COLUMBIA STUDIES IN THE CLASSICAL TRADITION 40

Moses Finley and Politics

Edited by **W.V. Harris**

BRILL

Moses Finley and Politics

Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition

Editorial Board

William V. Harris (editor)
Alan Cameron, Suzanne Said,
Kathy H. Eden, Gareth D. Williams, Holger A. Klein

VOLUME 40

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/csct

Moses Finley and Politics

Edited by

W. V. Harris

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2013

Cover illustration: Moses Finley c. 1947. Photo from the collection of his younger sister, Dr Gertrude Finkelstein, by kind permission of his nieces Sharon Finley and Lia Barrad and his nephew Joel Tepp.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Moses Finley and politics / edited by W.V. Harris.
pages cm. — (Columbia studies in the classical tradition ; volume 40)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-26167-9 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-26169-3 (e-book)
1. Finley, M. I. (Moses I.), 1912–1986—Political and social views. 2. Classicists—United States—Biography. 3. Classicists—Great Britain—Biography. 4. Economic history—To 500. 5. Anti-communist movements—United States. I. Harris, William V. (William Vernon) author, editor of compilation.

PA85.F48M67 2013
938.007202—dc23
[B]

2013032206

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0166-1302
ISBN 978-90-04-26167-9 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-26169-3 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements vii
Notes on Contributors ix

A Brief Introduction 1
W. V. Harris

Moses Finkelstein and the American Scene: The Political Formation of Moses Finley, 1932–1955 5
Daniel P. Tompkins

Finkelstein the Orientalist 31
Seth R. Schwartz

The Young Moses Finley and the Discipline of Economics 49
Richard P. Saller

Moses Finley and the Academic Red Scare 61
Ellen Schrecker

Dilemmas of Resistance 79
Alice Kessler-Harris

Finley's Democracy/Democracy's Finley 93
Paul Cartledge

Politics in the Ancient World and Politics 107
W. V. Harris

Un-Athenian Affairs: I. F. Stone, M. I. Finley, and the Trial of Socrates 123
Thai Jones

Bibliography 143
Index 151

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For help in organizing the conference on which this volume is based I owe much to the Coordinator of Columbia University's Center for the Ancient Mediterranean, Caroline Wazer, and for help in editing the book I am deeply grateful to Emily Cook. I also wish to thank Robin Osborne, who organized a conference about Finley at Cambridge in May 2012 and is co-editing its proceedings, for sharing information in the most collegial fashion. And no one should write about Finley without consulting Dan Tompkins, whose acumen and encyclopaedic knowledge of the man and his work have been invaluable, to me as to others.

May 2013 WVH

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Paul Cartledge is the inaugural A. G. Leventis Professor in the Faculty of Classics, Cambridge University, and President of the Fellowship of Clare College. He is the editor, co-editor, author or co-author of over 20 books, most recently *After Thermopylae: The Oath of Plataea and the End of the Graeco-Persian Wars* (OUP, 2013). He is co-editor of two monograph series, and sits on the editorial boards of three learned journals. He was awarded the Gold Cross of the Order of Honour by the President of the Greek Republic and is an honorary citizen of modern Sparta.

W. V. Harris is Shepherd Professor of History and Director of the Center for the Ancient Mediterranean at Columbia University. His most recent book is *Rome's Imperial Economy* (2011), and he was the editor of and a contributor to both *Mental Disorders in the Classical World* (2013) and *The Ancient Mediterranean Environment between Science and History* (also 2013).

Thai Jones earned his Ph.D. at Columbia and is an assistant professor of history in the Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching Program. He is the author of *More Powerful than Dynamite: Radicals, Plutocrats, Progressives, and New York's Year of Anarchy* (New York 2012), and *A Radical Line: From the Labor Movement to the Weather Underground, One Family's Century of Conscience* (New York, 2004).

Alice Kessler-Harris is R. Gordon Hoxie Professor of History and Professor in the Institute for Research on Women, Gender and Sexuality at Columbia University. She specializes in 20th century U.S. labor and social policy, and is the author of, among other books, *Out to Work: a History of Wage Earning Women in the United States* (1982), *In Pursuit of Equity: Women, Men and the Quest for Economic Citizenship in Twentieth Century America* (2001), and most recently *A Difficult Woman: The Challenging Life and Times of Lillian Hellman* (2012).

Richard P. Saller is a professor of Roman history in the History and Classics Departments of Stanford University. His research has focused on subjects of social and economic history of the late Republic and early Empire,

including patronage, the family, and human capital. Most recently, he has published studies of gender and work, and training and education in the imperial economy. His books include *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (1982) and *Patriarchy, Property, and Death in the Roman Family* (1994).

Ellen Schrecker is Professor Emerita of History at Yeshiva University. Widely recognized as a leading expert on McCarthyism, she has published many books and articles on the subject, including *Many Are the Crimes: McCarthyism in America* (1998), *The Age of McCarthyism: A Short History with Documents* (1994, rev. ed. 2002), and *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities* (1986). Her most recent book is *The Lost Soul of Higher Education: Corporatization, the Assault on Academic Freedom and the End of the University* (2010). She is currently working on a study of the politics of American professors in the 1960s and early 1970s.

Seth R. Schwartz is the Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Classical Jewish Civilization in the Departments of History and Classics at Columbia University. He was a senior research fellow at King's College, Cambridge, 1992–1995, and from 1995 to 2009 he taught history at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. He is the author of *Josephus and Judaean Politics* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 18 Leiden: Brill, 1990), *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 BCE to 640 CE* (Princeton, 2001) and *Were the Jews a Mediterranean Society? Reciprocity and Solidarity in Ancient Judaism* (Princeton, 2010).

Daniel P. Tompkins taught in the Department of Greek and Roman Classics at Temple University, retiring in 2010. He also taught at Wesleyan University and Swarthmore and Dartmouth Colleges. He has written on Moses Finley, Thucydides, Homer, the ancient city, Wallace Stevens, just war theory, and various topics in higher education. He won the American Philological Association award for teaching in 1980 and Temple University's Great Teacher Award in 2010. His current projects include the intellectual development of M. I. Finley and language and politics in the speeches in Thucydides.

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION

W. V. Harris

2012 was the centenary of the birth of Moses Finley, one of the most widely read scholarly historians of his age, and in particular a transformative influence on the study of the history of Greek and Roman antiquity. This volume contains most of the papers delivered at a commemorative conference held at Columbia in September of that year. Since Columbia was the institutional centre of Finley's intellectual life from 1927 until about 1953—not simply the place where he earned his Ph.D.—it was appropriate, and also a matter of pride, that the university community should recall, celebrate and debate his legacy.

In exactly what ways Finley's influence was transformative is a complex question which will be discussed elsewhere (in particular in a parallel publication deriving from a conference that took place in Cambridge in May 2012).[1] But the influence of his work was in the main benign and fertile, and that work therefore deserves close study, in spite of the fact that some of it is now inevitably dated (which is after all part of every historian's condition). This question too was discussed by Finley—is there progress in historiography (apart obviously from the accumulation of new data), or do historians merely re-state what is already known in the light of their own consciously or unconsciously held world-views?[2] His quite pessimistic answer to this question certainly has some appeal, and an experienced scholar may easily think sometimes that, for every two steps forward, the field takes three backwards. But he was *too* pessimistic, and it is enough to compare Finley's own best writings, with all their faults, with what came before, bearing in mind that the quality of the questions asked can be as important as the quality of the answers given.

It was above all in the economic history of antiquity that Finley made a difference (the range of his influence is another and much much wider matter). Hasebroek and of course Rostovtzeff—the standard readings on the subject in English before Finley—had their great merits, but Finley raised a series of new questions that urgently needed to be answered.

1 See Osborne et al. forthcoming.
2 Finley 1977 and elsewhere.

Of course he built quite openly on the work of predecessors, or rather, I would say, he plundered them for usable ideas. But his work in this area represented an enormous advance. Speaking as one who has often expressed basic disagreements with *The Ancient Economy*, I gratefully recognize that it stimulated my mental activity as few other ancient history books have ever done. And the same is clearly true for many other scholars, Anglophone and otherwise.

But the focus of this book is an area where Finley's achievement is more problematic, politics. Now, Finley was passionately concerned about politics—modern politics and Athenian politics alike. Even when he was writing about economic history or about other aspects of Greek and Roman society, politics always came in. Yet Finley's own political evolution, and its relationship to his scholarly work, have until recently been obscure subjects. For these reasons 'Moses Finley and Politics' seemed a theme very much worth pursuing. This book is thus intended to contribute to the understanding of his early political and semi-political activities, particularizing and contextualizing, as well as to the understanding of his writings about Greek and Roman politics. This involves a wider consideration of his intellectual formation in crucial areas of his interests, especially economics; see, on that topic, the paper published here by Richard Saller.

It also involves understanding how Finley positioned himself with regard to his Jewish inheritance and environment. That too has hitherto been an obscure subject, made more obscure by rumours and speculation. And the recoverable facts still remain insufficient to explain in full what Seth Schwartz calls Finley's 'drift away from Jewishness', which was perhaps both more and less than drift. More in the sense that it was quite deliberate, less in the sense that it occurred on a scholarly plane but not necessarily on a personal one. And be it remembered that until the 1940s, at least, Jewish scholars were not allowed to teach non-Jewish history in Ivy League universities; when Finley was a graduate student in the Columbia History Department Salo W. Baron was the only Jewish full member of the faculty. What prospect was there for Moses Finkelstein, Meyer Reinhold or Naphtali Lewis?

It would be too crude to say that the young Finley found an alternative religion in Marxism, but radical politics, including anti-racism, were plainly a major part of his identity by the mid-1930s. His style, however, was uninhibited intellectual voracity: he was the last person who would ever have imagined that all good historical ideas stemmed from a single source.

The onset of the Cold War and then the Korean War caught the American left substantially unprepared, and the reactionaries carried all before them. Finley was driven into exile by McCarthyism and Hooverism, in effect by J. Edgar in person. It is important to mention Hoover here because the McCarthy chapter in American history cannot be understood, nor can Finley's behaviour and experience, without the long-term history of red-baiting and radical-baiting, stretching from at least the Palmer Raids of 1919–1920 to the connivance of Hoover and Governor Ronald Reagan of California.[3] Such an environment encourages both political reticence and doubts as to the moral validity of the whole system.

One of the aims of this book is to illuminate this wider American political context, and for this purpose I invited two authoritative U.S. historians, Alice Kessler-Harris and Ellen Schrecker, and a younger one, Thai Jones (who also studied Roman history with me), to consider Finley's experience from diverse angles. Kessler-Harris brings out the breadth and ferocity of McCarthyism's assault on civil liberties. Ellen Schrecker, with her unrivalled knowledge of the effects of that assault on the academic world, is able to set out and make intelligible the mainly unheroic (to use no stronger term) reaction of the mass of university administrators and faculty. No wonder Finley fled,[4] and gave up his U.S. citizenship.

Finley had never left the United States until he was forty-one years old, and his whole American experience was so little known in Europe that even the British Academy memoir by his friend Dick Whittaker had little to say about that period, and much of what he could say was erroneous.[5] Even such friends as Momigliano, Vidal-Naquet and Hopkins seem to have known quite little.

There can be no doubt that Finley deliberately lowered the curtain on his past political and semi-political life—and at about the same time entered a period of intense productivity that lasted for more than thirty years. (This productivity cannot be measured by simply looking at the list of his publications, still less by consulting any citation index, because such lists of publications normally omit some or most of his print and broadcast journalism.) It has been the signal merit of the indefatigable Dan

---

[3] On this see now Rosenfeld 2012. Hoover was Director of the Bureau of Investigation, later the FBI, from 1924 to 1972.

[4] Pursued to the last, as Tompkins shows (p. 30), by that man of principle Arthur Schlesinger. 'Scoundrel time', indeed.

[5] Whittaker 1997; Tompkins 2006. Here I must disagree with Cartledge this volume (p. 94 n. 3).

