. Part of a Liberty Fund Inc. program, the meeting gathered a number of theologians and religious men—both Christians and Jewish—as well as many economists: Walter Block—senior economist at the Fraser Institue, Kenneth Boulding, H. Geoffrey Brennan, Kenneth G. Elzinga, Paul Heyne, Aaron Levine, David I. Meiselman, former president of the Mont Pèlerin society Arthur Shenfield and Anthony Waterman. And Milton Friedman. Papers, comments and discussions were printed after the symposium in a 1985 conference volume. This symposium is interesting because both Friedman and his commentators agreed on the lightness of evidence in *Capitalism and the Jews*. This suggests that Friedman and the organizers of the

symposium shared a common political agenda, that allowed them to go beyond the flaws of Friedman's essay.

This political agenda was clearly stated in the preface of the conference volume. The three editors -Block, Elzinga, and Geoffrey Brennan- claimed that the main objective of the symposium was to address a "political concern" regarding the domination of "an anti-market orientation [...] within the ecclesiastical establishment" (Boulding *et al.*, 1985, p.xvi). To change this situation, the organizers hoped "some useful purpose to be served by a dialogue between theologians and economists on the virtues and vices of the free market order" (Boulding *et al.*, 1985, p.xvi). Friedman's chapter was pivotal in the organization of the discussion.

Economist Sally Herbert Frankel's "Modern capitalism and the Jews", which had been written several years before, was included in the publication as a criticism of Friedman's text, while Frankel did not attend the seminar (Boulding *et al.*, 1985, p.xvii). Frankel has been one of the harshest critics of *Capitalism and the Jews* up to the point he devoted an entire lecture at the Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies to deconstruct Friedman's arguments.⁴⁹ The piece was published as a monograph (Frankel, 1983) before

49 Frankel (1903-1996) was first a professor of economics and economic history in University of Witwatersrand, South Africa, and in the postwar period, a professor of "Colonial Economic Affairs", and then of "Economics of Undeveloped Countries" at Oxford University. Frankel was a committed advocate for free market and opposed racial discrimination, while being unclear on the enfranchisement of black South-Africans (Feinstein 2004). He joined the Mont Pèlerin society in 1950. His relationship with Friedman dates back to the 1960s.

being a part of the Fraser's book (Frankel, 1985). The main attack concerned Friedman's arguments of the Jewish answer to the so called "Jewish stereotype", and his problematic reference to Sombart. According to Frankel, Friedman "did not realize that Sombart was using the Jews deliberately or unconsciously as a foil to promote socialist, and later national socialist ideas in the service of his fervent German patriotism" (Frankel, 1985, p.434).

Frankel went one step beyond in arguing that Friedman's piece and Sombart's book were actually similar both in form and content and should be therefore equally dismissed: Friedman used impressionistic evidence or forms of arguments which have a striking resemblance to those used by Sombart: "Friedman as well as Sombart [...] was seeking, in this way, simple explanations of political and economic circumstances which ideologically and emotionally deeply concerned them [...] Some one-hundred years after Sombart accused the Jews of responsibility for modern capitalism, Milton Friedman accused them of disproportionate intellectual and political support for socialism" (Frankel, 1985, p.440). In particular, Friedman's solution to his paradox—the Jewish reaction to the Jewish stereotype—is "the well-known stereotype of the *Salon Kommuniste* [...]—the rich man who hides his [...] feelings of guilt for being rich by joining the communist cause" (Frankel, 1985, p.435). Frankel judged Friedman view "a-historical and indefensible" and guilty of the "fallacy that races of people can be regarded as having identifiable

general characteristics or attitudes which determine their behaviors” (as summarized by Block in the introduction, p.xxiii).