Tompkins to have gone to the documents as well as the printed sources in the cause of constructing a detailed and accurate narrative of Finley's American years.[6]

But it was in the period in which he had given up every form of political activity and even allegiance that Finley turned to the analysis of ancient and especially Athenian politics, above all in *Democracy Ancient and Modern* (1973) and *Politics in the Ancient World* (1983). These were and are quite frustrating books, as I think Paul Cartledge and I have both found. A superficial pair of reasons is easily identified: both books were collections of lectures and both of them, *Politics* especially, showed signs of excessive haste. And, to me at least, Finley seems too easily satisfied with fifth- and fourth-century Athenian institutions—in part, admittedly, because David Cohen, Edward Cohen and others subsequently broadened the discussion of classical Athenian society. When Finley writes that 'it was literally true that at birth every Athenian boy had better than a gambler's chance to be president of the Assembly, a rotating post held for a single day',[7] we are impressed but we want to know how much power that office conferred. And it may be thought that Finley's ambivalence, in his writings of the 1970s and 1980s, about the significance of social class made it very difficult for him to answer questions about the real distribution of political power in high classical Athens. But all of this is balanced by the sheer richness of Finley's political philosophy: in a sense he had given up politics, but in a sense his engagement with current debates had never been deeper.

This volume is obviously not a full critique of Finley's writings, still less is it a biography. It is a critic's foolish cliché nowadays to complain that volumes of conference proceedings do not cover their subjects comprehensively or consistently: comprehensiveness and consistency are no doubt virtues, but we shall be satisfied if the readers of this book encounter novel information and suggestive arguments, as I believe they will.

---

[6] For the archival sources see below, p. 143.

[7] Finley 1973a, 20.

MOSES FINKELSTEIN AND THE AMERICAN SCENE: THE POLITICAL FORMATION OF MOSES FINLEY, 1932–1955[1]

Daniel P. Tompkins

'The World will have to be Changed, not the Past'

Sir Moses Finley's knighthood, conferred in 1979, honored three decades of achievement as scholar, teacher, organizer, broadcaster and writer: he was a well-known public figure as well as a professor at Cambridge. By contrast, his first four decades, spent in the United States, remained largely unknown, even to close friends in England. Finley himself was largely responsible for this asymmetry, for at least two reasons.

First of all, he was throughout his life intensely involved in the business of the moment and in projects for the future, seldom concerned with the past. Asked whether his family background had 'any bearing on your interest in the *World of Odysseus*?' he replied: 'I don't know. I've never been able to be terribly introspective about that sort of thing'.[2] Finley had, after all, revised Marx's revision of an apophthegm of Jesus to read:

> The dead past never buries its dead. The world will have to be changed, not the past.[3]

Of course, the meticulous crafting of this remark, like a number of other passages in his correspondence, not to mention his cold fury on learning that he would be featured in Ellen Schrecker's *No Ivory Tower*, hint that Finley's past *did* lie close to the surface. But these moments were rare. Finley did not dine out on stories from his youth. There is no sign that he even responded when I. F. Stone urged him to write a memoir.[4]

---

[1] James 1907. Allusion to Henry James's great survey of American life may seem incongruous in a study of Moses Finley. Yet both men became British citizens. Both wrote for a living. Each studied, and shed new light on, the importance of culture, the strains of social interaction and the role of money. Most importantly, the American past lurked in both men's memory, shaping, even when unmentioned, their mature thinking about politics, society, finance, culture and other topics.

[2] Richard Winkler, 'A Conversation with Moses Finley', 1980 (Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library).

[3] Finley 1968a, 196.

[4] Cold fury: see Finley's letter to Alice Thorner, February 9, 1981 (Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library). He had not known he would be featured in *No Ivory Tower*

The sparse documentation of Finley's American years results also from his awareness that for most of that time, he was a marked man, the target of multiple official investigations and chains of rumors, in all likelihood a member of the Communist Party. In 1941 the heads of the American Civil Liberties Union and the FBI, and even a vice-president of Bloomingdale's, labeled him a suspicious or truly dangerous Communist, and at one point in the 1940s the FBI searched the basement of his apartment building. In such a climate, leaving papers around could be dangerous.[5]

The Finley Papers at the Cambridge University Library are a rich trove of information about Finley and about the study of ancient history in general from the early 1950s to 1986. But because they begin only with Finley's arrival at Cambridge, research for this paper has required consultation with a range of archives along with personal interviews whenever possible. The essay that follows is part of a larger effort to reconstruct the lifelong intertwining of scholarship and politics that distinguishes Finley from most other historians ancient and otherwise.

It is a biographical *cliché* to say that a person 'grew up against the background of' the Holocaust, the Civil War, or the Depression. Finley's 'American Scene', however, is not a backdrop or stage set, but a sequence of events in which he was an agent. His mature understanding of land tenure, labor practices, political participation, class and ethnic tensions, and

(Schrecker 1986). Rutgers historian Richard McCormick, an active supporter of Finley when he was under investigation at Rutgers in 1952, mentioned that during an extensive visit in 1961, there was no discussion of Rutgers events: Finley was working on new projects, McCormick said, and talked about them, not the past. See Birkner 2001, 85–86. I. F. Stone wrote to Finley on August 22, 1983 (Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library).

[5] Ira Hirschman of Bloomingdale's, a member of the New York Board of Higher Education who had voted to terminate Finley's position at City College, wrote to Franz Boas: 'I still question his affiliations outside your group' (January 7, 1942). Roger Baldwin, the founder and director of the American Civil Liberties Union, wrote to Walter B. Cannon in April 1942: 'I know considerable about [Boas'] American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.... There is no doubt that the Committee... has a strong pro-Communist slant and that its paid secretary, Finkelstein, is either a member of the Communist Party or close'. See Kuznick 1987, 337 n. 62. J. Edgar Hoover to Attorney General Francis Biddle on December 12, 1941: 'Boas is one of the leading 'stooges' for Communist groups in the U.S. He is used to put over propaganda.... Among other positions which he holds is that of Chairman, ACDIF, of which organization Mr. Moe Finkelstein is Executive Secretary'. December 12, 1941. These letters are all in the Franz Boas Papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Finley's FBI file reports (January 29, 1944) that 'in accordance with Bureau letter of August 13, 1942' agents who searched his basement found copies of a suspicious-looking pamphlet: these turned out to be copies from the *Congressional Record* of a speech (June 1, 1938) directed against Nazi race science by Rep. Byron Scott. Finley's FBI file was obtained under the Freedom of Information Act.

other topics followed not only study of but participation in three tumultuous decades of American history.

In previous contributions, I discussed Finley's activities as Executive Secretary of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (1938–1942, Franz Boas, President) in considerable detail.[6] Here, I emphasize new documentary findings that enable us to construct a suite of exemplary moments in Finley's life, while admitting that the evidence does not permit a full, detailed chronicle.

Finley changed his name in the autumn of 1946, and took a position at Rutgers in 1947. His activities as Moses ('Moe' or to friends often 'Mo') Finkelstein can be roughly grouped under the following heads:

- Studying law at Columbia University, 1927–29
- Research and writing:
  - Fact-checker, bibliographer, author, *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (1930–34)
  - Editor and translator, Institute for Social Research (1937–39 on a steady basis, 1935–37 and 1939–47 as an occasional employee)
- Graduate studies:
  - Research assistant (Roman law), A. A. Schiller, Columbia (1933–34)
  - Completed examinations for Ph.D., Columbia History Department (1937)[7]
- Teaching positions:
  - Instructor in History, City College of NY (1934–42); Rapp-Coudert investigation, not re-hired by City College (1941–42)
  - Tutor in history, Yeshiva College (1935–36)
  - Assistant Professor, Rutgers University, Newark (1948–52)
- Salaried administrative positions:
  - Executive Secretary, American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (1938–42)
  - National campaign director, American Society for Russian War Relief (1942–46)
  - National Campaign Director, American Russian Institute (September, 1946–March, 1947).[8]

---

[6] See Tompkins 2006 and 2008.

[7] Meaning that the only remaining requirement was the dissertation.

[8] Shaw 1993. Finley omits his position with the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom and his role the American Russian Institute from his 'Supplementary Statement' vita, and apparently omitted his employment at City College (where he was dropped from the faculty) from the *vita* he provided Rutgers University, though it did appear in papers from the Columbia Placement Bureau. See Finley's exchange of letters with Dr. Edward Fuhlbruegge, Director, Division of the Social Sciences at Rutgers' Newark College of Arts and Sciences, February 26–27, 1948, 'Administrative History of the

These years of mixed scholarly and political activity were highly socialized: at every stage after the master's thesis, Finkelstein is functioning as a member in a group, often as the effective leader. These interactions deepened Finkelstein's political understanding, without any individual or theory fully 'influencing' ('flowing into') him as if being siphoned between two vessels.

'Badges of slavery or servitude': Learning from Justice Harlan, 1927–29

Nathan Finkelstein, an immigrant who designed gears for Buick, knew his son was a prodigy, and had aspirations of great corporate success. Thus it happened that after graduating from Syracuse University at age 15 in 1927, Moses began graduate work in the Columbia University Department of Public Law and Government (now the Department of Political Science), where his courses included Public Finance with E. R. A. Seligman. He wrote a Master's thesis: *Justice Harlan on Personal Rights with Special Attention to Due Process of Law*. Then, 'My father got me a job in the legal department of General Motors, but after six months I walked out'. He hated the routineness of legal work. 'That led to a certain strain that never ended until the day he died, aged 90. He was very much a patriarch'.[9]

Though generally overlooked, this episode merits attention. Finkelstein benefited from formal graduate-level training in accounting, finance and law. Meeting Seligman, editor of the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, may have led to his position there in 1930 (see below). The choice of thesis topic was also fateful: who could have been a more consequential subject for the future historian of slavery and inequality than John Marshall Harlan, the former Kentucky slave-owner whose forceful opinions on labor and civil rights, though barely noticed in 1927, were validated half a century later?[10] Harlan was no legal craftsman: to Holmes, Harlan's mind was 'a powerful vise the jaws of which couldn't be got nearer than two inches to each other', and both supporters and opponents of federal aid to the

Rutgers University Board of Governors' Special Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure', Rutgers University Libraries: Special Collections and University Archives.

[9] Winkler interview, 1980 (Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library). I wish to thank Sharon Finley and Gertrude Finkelstein for their generous assistance on a range of topics concerning the Finkelstein family.

[10] To be sure, 'Great Dissenter' was a *cliché*, recklessly used later not only of Holmes but Stone, Brandeis, Clark, and Harlan's grandson. But Harlan appears to have been the first, and his dissents were among the most important.

downtrodden would utilize the verbal ambiguities in his dissent in *Plessy v. Ferguson.*[11] But Harlan's choice of issues was acute and his language memorable.

By 1927, Finkelstein appears to have been among the few still paying attention. Harlan was losing traction in the public mind, and soon enough, journalists passed the title of 'Great Dissenter' to Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., who had futilely joined Harlan against *Lochner*, the 1905 decision that favored employers over regulators and workers and that would remain dominant for another decade. Earl Warren's finding in *Brown v Board of Education* (1954), that *Plessy*'s ' "separate but equal" doctrine . . . has no place in the field of public education' reversed the words of *Plessy* in 1896 and helped to restore Harlan's standing, but that was decades in the future.

Only one copy of Finkelstein's thesis exists, in the Columbia University Rare Book Library, and few appear to have read it. It is organized as follows:

> Introduction
> Chapter 1: Due Process of Law
> Chapter 2: Privileges and Immunities of Citizens. Equal Protection of the Laws
> Chapter 3: Ex Post Facto Laws
> Chapter 4: The Fifth and Sixth Amendments
> Conclusion
> Appendix: Chronological Summaries of Cases Discussed

Finkelstein comments on pivotal decisions. He emphasizes Harlan's reliance on common law and the *Magna Carta*, and his constant concern with the boundary between federal and state law.[12] He notes technical challenges, for instance, Harlan's seeming indifference to precedent (p. 10).[13] The footnotes are minimalist but to the point, suggesting rather than advertising Finley's underlying research. Exploring a simple reference to *Powell v. Pennsylvania* (1888), for instance, Finley brings us to Harlan's point that, 'in order to insure equal protection of the laws, a statute need

---

[11] 'How could Justice Harlan be a hero to both Justice Marshall and Justice Thomas . . .?': Liu 2008, 1384. See also Balkin 2001.

[12] Finley recurred to the *Magna Carta* in his 1971 inaugural lecture as Professor of Ancient History at Cambridge, but as 'bogus history'. See Finley 1975b, 34–59, especially 41. This inaugural lecture hints repeatedly at episodes from Finley's American past—but never does more than hint.

[13] Also p. 17: 'His paramount, and virtually sole criterion was the common law, and he frequently applied it at the cost of violating recognized precedents of constitutional law, interpretations to which all his colleagues adhered'. Cf. pp. 8, 19.

not apply equally to everyone, but merely to all within the same class, as long as the classification by the State legislature is not Itself an unjust discrimination'. Further details about the case are not, Harlan says, the Court's business: the producers must 'appeal . . . to the legislature or to the ballot-box, not to the judiciary'.

Though Finkelstein's tone is cool, he is alert to memorable phrases and to issues of social justice, devoting nearly two full pages on *Plessy* to verbatim quotations including the now-famous three sentences that, at the time Finley wrote, had not appeared in the *New York Times, The Nation*, or even in the NAACP journal, *The Crisis*:

> There is no caste here. Our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens. In respect of civil rights, all citizens are equal before the law.[14]

The following cases exemplify Harlan's concerns and Finley's approach:

The Civil Rights Cases (1883). In these cases the Court overturned the Civil Rights Act of 1875. As Finley observes (pp. 19–21):

> As with due process of law, Justice Harlan was never slow in declaring State action invalid as a denial of the privileges and immunities of citizens. And as with due process, he frequently dissented from the court in the face of seemingly overwhelming precedents and proofs. . . . Primary among the new rights which the black race received by the Fourteenth Amendment is, he believes, 'exemption from race discrimination in respect of any civil right belonging to citizens of the white race in that same State'.

Against the majority's finding that the Civil Rights Act's measures concerning private individuals and rights (hotel accommodations, admission to a theater and to a ladies' car on a railway) were unconstitutional, Harlan declared, in Finley's summary (pp. 37–38):

> . . . that the Fourteenth Amendment granted negroes the right of citizenship and all the attendant privileges and immunities therewith. And if it did not grant them any other privilege, it at least gave them exemption from race discrimination with regard to civil rights. The discrimination in these cases

---

[14] Pp. 58–9. The quotation does not appear in the on-line archives of these publications through 1930. It has been traced back to a speech by Col. Robert Ingersoll on October 22, 1883, at a rally in Washington D.C. after the Supreme Court, over Harlan's dissent, declared the 1875 Civil Rights Act unconstitutional. Ingersoll said that the Founding Fathers had in fact established 'caste' but that the 13th Amendment should have made us 'color-blind'. This phrase was adopted by Albion Tourgée, arguing for Plessy in *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896, and then by Harlan himself. See Elliott 2001 and Westin 1957, esp. 675–6 n. 160.

> was obvious, and therefore the verdict for the plaintiffs should have been affirmed.[15]

Hurtado v. California (1884)

In the following year, Harlan again dissented. The matter concerned due process, and revealed, as Finkelstein says, 'the length to which Judge Harlan was willing to go in applying the common law rules . . .'. As Finkelstein notes, the lengthy dissent on the need for a full twelve-person jury in state trials rests on Edward Coke and other jurists, and on the *Magna Carta.* It is here that Finkelstein refers to Harlan's 'characteristic disregard for precedent'. For Harlan, though for no other Justice, the rights to 'indictment by grand jury, trial by jury, and freedom from self-incrimination', should be covered by the Fourteenth Amendment and used in state as well as federal law. As it happens, the Fifth Amendment, unlike many others, has still *not* been 'incorporated' into the Fourteenth Amendment and made applicable to the states. Justice Alito's finding in *McDonald v. Chicago*, striking down a local law on gun control and applying the Second Amendment (as interpreted in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 2008) to the states, is built on a summary of Fourteenth Amendment jurisprudence. He mentions Harlan 26 times.[16]

Plessy v. Ferguson (1896)

In 1954, Chief Justice Warren emphasized that *Plessy* had cemented 'separate but equal' as racial policy for large parts of the nation for six decades: 'Any language in *Plessy* v. Ferguson contrary to this finding is rejected'.[17] Finkelstein summarizes the facts (pp. 56–58), mentioning that Plessy

---

[15] Abraham 1955, 885, says that the Plessy dissent was Harlan's ' "favorite" '.

[16] Finley comments further on *Hurtado* at pp. 31, 41–42. For the opinion in *Heller*, see: http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/07-290.ZS.html. For *McDonald*: http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/09pdf/08-1521.pdf. Eric Foner (Foner 2012) notes that 'selective incorporation' reflects the judges' attitudes at particular times and places: the Court currently understands the Fourteenth Amendment to favor firearms possessors, but not women:

> In 2000, in *United States v. Morrison*, the Supreme Court invoked the *Civil Rights Cases* to conclude that Congress lacks power to provide a remedy in federal courts for gender-based violence that is not state-sponsored, adding, . . . that the Fourteenth Amendment was not intended to 'obliterat[e]' federalism. *Morrison* also cited *United States v. Harris*, from 1883, in which convictions for lynching under the Ku Klux Klan Act were overturned because Congress lacked the power to punish individual criminal acts.

[17] http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&vol=347&invol=483.

'refused to remain in the coach for negroes', and quoting Harlan's claim that the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments, on rights of former slaves and guarantee of personal liberty, go hand in hand, guaranteeing 'privileges and immunities' to all citizens:

> Everyone knows that the statute in question had its origin in the purpose, not so much to exclude white persons in the railroad cars occupied by blacks, as to exclude colored people from coaches occupied by or assigned to white persons. . . .
>
> The white race deems itself to be the dominant race in this country. And so it is. . . . But in view of the Constitution, in the eyes of the law, there is in this country *no* superior, dominant, ruling class of citizens . . .

Lochner (1905)

In the 'Lochner Era', the Fourteenth Amendment's 'due process' clause protecting 'life, liberty and property', was construed as serving employers' liberty to set work hours. Finkelstein summarizes (p. 71): the Court overturned a New York law limiting hours of employment for bakers, stating that 'There is no reasonable ground for interfering with the liberty of a person or the right of free contract by determining the hours of labor in the occupation of a baker. . . . Clean and wholesome bread does not depend upon whether the baker works but ten hours per day'.[18] Harlan and Holmes both dissented, Holmes famously protesting the majority's economic theory ('the Fourteenth Amendment does not enact Mr. Herbert Spencer's *Social Statics*'), Harlan attacking the majority dismissal of health concerns ('constant inhaling of flour dust causes inflammation of the lungs and of the bronchial tubes. The eyes also suffer through this dust, . . . The long hours of toil to which all bakers are subjected produce rheumatism, cramps and swollen legs'). Finkelstein emphasizes the danger to workers' health.

Finkelstein's concerns, then, included citizenship, race and minority rights, due process and the heritage of common law. Equally significant: his attention to 'technical' features such as Harlan's disregard of precedent. Soon, he would write his own political pamphlet attacking ethnic discrimination, *Can You Name Them*, and assailing the Nazi-friendly eugenics of the New York Chamber of Commerce (see below). Nearly half a century later, we find Finley remarking that:

---

[18] http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/198/45/case.html.

> The 'mould' of Roman law, as of every other legal system examined by historians, was an instrument and a reflection of society and therefore of social inequality.[19]

We cannot miss the family resemblance between that comment and the observation of a legal scholar and Harlan expert to the effect that 'constitutional law became more egalitarian when American society became more egalitarian'.[20]

Under investigation a quarter century later, Finley and his attorney Joseph Fannelli invoked, without great success, the very rights against self-incrimination he had studied as a boy. Compounding the irony, it would be Harlan's grandson, himself a Supreme Court Justice in 1957, whose *Yates* decision ended seventeen years of repression of leftist Americans under the Smith Act, the key instrument used by universities to fire, and by authorities to prosecute, left-wing faculty in America.[21] By that time Finley was settled in Cambridge.

The currents in Finley's life often flowed together. After writing *on* Harlan he would collaborate *with* Franz Boas, whose lifelong effort against theories of racial superiority culminated in the American Committee's campaign against Nazi race theory, and who would help to shape the Supreme Court's momentous *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954. From at least 1910, when he spoke to the Second National Negro Conference on 'The Real Race Problem', Boas had been allied with W. E. B. DuBois.[22] Harlan, Boas, and DuBois helped to keep the issue of racial oppression alive for half a century. Finkelstein's important contribution in the later 1930s was perhaps overdetermined.

Stalinism and its friends and enemies: The Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, *1930–34*

Sergei Eisenstein's brilliant *Old and New* (1929) served as a Marxist 'Pilgrim's Progress' celebrating not just collectivized farms but the merging of agriculture and industry. The film's modern agricultural—genetic

---

[19] Finley 1983, 7.

[20] Klarman 2004, as summarized by Graber 2005, 804.

[21] The opinion can be found at: http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/354/298/case.html.

[22] Boas' speech was published in the NAACP journal, *The Crisis* (edited by DuBois): 1.2 (1910), 22–25. Lee D. Baker judiciously notes that *Brown v. Board of Education* used Boasian racial analysis sporadically and selectively: Baker 2010, 178–92. See also Baker 1998.

laboratory recalls comments on Soviet science in the 1920s by Columbia geneticist Leslie Dunn—a close friend of Boas and a mainstay of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. Dunn had visited Soviet laboratories and was impressed:

> You can see the same dangers through which human genetics was going at that time, because many human geneticists in the so-called bourgeois countries were plain Nazis, just about. The Russians [before Lysenko] were, I think, on the ball, and the westerners were not.... certainly the Soviet position was far superior to the western position as to what went on in Germany.

But Dunn is also haunted by the Soviet scientists Vavilov and Agol, who visited America in the early 1930s and returned, full of trepidation, after Lysenko had risen to power. Vavilov disappeared and Agol was executed: 'A whole small school of human genetics was wiped out with the Institute'.[23]

Old and New is in truth no documentary.[24] Soviet agriculture was deeply troubled, as few understood better than Lenin's old foe Peter Struve, by 1932 living in exile in Paris. Active in the 1890s in trying to improve agriculture under the Czar, he wrote a data-based long essay on land tenure in Russia for Seligman's ambitious *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences.* His contribution arrived in the late summer of 1932. It begins in 800 C.E. and concludes in 1932, four years after Eisenstein's *Old and New.* The real Stalinist collectivization was now underway. Industrialization did not assist, it displaced peasants, who starved in huge numbers or were shipped in freight trains to factories. Surveying the data, Struve concludes dismally:

> The real goal ... has not been reached ... a decrease in domestic agricultural production ..., without at the same time promoting ... export ... a terrific famine, on a scale exceeding anything Russia has ever experienced.

'A terrific famine'. This grim indictment of Stalin's agricultural policy never appeared in print. As the *Encyclopaedia* archives, now housed at Hampshire College in Massachusetts, reveal, the New York editors replaced Struve's text, referring instead to Stalin's 'order against forcible collectivization' as reported in Walter Duranty's cheery *New York Times* account:

[23] Dunn's oral history is on file at the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA. On the laboratory in the film, see Goodwin 1993, 103–4.

[24] Kotkin 1995 captures the grim truth of Soviet industrialization and the de-kulakization that enabled it.

'Peasants Rejoice Over Stalin Order'.[25] They may have supposed that the *Times* man on the scene knew more than Struve in Paris. They could not have been more wrong, as subsequent inquiry into Duranty's fabulations revealed—after he had won a Pulitzer Prize in 1936, his career having been built on mendacious reports.[26]

Who altered Struve's text? We cannot tell. The *Encyclopaedia*'s archives include fact-checking data but yield nothing conclusive. However, the list of the fifteen assistant editors for this volume is suggestive: these included Lewis Corey, Louis Hacker, Max Lerner, Herbert Solow and Bernhard Stern, all of whom were, in the early 1930s, interested in Marx one way or another (alignments in the 30s were kaleidoscopic). Solow was to play a pivotal role in bringing Whittaker Chambers in from the cold. Corey, under the name Fraina, had been a founding member of the Communist Party of the United States, as he revealed to his surprised associate editor Alvin Johnson, whose response—another surprise—was not to fire him. Johnson records this moment in his memoir.[27]

This was the *ménage* Finkelstein entered at age 18, immediately after leaving a firm—General Motors—that quite soon would be 'camouflaging' its collaboration with Nazi Germany and would ultimately use Jewish slave labor. GM managers told employees that names like 'Finkelstein' were career-enders.[28] Moses Finkelstein's younger brother Larry, hearing this fifteen years later, initiated a name change that ultimately included Moses and middle brother Murray.[29]

It is hard to imagine a less *heymish* corporate culture. At the *Encyclopaedia*, on the other hand, Finkelstein would have felt welcome, and in fact he clearly made good friendships there: twenty years later, after being

---

[25] See *New York Times*, March 8, 1930.