Friedman’s defense was straightforward: Frankel’s analysis applied to Sombart’s thesis, not his. Lipkes analyzes in depth how Frankel “misread” Sombart (Lipkes, 2019, pp.202-206). Yet, Frankel’s reaction was unsurprising and expressing a pretty mainstream and still consensual interpretation of Sombart. Other criticisms made at the seminar made clear Friedman’s lightness of evidence (Elzinga, 1985, p.450-451; Levine, 1985, p.426))

The publication of Friedman’s essay despite these criticisms may be explained by Friedman’s prestige. But more fundamentally, participants to the symposium agreed on a common political agenda, and this is probably the reason they maintained some kind of agreement despite factual and empirical divergences. As related in Block’s introduction, “the informal discussion which follows” Friedman’s chapter, was meant to address empirical issues but also to “embrace the place of Jewish intellectuals in the neoconservative movement, with disagreement being voiced as to whether these individuals can be construed as being friends of the market system or not” (Boulding *et al.*, 1985, p. xxiii). This discussion, we argue, captures the main objective of Friedman’s piece.

During the symposium in Vancouver, Friedman welcomed these critical “comments from those [...] who are more knowledgeable about the subject of

this paper". He also acknowledged that he "did not publish [*Capitalism and the Jews*] at the time [he] wrote it because, talking with a number of people about it [...] they suggested that they were not persuaded by it; and so [he] decided [he] would have to do some more work; but [he] never did any more work". Friedman did probably not regard *Capitalism and the Jews* as one of his academic contributions, but he never ceased to believe in the main thesis of his paper and remained inflexible about the virtues of "free-market" for minorities: "as I read my paper over on the plane coming up, I felt that I really didn't want to change very much in it. So I don't mind having The Fraser Institute publish it in this form" (quoted in Elzinga 1985, p.459). In the end, *Capitalism and the Jews* was published in the Fraser Institute collective book, without any substantial changes since the first Mont Pèlerin society lecture.

Two years after the Fraser conference, Friedman's *Capitalism and the Jews* was published in the journal that exemplifies the neo-conservative turn, *Encounter*. Kristol, the "godfather of neo-conservatives", had co-founded the CIA-funded magazine in 1953. Friedman's publication of another version of *Capitalism and the Jews* in *Encounter* (Friedman 1984), his only publication in this magazine, epitomizes some convergence between neo-conservative agenda and free-markets advocates in the Reagan era.

During the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, there was indeed strong rivalry between what Jacob Hamburger and Daniel Steinmetz-Jenkins

call “neoliberalism” and “neoconservatism”. While neoliberalism aimed at “extending the economic model of the market to new areas of social life”, neoconservatism preferred “waging cultural warfare against the New Left” . The two tendencies became companions within the conservative movement in the 1980’s (Hamburger and Steinmetz-Jenkins, 2018, p.2). Friedman and Kristol are obvious major figures of this reconfiguration. They participated in the renewal of the American right and conservatism during and after the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.⁵⁰

This political interpretation is further confirmed by the last venue in which Friedman published *Capitalism and the Jews*: the libertarian magazine *The Freeman* (Friedman, 1988a). Created in 1950 by the Foundation for Economic Education and considered as a forerunner of the *National Review*, Hayek and von Mises contributed to the magazine (Hamilton, 1999).

However, Friedman was no “neoconservative” and free market remained the foundational basis of his liberalism. Friedman had abandoned the “neoliberal” label in the 1950s; he never fully stuck to “libertarian” and was dissatisfied with “conservatism” (Burgin 2012, p.175). As noted earlier, Friedman remained alien to the kind of “hawkish neoliberalism” (Krampf, 2018), i.e. strong military and political support of the Israeli State in the

50. For a historiographical point on the renewal of the history of conservative movement, see Allitt, 2009; Burgin, 2012; Burns 2010; 2014.

Palestinian conflict, as embodied by thinkers and political leaders such as Kristol or Netanyahu. While engaging different audiences, Friedman remained inflexible in his own rhetoric, his own belief in the virtues of the free-market and his visceral opposition to state intervention.

His interpretation of the history of Jews in academia offers an interesting parallel with how he makes instrumental use of the other minorities in a discussion on discrimination against women, as explained by Chassonnery-Zaïgouche, Cherrier and Singleton (2018) as well as against other minorities (Chassonnery-Zaïgouche 2014, chapter 6). Again, whether in private correspondence with economist Carolyn Bell on gender discrimination or on his reflection on the discrimination he experienced at Wisconsin, Friedman never departs from his line: yes, there was antisemitism (and racism and sexism) in society, and these translate into economic discrimination, but affirmative action as well as other state regulation were not the solution.