[26] On Duranty, see Taylor 1990), and Karl E. Meyer, 'The Editorial Notebook; Trenchcoats, Then and Now', *New York Times*, June 24, 1990.

[27] See, in addition to Johnson's autobiography (Johnson 1952), Petr 1998.

[28] Turner 2005, 16. Turner explains (without advocating for GM) that since German law prevented Opel from transferring profits out of the country, this was the only way for management to keep the company going. At p. 152 and elsewhere Turner mentions the personal and political antipathy of many in GM leadership toward Hitler, Göring and Himmler. But GM policy was to continue doing business, whatever the regime of the moment.

[29] According to Finley's sister Gertrude Finkelstein, Larry reported to their father that he had just read of a judge named Finley: if the name was good enough for a judge, it would serve for him. Nathan approved. Moses Finley left no account of this decision, and indeed got the date wrong (see his letter to Nelson quoted below, under 'The crisis of spring 1947'). I have found no non-family account of Finley's change of name. (Personal interview, Gertrude Finkelstein with the author, April 27–28, 2005. Finley's FBI file dates the name change to October 1946).

fired at Rutgers and turned away by all potential American employers, Louis Hacker, as a dean at Columbia, became his most effective agent, making contacts at both Cambridge and Oxford that led to offers of a position.[30]

Bernhard Stern was one of the most affable of this lot, befriending Lerner, Edward Mims, and others.[31] Stern merits a book. Trained as an anthropologist, he produced studies of medical anthropology that influenced the young Robert Merton (who became a leader, decades later, in saving Stern's Columbia lectureship when Senator McCarthy targeted him).[32] By 1932, Stern already knew Lionel Trilling, Meyer Schapiro, Granville Hicks, Max Lerner and others at Columbia.[33] He was one of two Finley acquaintances who praised Stalin's 1938 pamphlet, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*[34] in print, and his Stalinism infuriated the Frankfurt School scholars.[35] Like others in the Boas ambit, Stern rejected notions of racial 'inferiority' and joined the African-American philosopher Alain Locke to produce the 750–page anthology, *When Peoples Meet: A Study in Race and Culture Contacts*, with contributions by Ruth Benedict, Boas, Rostovtzeff, Melville Herskovits, Raymond Firth, Robert Redfield and more than sixty others.[36]

---

[30] Finley, in Richard Winkler, 'A Conversation with Moses Finley', 1980 (Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library). Copies of Packer's correspondence with Antony Andrewes and M. M. Postan are in the Finley file at Rutgers University Library.

[31] See Lakoff 1998, 56–57, on the friendship of Lerner, Mims and Stern.

[32] Two essays in *Science and Society* were used to demonstrate his 'independence' and thus his fitness to teach at Columbia: 'Genetics Teaching and Lysenko', 13 (1949), 136–149 and 'Engels on the Family', 12 (1948), 42–64. See James Gutmann, 'Memorandum for the Files (June 4, 1953)' [on the Stern case], Robert Merton Papers, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library.

[33] See note 35 below, and Trilling's letter to Schapiro mentioning the other names, December 14, 1933 (Meyer Schapiro Papers, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library).

[34] Kazakevich 1944 and Stern 1943.

[35] One of Stern's many Stalinist moments: Stern 1944. In a letter to Max Horkheimer on August 2, 1946, Leo Lowenthal of the Institute for Social Research reported that Stern had alienated an important sponsor of the Institute's *Studies in Prejudice* series, Samuel Flowerman of the American Jewish Committee. At a crucial meeting, according to Flowerman's report to Lowenthal, Stern:

> . . . betrayed so outspokenly that his first loyalty belongs to Soviet Russia that he wrote himself his own farewell ticket. . . . I used the opportunity again to emphasize that I consider Stern's appointment by Flowerman as his greatest mistake in personnel matters. . . .

Lowenthal 1989, 212.

[36] This book was published in New York by the Progressive Education Association in 1942. Stern's longtime concern about eugenics is evident in *Historical Sociology. The Selected Papers of Bernhard J. Stern* (New York, 1959). See pp. 213, 218 (on Boas, first published 1943) and 304–27 (on Karl Pearson and others, first published 1950).

Stern had another side: he recruited very effectively for the Communist Party. In precisely this period he had dinner with the literary historian Granville Hicks and persuaded him to join.[37] He may have done the same with Finkelstein. In their papers, Stern and Finley never mention each other. But hostile press accounts linked them closely, using terms like 'real organizer' and 'notorious Stalinist'.[38] And Stern may have been the unnamed 'anthropologist in the cafeteria' who, in a 'crazy caper', introduced Finley to Frans Boas in 1938 (see below, on the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom).

The *Encyclopaedia* had other benefits for Finkelstein. He not only checked facts and composed bibliographies, but wrote one self-consciously magisterial entry on the biblical scholar Julius Wellhausen, finding that Wellhausen 'shows a remarkable critical ability in the use of source materials and considerable detachment from theological bias but fails to overcome certain a priori notions, as, for example, regarding the role and ideas of Jesus. Furthermore his conception of history was almost exclusively politico-religious. . . . The most significant and valid criticism is his disregard for new discoveries in the ancient Orient'.

And the *Encyclopaedia* put him in touch with the German historian Fritz Heichelheim. As Brent Shaw has shown, Finley fact-checked Heichelheim's entry on 'Land Tenure in the Ancient World' in the summer of 1932 and initiated a correspondence with Heichelheim that began his life-long interest in 'problems of the soil'.[39]

In the 1930s, land use joined race as a crucial policy topic. Social scientists and historians contributed to and benefited from the political discussion. In Washington and at the state level, sharecroppers, acreage limits, and the large landowners' war against small became national issues, and

---

[37] Hicks omits Stern's name, but Stern volunteered the information to faculty colleagues at Columbia two decades later. Gutmann, 'Memorandum for the Files', Robert Merton Papers, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library.

[38] Benjamin Stolberg, ' "Innocent Front" Catspaws of Communism', *Washington Post*, December 2, 1939, p. 11. The following spring (April 27, 1940), an unsigned article in the *New Leader* called Finkelstein a 'well known Stalinist', also attacking Mary Dublin (future wife of Truman economic advisor Leon Keyserling) and I. F. Stone. When Stone and Finley corresponded, decades later, neither mentioned this early linkage. On Dublin see the fine study by Storrs 2003. In 1941, Daniel Bell, who had chosen to major in Ancient History at City College under Finley's influence (class of 1939), became editor of *New Leader*, publicly aligned with Finley's foe Sidney Hook: 'I always thought that one could prepare oneself best to be a sociologist by studying ancient history. . . . [Later] we were political antagonists in the old wars of New York intellectual culture'. (Letter to Elisabeth Sifton at the Viking Press, October 28, 1980. Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library).

[39] Shaw 1993, 180–1.

the American left played an active role. One example is the case of Walter Goldschmidt, a young anthropologist trained by A. L. Kroeber, who caused turmoil in Washington and Sacramento when he reported in 1944 that large farms exacerbated economic inequality and social problems in the towns they surrounded. California agribusiness was furious, and the political response included closing Goldschmidt's unit, the California Bureau of Agricultural Research, and reorganization of the federal Bureau of Agricultural economics.[40]

Finley and the Frankfurt School, 1934–46

Interviewed in 1980, Finley remained enthusiastic about his time with the Institute for Social Research.[41] Though on salary there for three years (1936–38), he was busy reviewing, translating, editing and advising between 1934 and 1946 on a part-time basis. Leo Lowenthal became a friend and Max Horkheimer a supporter. Finkelstein was particularly close with Herbert Marcuse.

These relationships require study of their own. One item that has not been studied reveals Finley's debt to Frankfurt School Marxism. As often with Finley the information is buried in his correspondence. In July 1971, Quentin Skinner wrote to thank Finley for a copy of his Inaugural Lecture, *The Ancestral Constitution*; the ensuing exchange continues a discussion begun earlier over dinner at the home of E. H. Carr. About the lecture, Finley volunteers, 'If you are up to a large chunk of rather Hegelian German, you might find interest in Max Horkheimer's 'Egoismus und die Freiheitsbewegung', *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* 5 (1936). I read it when it appeared (I was then working for the Institute in New York), and I suspect that, in the last analysis, that is what originally put me on to the whole idea. I didn't cite it in the Inaugural because when I re-read it for the occasion, I found that it went off into *very* different matters quickly'.[42]

This remark leads to later exchanges in which the three thinkers—Horkheimer, Skinner and Finley—are revealed as meditating common themes across a discursive chasm: Skinner talks about 'prescriptivism',

---

[40] Koppes 1978; also Kirkendall 1966, esp. 223–4.

[41] 'They were the first people, I suppose, who were really involved in the sociology of culture': Winkler, 'Conversation with Moses Finley', 1980 (Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library).

[42] Finley to Skinner, July 13, 1971 (Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library).

Finley about *structures mentales* and the need for historians to attend to psychology, Horkheimer about the 'antagonistic structural dynamic' in 'bourgeois society'. All three are concerned with the politics of social psychology.

For Finley and Horkheimer, this was an issue within Marxism. Horkheimer's psychological approach to Marx was the opposite of *Diamat*, 'dialectical and historical materialism', which Stalin was forcing on orthodox Marxism in those years.[43] As Finley reveals, ideas he came across in New York at age 24 remained fruitful in Cambridge at age 59.

Finley, Boas, and the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, 1938–42

I have written elsewhere about Finley's work with Franz Boas.[44] Here, the focus is some recent documentary finds and interpretive developments.

The Committee was by far the most consequential of Finkelstein's left-wing activities. It was portrayed as a 'Communist Front', and provided a charge against Finley in later hearings. How did it all begin? Finley's account is disarmingly offhand:

> My involvement was never in straight politics. It was always on the fringe. In 1938 *Nature* published, as a deliberate provocation, an article by a virulent Nazi physicist on 'German and Jewish Physics', a bitter assault on Einstein.[45]
>
> Three of us, sitting in a cafeteria, decided we had to get something done about this. One of us was an anthropologist. He went to Franz Boas, who said O.K. and drew up a short statement. Then, in a very crazy caper, we

[43] In the 1970s and 1980s, a theme of Moses Finley's correspondence and meetings with the Czech historian Jan Pecirka and with several East German ancient historians was the need to move beyond *Diamat*. Even then this was dangerous, as Stasi communications about 'pseudowissenschaftliche' historians at the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften made clear. See *inter alia* this Stasi report in Florath 2005, 191–2:

> Information über eine operativ interessante Person...: „Im Zusammenhang mit dieser Information übergab uns unser IM [Inoffizieller Mitarbeiter] eine Konzeption für ein Kolloquium, das auf Initiative von [...] und [geschwärzt] mit Unterstützung von [geschwärzt] im März/April 1977 stattfinden soll (Fotokopie siehe Anlage). Nach Einschätzung unseres IM, dessen fachliche Kompetenz auf diesem Wissenschaftsgebiet ausser Zweifel steht, soll mit diesem Kolloquium der Versuch unternommen werden, die revisionistische These von der Existenz einer 6. Gesellschaftsformation, der sogenannten asiatischen Produktionsweise, zu propagieren und pseudowissenschaftlich zu belegen.

[44] Tompkins 2006.

[45] Stark 1938.

> got hold of the faculty lists of about 1200 universities, sent the statement out over Boas's signature and produced 1500 names. We were just a gaggle of students, not knowing anything about anything, but we issued a press release with all the names and hit the front page of the New York Times.[46]
>
> So then Boas said, 'We can't leave it at this, can we?' He went and got some money and organized the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.... One of its youngest members was a man named J. Robert Oppenheimer. We made noises, as pressure groups do, and then we took on the Dies Committee ['Un-American Activities'].
>
> It was at that point that 'Communist front' talk started and, given the structure of the committee, I had to be the Communist front. Oh boy! All the others were just being led by the nose. Well, when the United States entered the war there was no point to the committee's continuing and it was wound up. But by that time I had a fair label on me.[47]

Readers may ask, with *which* anthropologists was Finkelstein friendly in 1938? The only evident candidate is Bernhard Stern, the former *Encyclopaedia* colleague. Stern had also worked with Boas. If we replace 'an anthropologist' with 'an important Communist Party author, editor and recruiter', the narrative conveys, perhaps, not an impish 'caper' but a premeditated initiative. Did Finley's failure to name his contact reflect the casual nature of the interview, or long, artful practice? We do not know.

In any case, despite the accusations of its foes the Committee's work was positive, and the Committee's most active members were not Party members but people like Leslie Dunn. Nor can we infer from the correspondence and other documents that Boas was becoming senile, as asserted by J. Edgar Hoover and others. Indeed, Dewey's correspondence with Hook in this period shows far less involvement and command of detail than Boas' with Finkelstein, and at one point Hook undermines Dewey's relationship with his old Columbia colleague by leaking anonymously to the *New York Times*.[48]

---

[46] Finley played the key role in placing 'Nazis' Conception of Science Scored' in the *New York Times* (November 1, 1938).

[47] Richard Winkler, 'A Conversation with Moses Finley', 1980 (Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library).

[48] See Tompkins 2006, 116; see Hoover letter of December 12, 1941 (note 5 above), and the draft notes of Esther Goldfrank, *Notes on an Undirected Life*: 'The political climate in the Department of Anthropology'. E. S. Goldfrank Papers, National Anthropological Archives, Suitland, Maryland, Folder 2, p. 225. The affiliations of both Boas and Dewey in this period were shifting radically: Boas served with Dewey on the Trotsky defense committee until at least February, 1937, and Dewey was on the board of the American Russian Institute. See Hook 1995, 43–47, and this Moscow communication provided by Russian historian Svetlana Chervonnaya: from Neiman, Head, 3rd Western Department, NKID to VOKS/Arosev,

The Communist Party was still legal at this time, though members were often prudent about revealing their affiliation. In any case, Finkelstein's enemies were prompt, as Finley later said, to give him a 'label'.

Finkelstein and Boas took strong positions on racial matters.[49] Internationally, Boas had consistently opposed imperial oppression. Commenting in 1919 on Versailles in 'Colonies and the Peace Conference', he warned that League of Nations mandatories '. . . have an ugly habit of forgetting their mandate and of considering their temporary charges as their permanent property'. If colonies *are* maintained, the welfare of 'inhabitants . . . and . . . humanity as a whole' requires minimal standards including non-removal of 'valuable raw materials' and preservation of natives' 'industrial and social life'.[50] Boas was unwavering. As he wrote to Finkelstein in 1941:

> It has always been my position and my regret that our help to England has not been made conditional upon the recognition of the rights of oppressed races.[51]

And for Boas, 'oppressed races' were not just an international challenge.

It is not surprising therefore that in the busy summer of 1939 Finkelstein wrote *Can You Name Them*, a short and attractive brochure on undistinctive phenotypes (English, Swedish, Jewish . . .).[52] His arguments were brief and pointed:

> Today the term 'race' has taken on a high emotional intensity and is almost unavoidably associated with an exaggerated nationalism and with claims of 'racial' superiority.
>
> Serious anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists have emphasized over and over again that no proof has ever been given to show that the mental characteristics of a 'race' can be deduced from its descent . . .

Finkelstein added two-page sections on 'Race in Textbooks' and 'Vulgar Modes . . .' and a longer one, 'What Science Teaches . . .'.

---

28 June, 1937: 'sending over an excerpt from Oumansky's letter from 31/V [1937]. We attract your attention to the paragraph discussing the need to push the American Russian Institute to get rid of Dewey ASAP . . .'. Referent S. Vinogradov.

[49] Peter J. Katzenstein details the longstanding racial bias of American foreign policy: Katzenstein 2012. See especially 217 on Woodrow Wilson.

[50] Boas 1919. Sidney Hook's memoir, *Out of Step* claims (Hook 1987, 258) that Boas had never 'been political' before the late 1930s: a claim that serves Hook's rhetorical purpose, but does not square with the facts of Boas' life.

[51] July 16, 1941. Boas Papers, American Philosophical Society.

[52] American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom 1939.

'Race' now concerned whites, especially Jews, for obvious reasons. Not only Hitler but the New York Chamber of Commerce were the foes. Since 1934 the Chamber had deployed the 'findings' of the eugenicist Harry Laughlin to oppose Jewish immigration.[53] In 1939 it published Laughlin's *Immigration and Conquest. A study of the United States as the receiver of old world emigrants who become the parents of future-born Americans*, a curious document that deploys fanciful charts to claim that Italians are moronic, because many wind up in mental institutions, while 'Africans' score low (along with Italians, Poles, Belgians, and Latin Americans) on the vague measure of 'inventiveness'.[54] Americans of French descent score highest, English in the middle. No one in the Chamber appears to have asked why, if this supposed difference is 'racial', Belgians score low and the French high.[55]

Jews are the Chamber's real target. A long section on immigration 'loopholes' (123–161) bemoans the government's passivity in admitting Jews who violated German law to escape Hitler. Jews, to Laughlin and the Chamber, were 'human dross . . . slow to assimilate to the American way of life'. (p. 20). The *New York Times* story ('Immigration Curb is Urged in Survey') appeared on June 8, 1939. Finkelstein developed a reply, writing Boas on July 17, 'I have given you a back seat in the Chamber of Commerce story, which, by the way, may create an explosion'. It appeared on July 23 under the headline:

> Aliens Defended in Race Dispute. Educators Denounce State Chamber's Report . . . View Held Unscientific.

This was only one of several tiffs with the Chamber that summer.[56]

---

[53] On May 7, 1934, the *New York Times* reported a protest by Rabbi Stephen Wise and others against a previous Laughlin-Chamber effort to prevent refugees from Hitler to enter the United States ('State Chamber Assailed by Jews').

[54] No one complained about the dissonance between a fine-tuned separation of Belgians from French and, on the other hand, use of an entire continent for 'Africans'.

[55] The *Times* headed a later Finkelstein response to a Chamber report on schools, 'Report on Schools Scored as "Fascist" ' (October 3, 1939). The adjective worried Boas. Finkelstein explained, 'We did not call the report of the Chamber of Commerce fascist. What we did say was that its conception of the state was fascist'. (Boas Papers, October 4, 1939).

[56] I can find no evidence that the Chamber has ever apologized for, or even acknowledged, portraying Jews as 'human dross'.

Finley and His Fellow Students, 1932–47

To a certain extent, Finley and his friends educated each other:

> At Columbia University I first studied ancient history. . . . Those were years of considerable tension. . . . the Nazi seizure of power, . . . the Spanish Civil War. . . . As I think back to this period, I have the firm impression that the lectures and seminars were pretty severely locked in an ivory tower. . . . I . . . refer . . to the irrelevance of [our professors'] work as historians. The same lectures and seminars could have been given—and no doubt were—in an earlier generation, before the First World War. . . . We, who were growing up in a difficult world . . . sought explanation and understanding. . . . And so we went off on our own to seek in books what we thought we were not getting in lectures and seminars.
>
> We read and argued about Marc Bloch and Henri Pirenne, Max Weber, Veblen and the Freudians, . . . Marx and the Marxists . . . not just *Das Kapital*, not even primarily *Das Kapital*, but also Marxist historical and theoretical works.[57]

Many of Moses Finkelstein's brilliant comrades were severely damaged in the McCarthy years, even though some continued teaching careers (Thorner and Finley in exile). A large number were on the left, though the sociologist Benjamin Nelson was not. A number of them, including Daniel Thorner, Jack and Phil Foner, Ben Paskoff, and Finkelstein himself, taught history at City College. Records of this group are scattered when they exist at all, and some names emerge by sheer chance: Ted Geiger is barely mentioned in the correspondence, but figures importantly in the reminiscences of Alice Thorner.[58] The name of Renaissance historian Charles Trinkaus does not seem to appear in the Cambridge Finley Papers, but a visit to the Sarah Lawrence College Library uncovered not only very full correspondence with Moses Finley in later years but a beautifully written paper Trinkaus prepared for Lynn Thorndike in 1933 on 'economic freedom and gilds', detailed typed notes, probably from the '30s, on Engels' *Anti-Dühring*, and an unpublished paper on Marxism from the 1990s.[59]

There is no sign that any of those who continued teaching harmed the country or indoctrinated their students, as was often claimed. Indeed,

---

57 Finley 1967a.

58 Personal interview, August 10–11, 2005.

59 The paper on guilds is 'The Problem of Economic Freedom in the Craft Guilds of Thirteenth Century Paris. A Study of the Relationship of the Individual and the Institution Based upon the *Livre des Métiers d'Étienne Boileau*', Charles Trinkaus Papers, Sarah Lawrence College Library Archives.

some were later assailed as 'anti-Marxists'. Charles Trinkaus' case is exceptional since Sarah Lawrence College, perhaps more than any American institution, treated the political preferences of its faculty as a private matter and punished no faculty for their convictions.

Finley's relationship with Meyer Reinhold is particularly interesting. Finley and Reinhold knew each other from the mid-thirties. Westermann told them and Naphtali Lewis 'You are the ablest . . . students I have ever had',[60] but he did not always treat them well.[61] Mary Finkelstein had introduced Reinhold to his future wife, Diane, and Reinhold had a number of worthwhile stories about their early years. Unfortunately, we know nothing about the composition of Reinhold's bold assault on Rostovtzeff. There is good reason to believe that his friend Moses Finkelstein was involved, but—as so often in this essay—no hard evidence.[62] Finley praised Reinhold's analysis in later years, noting that the profession had treated it unfairly.[63]

Reinhold begins by contrasting 'scientific' study with Rostovtzeff's 'subjective, *a priori* method'. He notes Rostovtzeff's tendency to 'modernize' antiquity by using modern terminology ('capitalist', 'mass production'), and his view of the ancient world as an 'infant capitalist system' that was 'more or less similar to modern capitalism'. For Reinhold, this runs 'counter to the objective facts': the 'foundation of economic life in all periods of antiquity for all classes was agriculture', and—as Gunnar Mickwitz had recently claimed—'scientific rationalized agriculture is [only] a product of modern times'.[64] Rostovtzeff ignores mass poverty; influenced by his class location in the prerevolutionary Russian bourgeoisie, he imagined a 'mythical' ancient 'bourgeoisie', portraying the Ptolemies as 'impartial and just' and Roman emperors as 'protectors of the weak' (90, 93). Most importantly, he divorced class struggle from the 'economic order'.

---

[60] Briggs 2006.

[61] When Rutgers University Press in 1951 asked his opinion of Finley's *Studies in Land and Credit*, Westermann responded: 'I must say in frankness, that in my judgment its publication is not really imperative. It is a good doctoral dissertation'. Quoted in G. W. Bowersock's unpublished paper, 'Westermann's Role in the Development of Ancient History in America' (2000; copy kindly provided by Professor Bowersock).

[62] The original initial footnote in Reinhold's critique of Rostovtzeff (Reinhold 1946) credits 'several friends' and in particular the third in their group, Naphtali Lewis. In the reprinted version in Reinhold 2002, the reference to 'several friends' is dropped.

[63] 'When . . . Meyer Reinhold wrote a sympathetic, perceptive, but critical article on Rostovtzeff in 1946, . . . he was castigated in private for his "bad taste" and he was ignored in public. Only Momigliano noticed the article . . . ': Finley, reviewing Momigliano's *Terzo Contributo* (Finley 1968b, 357).

[64] Mickwitz 1937.

> [I]t is only in part his pluralistic historical methodology that accounts for the glaring contradictions and inconsistencies … Equally responsible are his ambivalent petite [*sic*] bourgeois ideological position, … and eclecticism …, and his projection into antiquity of modern social and economic forms. (99)

That Reinhold's essay was published not in a classical journal (which journal, we can ask, would have accepted it?), but in Bernhard Stern's Marxian *Science and Society*, possibly contributed to the baseless charge that Reinhold was a Communist and to his resignation from the Brooklyn College faculty a decade later.[65] The essay reveals wide reading, substantial effort, and a sound core principle, i.e. that modern economies, with their industrial basis, massive financial coordination, and wage labor, are very different from ancient. That Reinhold never again wrote in this vein is a loss to the profession.

Reinhold does not mention Finkelstein, but linkages emerge. Like Finkelstein and unlike any other American ancient historian at that time, Reinhold favored not only Mickwitz but Max Weber's *Agrarverhältnisse im Altertum* (98).[66]

In style and manner, the essay is very much that of a young scholar immersed in economic history, with a family resemblance to Finley himself. Their tones are different, however. Finley never spoke of an 'ambivalent petite bourgeois ideological position'. Finkelstein's critique of Victor Ehrenberg a decade earlier had used some leftist terminology ('scientific' below), but relied more an allusion than direct attack:

> The study of history has reached an impasse. Unless the basic postulates are shifted, no real advance is possible any longer. Most historians … continue to flounder in positivistic analysis and the eternal reiteration of 'the glory that was Greece …'. [M]any, led by Berve, demand a backward step to Treitschkean 'Individualgeschichte' where 'Volk, Stamm und Rasse' will receive the center of the stage. … Ehrenberg attacks this position strongly—and lands in the same camp [of] dialectical idealism. …
>
> He thus avoids … a simple struggle of Europe against Asia [or] racial mysticism [but avoids] still more strictly those very problems … which can provide a consistent scientific understanding of antiquity. … [He has] an unintelligible conception of the break between ancient and medieval society: of the change from slavery to feudalism he knows nothing … . Despite himself, E. constantly ends in mysticism … The discussion of politics is unrealistic.