Conclusion

The present paper has focused on Friedman's public interventions on the theme of capitalism and the Jews in different contexts. The 1972 lecture at the Mont Pèlerin Society was not the result of Friedman's episodic interest in Jewish economic history. *Capitalism and the Jews* was strongly embedded in

discourses on the politics of minorities and discrimination from the 1960's to the 1980's. Even though Friedman refused the label "neoconservative" and was not an observant Jew, his essay was meant to meet neoconservative and Jewish audiences. Pointing out the contradiction of what he referred to as "Jewish leftism" was a rhetoric device whose objective was to persuade his audiences of the virtues of the free-market.

References

Allitt, Patrick. 2009. *The conservatives: Ideas and personalities throughout American history*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Arendt, Hannah. 1951. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace&Co.

Ayal, Eliezer. B., & Chiswick, Barry R. 1983. The economics of the diaspora revisited. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 31(4), 861-875.

Becker, Gary S. 1957. *The Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1957, 1971.

Ben-Basat, Avi. Editor. 2002. *The Israeli Economy, 1985-1998: From Government Intervention to Market Economics*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Ben-Porath, Yoram. Editor. 1986. *The Israeli economy: Maturing through crises*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Blundell, John. 2013. Where is the next Rose Director? *Econ Journal Watch*, 10(2): 162-166.

Boulding, Kenneth. E., Block, Walter, Brennan, Geoffrey, & Elzinga, Kenneth G. 1985. *Morality of the market: Religious and economic perspectives*. Vancouver: Fraser Inst.

Burgin, Angus. 2012. *The Great Persuasion: Reinventing Free Markets Since the Depression*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Burns, Jennifer. 2010. in search of a usable past: conservative thought in america. *Modern Intellectual History*, 7(2), 479-494.

Burns, Jennifer. 2014. across the great divide: free markets from right to left. *Modern Intellectual History*, 11(1), 253-265.

Burstein, Paul. 1998. Discrimination, jobs, and politics: The struggle for equal employment opportunity in the United States since the New Deal. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cernea, Ruth. Editor. 2005. *The Great Latke-Hamantash Debate*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Chassonnery-Zaïgouche, Cléo. 2014. *Expliquer, Mesurer, Prouver. Une histoire de l'économie des discrimination 1957-2010*. Ph.D thesis, University Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne.

Chassonnery-Zaïgouche, Cléo. 2018. Crossing Boundaries, Displacing Previous Knowledge and Claiming Superiority: Is the Economics of Discrimination a Conquest of Economics Imperialism? in Uskali Mäki, Manuela Fernández Pinto, and Adrian Walsh (eds.), *Scientific Imperialism: Exploring the Boundaries of Interdisciplinarity*, London: Routledge.

Chassonnery-Zaïgouche, Cléo, Béatrice Cherrier and John Singleton. 2018. A game of mirrors? Economists' models of the labor market and the 1970s gender reckoning. Blog post, March 6.

<https://beatricecherrier.wordpress.com/2018/03/06/a-game-of-mirrors-economists-models-of-the-labor-market-and-the-1970s-gender-reckoning/>

[Accessed 15 may]

Chiswick, Barry. R. 1983. The earnings and human capital of American Jews. *Journal of Human Resources*, 313-336.

Chiswick, Barry. R. 1993. The skills and economic status of American Jewry: Trends over the last half-century. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 11(1, Part 1), 229-242.

Chiswick, Barry. R. 2010. "The Economic Progress of American Jewry: From Eighteenth Century Merchants to Twenty-First Century Professionals" in Aaron Levine, ed., *Oxford Handbook of Judaism and Economics*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 625-645.

Cohn, Werner. 1956. Sources of American Jewish Liberation – Study of the Political Alignments of American Jews, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, New School for Social Research.

Diner, Hasia R. 2004. *The Jews of the United States, 1654 to 2000*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dorman, Joseph. 2000. *Arguing the World. The New York Intellectuals in their own words*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Ebenstein, Lanny. 2007. *Milton Friedman: a biography*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Elzinga, Kenneth. G. editor. 1985. *Discussion* in Boulding, Kenneth. E., Block, Walter, Brennan, Geoffrey, & Elzinga, Kenneth G. 1985. *Morality of the market: Religious and economic perspectives*. Vancouver: Fraser Inst, pp.401-418. pp.446-459

Feinstein, Charles. H. 2004. Frankel, (Sally) Herbert. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Online edition.

Fleury, Jean-Baptiste, & Marciano, Alain. 2013. Becker and Posner: Freedom of speech and public intellectualship. *History of Political Economy*, 45(suppl_1), 254-278.

Frankel, Herbert. 1983. *Modern Capitalism and the Jews* (pp. 429-442). Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies.

Frankel, Herbert. 1985. "Comment" in Boulding, Kenneth E., Block, Walter, Brennan, Geoffrey, & Elzinga, Kenneth G. 1985. *Morality of the market: Religious and economic perspectives*. Vancouver: Fraser Inst, pp.429-442.

Frankel, Jonathan. 1986. "Introduction" in Kahan, A. (1986). *Essays in Jewish social and economic history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press Economics Books, pp.xi-xx.

Friedman, Milton. and Kuznets, Simon. 1945. *Income from Independent Professional Practice*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Friedman, Milton. 1962 (1982). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Friedman, Milton. 1972. *Reprint of Capitalism and the Jews, Presidential Lecture at the Montreux Conference of the Mont Pelerin Society*, Box 220 Folder 7 , MFA.

Friedman, Milton. 1973-a. "Interview: Milton Friedman" *Playboy*, August 1973.

Friedman, Milton. 1973-b. *Money and economic development: The Horowitz lectures of 1972*. New York: Praeger.

Friedman, Milton. 1974. "Anti-Semitism and the Great Depression" *Newsweek*, 16 December 1974, p. 90

Friedman, Milton. 1976. "Capitalism and the Jews", conference for the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation at Chicago, recorded on October 15, 1978 by James H. Fox. Accessed February 1, 2018, from <https://www.law.uchicago.edu/recordings/milton-friedman-capitalism-and-jews>

Friedman, Milton. 1977-a. "Israel's Other War" *Newsweek*, 22 August 1977, p. 57

Friedman, Milton. 1977-b. "Entebbe Again" *Newsweek*, 14 November 1977, p. 90-91

Friedman, Milton. 1977-c. "Commencement talk", delivered at Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Collected Works of Milton Friedman Project records. Accessed February 1, 2018, from <http://miltonfriedman.hoover.org/collections>. Record Number 2016c21.1094.

Friedman, Milton. 1984. Capitalism and the Jews. Confronting a paradox. *Encounter*, 63(1), 74-79.

Friedman, Milton. 1985-a. *Capitalism and the Jews* in Boulding, Kenneth E., Block, Walter, Brennan, Geoffrey, & Elzinga, Kenneth G. 1985. *Morality of the market: Religious and economic perspectives*. Fraser Inst, pp.401-418.

Friedman, Milton. 1985-b. *Reply* in Boulding, Kenneth E., Block, Walter, Brennan, Geoffrey, & Elzinga, Kenneth G. 1985. *Morality of the market: Religious and economic perspectives*. Vancouver: Fraser Inst, pp.443-46

Friedman, Milton. 1988-a. "Capitalism and the Jews". *The Freeman*, October 1988, pp.385-394.

Friedman, Milton. 1988-b. "'Opening Address.'" Address delivered at the Symposium on American — Israeli Economic Relations, New York City, 5 June

1988. In *Transcript of the Symposium on American—Israeli Economic Relations*, pp. 8-18. New York: American Israel Economic Corporation, 1990.

Friedman, Milton, and Rose D. Friedman. 1998. *Two lucky people: Memoirs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Friedman, Milton. 2005. *The Neoconservative Revolution: Jewish Intellectuals and the Shaping of Public Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fuchs, Lawrence. H. 1956. *The political behavior of American Jews*. Glencoe, Ill., Free Press.