65 Could Finkelstein, as an acquaintance of Stern, have placed the article there?
66 Finley was citing Mickwitz in the same period: Shaw 1993, 192.

> He confuses motives with propaganda symbols . . . and he frequently resorts to the very racial explanations which he elsewhere attacks.[67]

Russian War Relief (*RWR*) *1942–46*

If Bernhard Stern's career deserves a book, so does Russian Jewish War Relief, which raised over $50 million to send goods to embattled Soviet villages. Finley became national campaign director, and the sparse and scanty records of the group, at Columbia University Library and in the Edward Carter Papers at the University of Vermont, as well as others unearthed by Fred Naiden, reveal Finkelstein's senior role in this organization, including occasional disagreements with senators, Zionists, immigrant groups hostile to the USSR, and the Roosevelt administration.[68]

Wealthy financiers, carefully excluding anyone who seemed 'pink', had founded this group in the 1930s to raise 'millions not just thousands' for Soviet medical relief. During the war, Rabbi Wise and Albert Einstein became honorary co-chairmen and Finley escorted them to the dais at Madison Square Garden.[69] Documents from Moscow show that by late 1943 the Kremlin was increasingly critical of the 'independence' of Russian War Relief and in 1945 or 1946 ceased to provide financial support. Svetlana Chervonnaya, a Russian historian and archival scholar, remarks that this was 'a story of two different cultures, of perception gaps on both sides, and of how the Soviets were their own worst enemies—initiating the first ever *de facto* pro-Soviet lobby and then killing it with their own hands'.

A fascinating detail: William Nelson Cromwell, co-founder of the very white-shoe law firm Sullivan and Cromwell, was also one of the wealthy founders of Russian War Relief. When Cromwell died in July 1948, his executors—led by John Foster Dulles—were dismayed to learn of a major bequest to Russian War Relief. Dulles went to court, and succeeded in canceling this bequest since the organization was 'not functioning within the terms of the will'. On May 30, 1950 New Yorkers learned that Cromwell's funds went instead to Columbia, to support a new building on Amsterdam Avenue housing the Law School, International Studies, and

---

67 Finley [Finkelstein] 1936, 439–40. At the same time, the Nazi historian Helmut Berve was condemning the "jüdische-apologetische Tendenz" of Ehrenberg's book: *Philologische Wochenschrift* 23/24 (June 12, 1937), 650–55: 655.

68 See Naiden forthcoming for a full account of Finley's work with RWR.

69 Wealthy founders: Svetlana Chervonnaya, April 25, 2005, personal communication. Einstein and Wise: Fred Naiden, May 2012, personal communication.

Public Law and Government—where Finley had begun graduate study, 22 years before.

The American Russian Institute, 1946–47

In March 1946, Soviet-friendly institutions began a massive publicity campaign and membership drive. The month is significant: on March 5, Winston Churchill had delivered his Iron Curtain speech in Fulton, Missouri, and interoffice communication at Russian War Relief reflect an awareness that Soviet-Western relations were about to shift. In March, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship called for a national conference. On June 12, the board approved expending $25,000 above the budget for an organizing campaign, and on June 19, Fred Myers, Finkelstein's immediate superior at Russian War Relief, moved from Executive Director of that organization to the same post in American Russian Institute: Finkelstein followed in September, either as 'activities director', his term in a letter to Edward Carter, or 'membership director', in his FBI file.[70]

August 1946 was a busy month at the National Council. Richard Morford, Executive Director and Corliss Lamont, Chairman of the Board were charged with contempt of congress; a call was issued for nationwide organizing in the interest of Soviet-American friendship; facilities were enlarged; staff changes seem to have verged on frenetic, and fund-raising became urgent. Then, in January 1947, internal memos record disappointing fund-raising, despite a Madison Square Garden rally in December.[71]

We have two reports on Finley from this period. On the one hand, from his FBI file, informants report that the American Russian Institute lost large sums in the expansion drive, infuriating Lamont and other backers and leading to charges that Finkelstein and Myers were 'wreckers': a consequential term in Stalin's day. One informant adds:

> Throughout his activities at the American Russian Institute, . . . Finley was meticulous in his efforts to retain the American Russian Institute at an unassailable level in relation to political controversy.[72]

The other, new, perspective was recently discovered in papers from the Moscow archives:

---

[70] 'Named By Russian Institute', *New York Times*, June 20, 1946, mentions Myers' move.

[71] All the above is based on the files of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship at the Tamiment Library, New York University.

[72] Finley FBI File.

> From A. A. Ermolaev's diary, Moscow. Record of conversation with the editor of foreign department of the *New Masses*, John Stuart, March 20, 1947, p. 142:
>
> > Finley is a devoted person, member of the Communist Party and sort of [Fred] Myers's political commissar, but he has not determined his place at American Russian Institute . . . and does not understand his tasks.[73]

Why, at this point in his career, did the issue of Finkelstein's role in the Party come up, eight days before his known contacts with the Party terminate? Was Stuart being asked whether Finkelstein was reliable? We don't know, but the date makes clear that Stuart was reporting on a colleague whose mission had failed.

On March 28, Finley resigned from his position.[74]

The Crisis of Spring 1947

Now, at last, Finley's name figures in multiple documented accounts, though they are not transparent:

> March 28: Finley resigns post at American Russian Institute.
>
> March 30: Finley writes to Benjamin Nelson:
>
> > I now NEED the Corpus Iuris and the other books that you have . . . So please be a good guy and dispatch them this week . . .
> >
> > P.S. Since last December, by the way, the name has changed to Finley.[75]
>
> Early April, 1947, Professor Westermann responds to Finley's inquiry about returning to Columbia:
>
> > As I recall your thesis, as previously outlined, was not in the field of the mechanics of polis administration. . . . . Of your proposed problems [only a few] offer anything new to me. . . . I wish to repeat that I am not at all convinced that I want this business of carrying your thesis through under my direction. If I should decide to accept this task I can not accept any responsibility in respect to getting a position for you. There are too

[73] The source for this report is Fond 5283, op. 22s, file 25, Corp. 142, State Archive of the Russian Federation. Fond (record group) 5283 contains the records of VOKS, Russian abbreviation for the Soviet Society for Cultural Contacts with Foreign Country. 'Ermolaev was at the time VOKS's representative in NYC; likely from MGB, working under the roof of the Soviet Consulate General. Fred Myers was not only the executive Director of the New York American Russian Institute and previously a leader at RWR, but had represented RWR in Moscow'. This information is provided by Russian historian Svetlana Chervonnaya, personal communication, July 9, 2012. Stuart was not ignorant: he was the person sent to talk to Granville Hicks when Hicks left the Party in 1939: Hicks 1965, 183–4.

[74] Finley FBI file.

[75] Nelson Papers, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Finley's FBI file dates the name change to October.

> many handicaps. Lack of sufficient ability in handling Greek and Latin is decisive, in itself, in making it impossible for me to recommend you as a primary candidate for a position in ancient history. Other hurdles, also, exist which are known to us both. I would strongly advise you to go back into the work in which you have apparently found success, because I see little help of a future in this revival of your old interests. Meanwhile I will reconsider the problem of sponsoring your thesis.... As it now stands the subject is not acceptable to me.[76]

April 20, 1947, Finley thanks Benjamin Nelson and adds:

> The point to my urgency is, as you must have guessed, no Weber-Tawney acquisitive instinct but a slowly maturing decision to return to the world from which I came. Last year I began to make up my mind that I belonged in the academic world, if it will have me, and last month I seized upon the fortuitous fact of suddenly losing a job to turn the decision into reality.[77]

Horkheimer's very positive letter of recommendation arrived, May 28.[78]

Spring 1947 is a turning point. From March 28, 1947 through the rest of his life, Finley no longer had any visible association with any Russian, or with any Communist Party, group. The scholarship he produces in the next decade seems not to be 'Marxist', and the non-Marxist sources he uses are exuberant—Mauss, Polanyi, Weber, Richard Thurnwald, Nietzsche. As his long correspondence with Jan Pecirka and other East Bloc scholars, and his treatment of these scholars in *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* indicate, he certainly remained interested in Marxist topics and in economic oppression. All these are topics for another day. But as regards Party-oriented activism, a long and action-filled arc of his career appears to have ended.

Like others, Finley took large risks. His FBI file shows agents hard at work in 1953 on a possible a perjury case against him. They finally decided they could not build one. But especially since the 'Communist' tag is so often employed to condemn, we must note the activities he engaged in. He helped to shape American opposition to Nazi race theory. As the author of the American Committee's statements, he was a leader against racist and lethal eugenics. He also fought the intrusive inquisitions of the House Un-American Activities committee, and helped to send $50 million worth of goods to suffering Russians. This is an impressive list of achievements.

---

[76] Westermann Papers, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library.
[77] Nelson Papers, Columbia.
[78] Lewis Webster Jones Papers, Rutgers University.

The final archival find comes from the Hoover Institution. The historian Arthur Schlesinger wrote to Sidney Hook about an apparent attempt to derail Finley's effort to find work in England:

> I have forwarded the information about Finley on to Oxford, where it will serve a useful purpose.[79]

That month at Oxford, Finley's strongest backer was Hugh Trevor-Roper, who had read Finley's *World of Odysseus*, and persuaded his college to extend an offer to Finley:

> I determined to get him to Christ Church. Of course there was a panic on the Right Wing, but after a tremendous struggle I persuaded the governing body of Christ Church to make him an offer. Unfortunately, by that time my old classical tutor, Denys Page, . . . persuaded Cambridge to make him a better offer, so we lost him.[80]

Finley, working with Boas in 1938–39, had been opposed by Hook, who was allied with Dewey. Hook carried on his campaign, as was his wont, for more than a decade and a half, reaching even into foreign countries.[81] In this case, he failed.

Ironically, the other topic in Schlesinger's letter is the international Congress for Cultural Freedom, the organization that grew out of American Committee for Cultural Freedom that Hook and Dewey set up against Boas.[82] Under Hook's leadership, the Congress had evolved into an entity generously and secretly funded by the CIA.[83]

---

[79] Sidney Hook Papers, Hoover Institution.

[80] Trevor-Roper 2007, 198–9.

[81] Any doubts about Hook's unremitting bitterness about the 1930s are dispelled by a review of his correspondence in the 1980s with Harry Slochower, a boyhood friend who had gone to prison in the McCarthy era, in the Hook Papers at the Hoover Institution. Fifty years after the events, they are still quarreling about who signed which petition with what intent in 1939. At one point Slochower explodes: 'I *did* know what I did in the thirties and did so in the deepest conviction that it was Nazism which was the enemy of mankind and I supported *any* force which fought against it'.

[82] 'I agree with most of your comments about the Committee. I am particularly grateful for the fight you made to gain a measure of tolerance in New York for the activities of the Congress'.

[83] See, among many treatments, Walter Goodman, 'Studies Thaw the Exploits of Undercover Cold Warriors', *New York Times*, June 10, 2000.

FINKELSTEIN THE ORIENTALIST

Seth R. Schwartz

As Arnaldo Momigliano noted soon after Moses Finley's death, Finley paid very little attention to Jews or Judaism in his scholarship.[1] In this paper I would like to explore this silence in two ways, first, biographically, by trying to determine what sort of Jewish background Finley had, and how much Jewish knowledge he is likely to have brought to his career as ancient historian, a topic about which quite a lot of dubious lore (and some correct lore) has been reported. Second, I would like to explore it intellectually, by wondering about the cognitive costs and benefits of this act of 'erasure'. My question was inspired by Finley's unconvincingly cavalier dismissal of the 'near east', including the Jews, as a suitable topic for coverage in the introduction to *The Ancient Economy*. Why did he do it and how would the text have looked if he had not?