Gilman, Sander L. 1996. *Smart Jews: The construction of the image of Jewish superior intelligence*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Gioia, Vitantonio. 2014. Capitalism and Judaism in Werner Sombart: A Contribution to the Analysis of Capitalist Rationality and its Limits. In *A Research Annual* (pp. 15-38). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Glazer, Nathan. 1961. *The social basis of American Communism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Glazer, Nathan. 1975. *Affirmative Discrimination. Ethnic Inequality and Public Policy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gross, Nachum. editor 1975. *Economic History of the Jews*. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House.

Grundmann, Reiner, & Stehr, Nico. 2001. Why is Werner Sombart not part of the core of classical sociology? From fame to (near) oblivion. *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 1(2), 257-287.

Hamburger, Jacob and Daniel Steinmetz-Jenkins. 2018. Why did neoconservatives join force with neoliberals? Irving Kristol from critic to ally of free market economics. *Global Intellectual History*, 1-16.

Hamilton, Charles. H. 1999. "Freeman, 1950-". In R. Lora and H. William Longton (eds.). *The Conservative Press in Twentieth-Century America*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Har Gil, S. 1969. "Nixon's friend: Admiration for Israel—in the US (in Hebrew)". *Maariv*, 19 March 1969, p.18.

Harris, Abram. L. 1942. "Sombart and German (National) Socialism." *Journal of Political Economy* 50(6): 805-835.

Heffner, Richard. 1977. "Milton Friedman A Nobel Laureate on the American Economy", *Open Mind*, May 3, 1977. <https://www.thirteen.org/openmind-archive/public-affairs/a-nobel-laureate-on-the-american-economy/>

Jacobs, Jack. Editor. 2017. *Jews and Leftist Politics: Judaism, Israel, Antisemitism, and Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kahan, Arcadius. 1981. "Jewish life in the United States: Perspective from Economics," in Joseph B. Glitter, editor, *Jewish life in the United States: Perspectives from the Social Sciences* (New York: New York University Press).

Kahan, Arcadius. 1986. *Essays in Jewish social and economic history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press Economics Books.

Karabel, Jerome. 2005. *The chosen. The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale and Princeton*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Karp, Jonathan. 2008. *The Politics of Jewish Commerce: Economic Thought and Emancipation in Europe, 1638–1848*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Katz, Jacob. 1961 (2000). *Tradition and crisis: Jewish society at the end of the Middle Ages*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Kessel, Reuben A. 1958. Price discrimination in medicine. *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 1, 20-53.

Kisch, Guido. 1951. "Review of *The Jews and Modern Capitalism* by Werner Sombart", *American History Review*, LVII [195-195I], p. 200.

Kleiman, Ephraim. 1997. The Waning of Israeli" Etatisme". *Israel studies*, 2(2), 146-171.

Krampf, Arie. 2018. Israel's hawkish neoliberalism. In *The Israeli Path to Neoliberalism: The State, Continuity and Change* (pp. 217-237). Routledge.

Kristol, Irving. 1973. Capitalism, socialism, and nihilism. *The Public Interest*.

Kristol, Irving. 1999. On the Political Stupidity of the Jews. *Azure*, 49-4.

Kuznets, Simon. 1972. *Economic structure of US Jewry: Recent trends*. Institute of Contemporary Jewry, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Kuznets, Simon. 1975. "Immigration of Russian Jews to the United States: Background and Structure." *Perspective in American History*, Vol. 9, pp. 35-126.

Kuznets, Simon. Edited by Glen Weyl and Stephanie Lo. 2017. *Jewish Economies: Development and Migration in America and Beyond: The Economic Life of American Jewry*. New York: Routledge.

Lamerkhav. 1969. "Departure of Nixon's former advisor (in Hebrew)." March 27.

Lampman, Robert. J. Editor. 1993. "The Milton Friedman Affair at Wisconsin, 1940-41". In *Economists at Wisconsin: 1892-1992*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, pp.118-121.

Lawin, M. 1905. Der Cheder-Unterricht in Rußland. *Zeitschrift für Demographie und Statistik der Juden* 1(9): 6-10.