Finley on the Jews

We can begin with a survey of Finley's few treatments of the Jews: most substantial is the introduction to an abridged English translation of Josephus's *Jewish War*.[2] When Finley's friend Vidal-Naquet took on a nearly identical project a few years later, he used it to produce novel and highly influential readings of the text.[3] By contrast Finley's essay mainly rehashes, albeit with the trademark Finleyesque verve, standard scholarship on Josephus and on Jewish history in the Hellenistic and early Roman

[1] Momigliano 1994, 203–8. Yet Momigliano believed that Finley's interest in slavery was a vestige of his (presumed) childhood study of the Hebrew Bible and the Passover Haggadah. Finley's brief essay on Julius Wellhausen in the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (Finley 1935), for all its precocity, provides little direct evidence about the depth of its author's knowledge of the Hebrew Bible.

This brief paper has taken me into some unfamiliar territory. I would like to thank my guides: Michael Beizer, David Fishman, Michael Stanislawski; Jonathan Krasner, Shuly Schwartz, Jack Wertheimer. Peter Garnsey shared with me what he had learned from Finley's correspondence with Momigliano, preserved among Finley's papers at Cambridge, and Dan Tompkins provided much of the documentary material cited in the paper. None of these is responsible for my errors.

[2] Finley 1965a.

[3] Vidal-Naquet 1977; expanded as P. Vidal-Naquet 1982, with preface by Momigliano.

periods; furthermore, it is not difficult to discern the influence on the chapter of A. H. M. Jones and even more so of Momigliano, both of whose help Finley acknowledges.[4] Finley's judgment about which scholarship to rehash is generally solid. Of his more argumentative views, his skepticism about Josephus's qualities as a historian bucked mid-century fashion, and is unfashionable again today, but it is indubitably valid. Even his long condemnation of Josephus as moral agent, I believe an unusual move in Finley's work, is amply justified.

But there are some lapses. In line with the standard scholarship of the time, Finley supposed that there was in first century Judaea a single anti-Roman movement called the Zealots,[5] but his characterization of them is eccentric: they were, intense nationalism notwithstanding, the *left* wing of the Pharisees (the right wing cared only about religion, not politics), so characterized because their rebellion against Rome was also a class war against collaborationist Jewish aristocrats.[6] A commentator more clued in to Zionism, for example, might have characterized the Zealots precisely as right wing; a decade after Finley wrote about them, they would begin to evoke the right fringe of Religious Zionism, committed to a 'complete Land of Israel' inhabited by Jews alone. The Zealots, Finley claimed, were the activists, organized in secret cells (!), at the vanguard of a mass popular movement.[7] Josephus's own views give us a sense of the political ideology embraced by the Zealots' aristocratic enemies: scrupulous devotion to

---

[4] Finley 1965, xxxiv.

[5] E.g., Farmer 1956. Though there remains much confusion on the point, most scholars now acknowledge that there was no unified anti-Roman movement at any time before 66 C.E., that the Zealots were one faction among many, first attested during the Revolt itself, and that the one faction likely to have significantly pre-existed the Revolt was the Sicarii, and they were probably the group that Josephus characterized as differing from the Pharisees only in that they refused to be ruled by any king but God. The organization's secrecy is a reasonable inference from the illegality of its trademark activity, assassination of pro-Roman Jews—though Josephus says only that they committed their crimes stealthily (*Jewish War* 2.254–5)—but organization in secret cells seems 'overdetermined'. Cf. M. Smith 1971; Stern 1973, 135–52.

[6] Finley thus anticipated the argument of the orthodox Marxist East German historian Heinz Kreissig (Kreissig 1970) His immediate source was probably Momigliano (cf. *Cambridge Ancient History* 10.850, published 1934), who had had a remarkably unsophisticated view of social relations in first century Judaea; Brunt's paper 'Josephus on Social Conflicts in Judaea' (Brunt 1977) at least cited evidence. There were complex social tensions at work and a few early episodes in the rebellion (most famously, the burning of the Jerusalem archives containing copies of loan contracts) had the features of class war, but it is now generally acknowledged that most of the wealthy enthusiastically joined the rebellion (e.g., Goodman 1987); and even this view is, furthermore, misleading since the rebellion was a rebellion only in its opening and closing phases; in between it was chaos, generated by the evaporation of Roman rule in the Palestinian interior.

[7] Finley 1965a, xvi–xvii.

the more anodyne beliefs and the ritualistic surface of the Jewish religion, but repression of its revolutionary messianic core.[8] One almost expects Finley, writing at the high-water mark of expansionist liberal Judaism (in which Finley himself had grown up), to characterize his purely hypothetical aristocratic version of Judaism as suburban or bourgeois.

Did Finley reveal something about himself in these pages, or was his repression/suppression of both his Judaism and his communism, not to mention his control as a writer, by this time so complete that we should see nothing here but surprisingly bad history?

In 1964, Finley reviewed for the *New York Review of Books* two books on Christian origins, and in early 1965 published a piece on the Second Vatican Council and the execution of Jesus; some of the content overlaps with the contemporaneous essay on Josephus.[9] In the first essay he decries the practice of conservative Christian theologians of forgetting that Jesus was Jewish and that the earliest Christianity was a Jewish sect, and in the second notes that Vatican II did not actually absolve ancient Jews of the responsibility for executing Jesus, only modern ones, but then argues in a striking peroration that chimerical hostility to Jews is central to all of the long history of Christianity, a fault which cannot be resolved either by pontifical fiat or by historians' arguments over what happened in Jerusalem on Passover of the year 30: it is the world of the present that needs to change. Unexpectedly, Finley comes across as fascinated by and well-informed about the material. He argued that theological scholarship—in the worst case a crude and partial type of history of ideas—is intellectually unsound. He expressed skepticism about, though interest in, the process of extracting historical narratives from religious or other non-historical texts by means of what we might call methodology, or what Finley's student Hopkins famously called sifting,[10] and squeamishness about historical inquiries shaped too blatantly by contemporary political/religious concerns.[11] These objections have aged rather well. What is

8 Finley 1965a, xxiv.

9 March 6, 1964, and January 28, 1965, reprinted together in Finley 1968a, 177–96. The mid-'60s was Finley's 'Jewish' period: there is no hint of comparable engagement either before or after.

10 Finley had previously been less skeptical of such projects: see *The World of Odysseus* (Finley 1954). Admittedly Finley used a model rather than a methodology of reading.

11 All these themes, including the condemnation of Christianizing teleology, are present *in nuce* in the encyclopedia article on Wellhausen cited above. In addition, the late adolescent Finkelstein criticized the deceased German grandee for writing an internalist history of the Israelites focused on politics and religion alone and not, presumably, on economy and society. But he expressed sympathy for Wellhausen's basic project, as he did thirty years later for Goguel's, of painstakingly extracting a non-theological history

even more surprising is how impassioned the essays are: in the first, Finley's demonstration of the intellectual vapidity of a long forgotten book on early Christian allegoresis written by the German Catholic theologian, Hugo Rahner, is utterly convincing, but his outrage at Rahner's treatment of Christian theology as if it had only Greek, not Jewish, roots constantly threatens to burst through the surface of the writing which is otherwise lively and polemical but emotionally cool. From these short essays we learn that Finley's wartime activism, which was both pro-Soviet and anti-antisemitic (see Tompkins in this volume), still resonated for him decades later. Momigliano, who was the first to discern how unusual the *NYRB* essays were in the context of Finley's work, listed some other very scattered but totally neutral references to Judaism. I will return below to Finley's comment near the beginning of *The Ancient Economy* that Hebrew has no word for freedom.

How unusual was Finley's silence about the Jews? It was quite unusual if we think of him as a New York Jewish intellectual of the mid-twentieth century. To be sure, the classification is debatable: though he had connections in that world until his departure for the United Kingdom, Finley does not comfortably fit the description. He did not grow up among inner-city immigrants, did not attend City College, though he taught there when he was no older than most college students, never wrote for the *Menorah Journal* or the *Partisan Review*, and was emphatically not a Trotskyite-turned-social-democrat (-turned-neoconservative).[12] But he was not far from the model either, and in any case the boundaries between the various leftist schisms were vigorously policed but extremely porous; and it is worth at least noting the fact that his contemporaries in that world, who without exception rejected Judaism at least as completely as Finley, nevertheless in many cases remained engaged in their writing, often critically, with some sort of Jewishness—cultural, social, or political. Finley

from theological texts. His critique of Wellhausen's implicit Christianizing anticipated by a few years Yehezkel Kaufmann's epic expatiation on the theme in *Toldot Ha-Emunah Ha-Yisre'elit* (*History of the Israelite Religion*), 4 volumes, Tel Aviv, 1937. Finkelstein's essential affirmation of Wellhausen at a time when the organized Jewish denominations (and not just the orthodox, as F. stated) all rejected him (so the Conservative movement/Jewish Theological Seminary) or were ambivalent (Reform/Hebrew Union College), and when very few Jewish scholars, whether or not they were affiliated with a religious movement, admitted to accepting the 'documentary hypothesis' is telling. But many individuals associated with these institutions—including Louis Ginzberg: see below—held surprising views. See Ellenson and Bycel 1997 (also covering the HUC curriculum).

12 See Cooney 1986, with excellent discussion of the Jewishness of the New York intellectuals, even the ones who were not Jewish, at 229–45.

chose to write on a different set of topics from Alfred Kazin, Philip Rahv, Irving Howe or Daniel Bell; there was no real place in his mature work for discussion of Jewish immigrant culture, Yiddish, the Holocaust or Zionism. If Finley had written more pieces like the *NYRB* articles, the record might look different.

More relevant is the fact that Finley resisted engagement with ancient Jews in his scholarship. Indeed, few people who wrote as much as he did about Roman history succeeded in avoiding the Jews as effectively as Finley. He can be readily compared with his fellow professors of ancient history at Cambridge, A. H. M. Jones, who wrote a book about the Herodian family,[13] M. K. Hopkins, whose final book covered the Jewish context of early Christianity extensively though eccentrically,[14] or the Romanists among his Oxford counterparts, most notably F. G. B. Millar, whose contributions to ancient Jewish history are too numerous to be listed, and even Ronald Syme who, though he focused on the imperial center, did not neglect the Jews to the same extent Finley did.[15]

Finley may be even more meaningfully contrasted with his contemporaries and colleagues Elias Bickerman and Arnaldo Momigliano. Like them Finley was a Jew who had witnessed the upheavals of the early and mid-twentieth century, though the others admittedly had done so at closer quarters. Like them, Finley was brilliant and self-consciously iconoclastic. Bickerman and Momigliano both, in their drastically different ways, used Jewish history as a wedge issue to broaden the study of classical antiquity in challenging new directions.[16] How then to explain Finley?

---

[13] Jones 1938.

[14] Hopkins 2000.

[15] See Syme 1971 and 1988.

[16] Baumgarten's book about Bickerman (Baumgarten 2010) has much to say about Momigliano as well. Momigliano had a substantial Jewish education though, by central and eastern European standards, it was an eccentric one, having been provided by a relative who was both a kabbalist and a humanist, a peculiarly Italian combination. It is not clear that he ever studied even the basic rabbinic texts, though he indubitably knew Hebrew, Bible, and much additional Jewish lore. Bickerman received little Jewish education, and never succeeded in learning Hebrew. Momigliano constantly discussed his own background (with certain episodes omitted!) and its relevance to his intellectual life and work, whereas Bickerman did not, at least in print.

Finley's Family

I would like to detour briefly to discuss Finley's background, which will help sharpen the question. Many accounts viewed Finley's life as conforming to certain stereotypical patterns, say an American or Calvinist story of self-realization, or a story of immigrant acculturation, or of Jewish enlightenment. Though he was not precisely a 'New York intellectual' he was sometimes spoken about, misleadingly rather than completely falsely, as if his life conformed to the same pattern: escape from the stifling parochialism of immigrant Jewishness into commitment to universalistic radical politics combined with a career in literature or academic humanities. In Finley's case this trope was often merged with another, conforming Finley to a model of Jewish modernization easily traced back to figures like Salomon Maimon (1754–1800), a Lithuanian Talmudic prodigy who ran off to Berlin and the circle of Immanuel Kant, only to be rejected and disillusioned there too, a perpetually alienated iconoclast, the Job of the Enlightenment, as one of his biographers called him.[17] There may be some poetic justice in the subordination of the facts of Finley's life to one or another Weberian ideal type, but Finley would have been the first to object that Weberian ideal types are purely heuristic, with no predictive value in individual cases. Dan Tompkins dismantled some of the most egregious misprisions of Finley's story, perpetrated not by optimistic American strivers or acculturating Jews but by uncomprehending English dons.[18] Some elements of the narrative presumably came from Finley himself. Such master narratives are attractive after all because among other things they are not always totally false—they provide a convenient way of summing up common experiences. The version of the story applied to Finley emphasizes the intensity of his youthful Jewishness and in some cases the distinction of his rabbinic ancestry. This is meant to provide a primordial history of his genius, achieved in part through heredity but with the primitive aspects overcome. Even the most knowledgeable commentators have stumbled here. It is possible to construct a more reliable, though necessarily somewhat aporetic, account.