Lederhendler, Eli. 2009. *Jewish immigrants and American capitalism, 1880-1920: from caste to class* (p. 6792126). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lipkes, Jeff. 2019. "Capitalism and the Jews" Milton Friedman and His Critics.

History of Political Economy, 51(2), 193-236.

Leeson, Robert. 1998. The Early Patinkin—Friedman Correspondence. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 20(4), 433-448.

Levine, Aaron. 1985. *Comment in Capitalism and the Jews* in Boulding, K. E., Block, W., Brennan, G., &

Liebman, Charles S. (1969). "Toward a theory of Jewish Liberalism". *The Religious Situation* (Boston, 1969), 1034-62.

Lipset, Seymour M. and Everett C. Ladd. 1971. "Jewish Academics in the United States: Their Achievements, Culture, and Politics." *American Jewish Yearbook*: 89-128.

Mata, Tiago & Steven G. Medema. 2013. The Economist as Public Intellectual. *History of Political Economy*, 45 (Annual supplement).

Medema, Steven G. 2019. The Economist and The Economist's Audience. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 41(3): 335-341.

Mendes, Philip. 2014. *Jews and the Left: The Rise and Fall of a Political Alliance*. London: Springer.

Metzer, Jacob. 1985. "Arcadius Kahan: Profile of a Scholar" in Gross, Nachum. Editor. *Jews in Economic Life: Collected Essays in memory of Arkadius Kahan (1920-1982)*. Zalman Center for Jewish History, Jerusalem, pp.ix-xxvi.

Mohrer, Fruma, & Marek Web. Editors. 1998. *Guide to the YIVO Archives*. New York: ME Sharpe.

Penslar, Derek. 2001. *Shylock's children: economics and Jewish identity in modern Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rabinowitsch, Sara. 1913. Zur Bildungsstatistik der jüdischen Arbeiter in Rußland. *Zeitschrift für Demographie und Statistik der Juden* 9, 11: 153-160

Reuveni, Gideon. 2014. Emancipation through consumption: Moses Mendelssohn and the idea of marketplace citizenship. *The Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, 59(1), 7-22.

Rivkin, Ellis. 1952. "Review of The Jews and Modern Capitalism by Werner Sombart"; *The Journal of Economic History* 12(2): 174-75.

Rivkin, Ellis. 1971. *The Shaping of Jewish History*. New York: Scribner's.

Rogin, Leo. 1941. "Werner Sombart and the Uses of Transcendentalism." *The American Economic Review* 31(3): 493-511.

Ruppin, Arthur. 1906. Die russischen Juden nach der Volkszählung von 1897. *Zeitschrift für Demographie und Statistik der Juden* 2: 17-22.

Sarna, Jonathan D. 2004. *American Judaism: a history*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Schiffman, Daniel, Young, Warren and Zelekha, Yaron. 2017. "Politicization

of Policy Prescriptions: Friedman and Israeli Economic Reform, 1977.” In *The Role of Economic Advisers in Israel’s Economic Policy*. Cham: Springer, pp.81-123.

Sombart, Werner. 1911 (1913). *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, translated by Mordecai Epstein. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

Sombart, Werner. 1951. *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, translated by Mordecai Epstein. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Steinfels, Peter. 1979 (2013). *The neoconservatives: The origins of a movement*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.

Svonkin, Stuart. 1997. *Jews Against Prejudice: American Jews and the Fight for Civil Liberties*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Synnott, Marcia. G. 1979. *The Half-Opened Door: Discrimination and Admissions at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, 1900-1970*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

The Sentinel. 1977. “Friedman: Israeli economics fails—it has dual systems.” January 13, p.6.

Vallois, Nicolas. 2020. Statistics, race and essentialism in the debate over Jewish employment structure (1903-1937). Working Paper.

Weintraub, E. Roy. 2014. MIT’s openness to Jewish economists. *History of Political Economy*, 46(suppl 1), 45-59.

Weiss, Roger W. 1985. "Foreword". In Kahan, Arcadius. *The Plow, the Hammer and the Knout: n Economic History of Eighteenth-Century Russia*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, pp. ix-x.