[17] See Socher 2006. Maimon's autobiography (*Salomon Maimons Lebensgeschichte, von ihm selbst erzählt und herausgegeben von Karl Philipp Moritz*, Berlin, 1792–3) was and to some extent even remains, due to its place on modern Jewish history syllabi, a required text for every Jewish '*maskil*' (someone who passes from traditional society to 'Enlightenment').

[18] Tompkins 2006.

Rabbinic ancestry: Momigliano alluded to Finley's descent from Rabbi Meir of Padua (1482–1565; presumably out of Italian patriotism since Meir was not Finley's most illustrious ancestor), and Vidal-Naquet in his memoirs noted two facts about Finley's background, which *ne manquait pas d'intérêt*, his descent from the Maharal (Rabbi Liva [= Loewe/Judah] ben Bezalel) of Prague (c.1520–1609), and his expulsion from Rutgers.[19]

Though Momigliano, unlike the less Jewishly knowledgeable Vidal-Naquet, may have known that all the Katzenellenbogens (Finley's maternal family) claimed such descent, it stands to reason that the source of this information was Finley himself, who thus even as a mature adult (he met Vidal-Naquet in 1964) still liked to boast to or joke with Jewish colleagues about his ancestry. But for Finley's immediate ancestors, it was no laughing matter: his maternal relatives preserved a written document, called a *shalshelet yuhasin* (chain of descent), listing all ancestors in the male line back to the fifteenth century, every one of them a rabbi. Finley's grandfather's epitaph in the Preobrazhenskii Cemetery in Leningrad mentions his descent from the Maharal. The importance of *yihus* (rabbinic ancestry) in traditional Jewish eastern Europe—it provided automatic social networks within the rabbinic class, and extensive cultural capital, crucial in both the marriage and professional markets, outside it—is if anything demonstrated by Finley's presumably humorous or ironic preservation of the value.

Finley's maternal grandfather was Rabbi David-Tevel Katzenellenbogen, born Taurogen, Kovno government, in 1847 and died Leningrad, 1930.[20] In 1907, according to Mikhail (Michael) Beizer, the late-Soviet era chronicler of Jewish Petersburg and Leningrad, he was appointed official rabbi of St. Petersburg, despite the fact that he lacked the secular education required for the job, which had previously been held by rabbinically

---

[19] Momigliano, cited in note 1; Vidal-Naquet 1998, 172. Both rabbis were prominent legal authorities, and the Maharal in addition wrote on kabbalistic and philosophical topics; the story of his creation of the Golem of Prague, for which he is most famous (it is the only thing Vidal-Naquet reports of him), achieved wide currency only in the late nineteenth century, though it is attested in writing (as a piece of German gothicism) in 1834: see Dekel and Gantt Gurley 2013. There is no adequate monographic biography of either rabbi, though there is extensive scholarship on the Maharal's writings.

[20] The essential if anecdotal biographical essay is now M. Beizer, 'Yevreiskaya Aristokratiya: Rabbin Sankt-Peterburgskoi Khoralnoi Sinagogi i yevo Rodoslovnaya' ('Jewish Aristocracy: The Rabbi of the Saint Petersburg Choral Synagogue and his Genealogy'), published electronically at http://jeps.ru/userimages/katsenellenbogen.htm. I thank Bradley Gorski for helping me read this essay.

undistinguished hacks and administrators.[21] It seems an obvious inference that Katzenellenbogen received the job through the intermediation of Baron Horace Ginzburg (1833–1909) or his son David (1857–1910), heads of the wealthiest and most powerful Jewish family in Petersburg.[22] In the world of Lithuanian rabbinism he was more famous for having been the rabbi of Suwałki, a large and, by the 1890s, mainly Jewish town in northeastern Poland, served in its brief Jewish history by several distinguished rabbis.[23] This is because Petersburg was compromised (if not as much so as Odessa). It was not a standard Jewish community of the Russian imperial west. Petersburg lay outside the Pale of Settlement, and only privileged Jews could live there legally. Such Jews were under the strong influence of the barons Ginzburg; Horace was a very rich but very scholarly advocate of moderate Jewish religious reform, not necessarily along familiar western European lines.[24] By 1900, most rabbis in the Pale faced challenges to their authority. There was a growing tendency to religious laxism unconnected to new religious or political ideologies, and the advancing popularity of radical movements, most importantly socialism, communism and Zionism, all of which rejected traditional religion and rabbinic authority.[25] But such challenges, except sometimes non-ideological laxism, did not encourage rabbinic compromise. By contrast, religious reform, whether moderate or radical, accepted rabbinic authority but sought to alter its contents: it presented traditional rabbis with far more subtle and complex challenges than communism, which could be simply condemned (though

---

[21] See Nathans 2002, 235–8.

[22] On the Jews of Petersburg, see Nathans 2002. On the Ginzburgs, see 43–44; 150–2; passim.

[23] See www.yivoencyclopedia.org, under Suwałki.

[24] Ginzburg is said to have preserved some traditional Jewish observances, unusually though not uniquely among the city's wealthier Jews (Nathans 43–4), and to have been a liturgical traditionalist. The central Petersburg synagogue, heavily funded by Horace, thus had a choir and sermons delivered in the vernacular as opposed to Yiddish—both tracers of Reform in the nineteenth century—but no organ. Beizer describes Ginzburg as orthodox but this seems incorrect; his combination of haute bourgeois acculturation, thoroughly 'enlightened' (modernized, academic, nontraditional) Jewish scholarship and ritual traditionalism make him sound comparable to a member of the 'historical school' in Germany, with which he had extensive ties, close to what we would call conservative (see Beizer 1989, 180–6). Nathans noted that Jewish artisans and small merchants were reputed to have been more traditional than their wealthy coreligionists, but that in reality both groups had more and less traditional members. The more progressive rich tended to support religious reform, whereas their counterparts among the non-rich simply let their ties to Judaism lapse.

[25] See Frankel 1981.

in practice traditional rabbis might sometimes try to protect Jewish radicals from the Russian state). If Katzenellenbogen had a position of any distinction it is certain that he was willing at least to play along with the moderate reformer and *maskil* (promoter of enlightenment) Ginzburg, all the more so if he owed his job to the baron's patronage.

Nevertheless, Katzenellenbogen was basically a traditional Lithuanian rabbi, even if he had religiously progressive tendencies (not an unknown combination). He participated in the Rabbinic Commission of 1910, which marked the beginning of a quasi-official and very brief alliance between the orthodox rabbinate and the Russian state, united in their hostility to Jewish political radicals.[26] Despite this, Katzenellenbogen remained in Petrograd after the Revolution, and held on tenuously to his position now as unofficial rabbi to a massively expanded but ever less Jewishly traditional community until his death in 1930.[27] Beizer gathered what information he could from Katzenellenbogen's daughter Berta Ioffe (who outlived Finley) about the fate of the rabbi's children: several of the six children from his first marriage including Finley's mother Hannah (Anna) emigrated to the USA, Hannah around the time of the move to Petersburg. One child of the first marriage, Naftali Hirsch, according to family tradition a pious craftsman, remained in Leningrad where he was arrested in 1938, and died in Solikamska labor camp in 1942; his half-brother Saul, who (perhaps fatefully) was studying in a Lithuanian yeshiva around the time of the Revolution, subsequently studied law and in 1924, not long before his nephew Moses entered Columbia law school, became a lecturer in the short-lived faculty of Roman law at Leningrad University. In 1938 he was arrested and shot.[28] Berta Ioffe implied to Beizer (apparently) that both men were considered reactionary because of their religious activities. Saul's brother Ilya moved to Berlin, received rabbinic ordination at the orthodox Hildesheimerseminar there and eventually became an official in the 'national religious' (*mamlakhti dati*) division of the Israel Ministry of Education. This is all highly suggestive and deeply ironic, as family prosopography so often is. But it is unclear if Moses knew anything about these relatives, or if he ever thought about their fates, or if they had any impact on his self-conception. His aunt Berta knew about

[26] Freeze 2002, 251–70.
[27] By 1930 there were close to 250,000 Jews in Leningrad; the number appears to have grown at least tenfold since 1914: Stanislawski 1988, 107.
[28] Beizer, 'Yevreiskaya Aristokratiya', correcting the account in Beizer 1989.

him: in a family tree she provided to Beizer in the '70s or '80s (at Berta's request it was unpublished)[29] she listed her nephew by his more or less (!) current name, Moshe Finley, and gave his place of residence as London. Indeed, according to Beizer the American and Russian branches remained in limited contact, but it would be surprising if Moses maintained the connection beyond his childhood. He clearly knew something about his grandfather and his general family background—otherwise Momigliano and Vidal-Naquet are unlikely to have known anything—but beyond that I cannot say.

Finley's Jewish Education

The other relevant bit of the story concerns Finley's own Jewish piety and education. Tompkins correctly dismissed the claim occasionally encountered that Finley trained to be a rabbi, but did not address Momigliano's softer claim that he was qualified to enter rabbinical school at the Jewish Theological Seminary. If this claim were true it would imply that Finley had achieved as a teenager a high level of competence in biblical and rabbinic Hebrew and Aramaic, and extensive familiarity with the ancient and some medieval texts written in those languages, in addition to basic knowledge of Jewish history and philosophy. It does not prove it since by the 1920s the Seminary's entrance exams might be administered up to three years after students had already been admitted.[30] So some students entered with an excellent command of the requisite languages and texts, but others did not. It is thus worth saying a word about the implications of Tompkins's information about Finley's Jewish engagement as a young person.

Finley's family attended a Conservative synagogue in Syracuse, apparently one toward the less traditionalistic end of the movement's spectrum; Finley had a 'confirmation' at his synagogue in May, 1925, corresponding roughly with his thirteenth birthday. Indeed, the invitation to a celebratory reception at the Finkelstein house refers to the ceremony as both a confirmation and a bar mitzvah.[31] These were not normally identical.

[29] I am grateful to Beizer for sending it to me.

[30] See Ellenson and Bycel 1997, 543, for the impressive list of prerequisites for admission, and 546 for the change in the 1920s.

[31] I am grateful to Dan Tompkins for sending me scans of both the confirmation program and the party invitation.

Reform synagogues, many of which had abolished the bar mitzvah in the course of the nineteenth century, borrowed the confirmation from Protestantism, and used it to mark emergence into educated adulthood, normally around the age of fifteen. It was a group ritual performed in the synagogue on the late spring festival of Shavuot. By the 1920s many liberal-leaning Conservative synagogues were adopting the practice, too: it helped keep a few teenagers in Hebrew school classes past their bar mitzvahs, and it was also a ritual in which girls could participate (this is the era before the invention and diffusion of the bat mitzvah). What this means is that Moses Finkelstein, confirmed on the day of his bar mitzvah (at the end of his second year in college), was a prodigy in Hebrew school too, two or three years younger than the other 'confirmants'.[32] According to the program, Moses did the Pentateuchal reading for the day, while his classmates had less demanding assignments. This means that he could read Hebrew, from an unvocalized and unpunctuated manuscript scroll, but actually does not prove that he could understand what he read. In the absence of specific information it is surprisingly difficult to establish what Moses Finkelstein's Jewish education might have consisted of, and where he might have received it, since the Hebrew school of Temple Adath Yeshurun was not the only option. If he did attend that school, which would have met an hour or ninety minutes a day between three and five days a week, he might not have been taught much more than basic information about Jewish practice and the ability to read the prayer book and the Pentateuch in Hebrew; ideally, he might have acquired some ability to comprehend these texts, though the one extant account of the curriculum at Adath Yeshurun suggests that this was not the school's priority.[33]

[32] See the impressionistic but informative account of the rightward spread of confirmation (it has subsequently retreated), highly controversial among conservative rabbis in the 1920s, in Joselit 1994, 118–27.

[33] Rudolph 1970, 172. For a better informed discussion of early twentieth century Hebrew school curricula, with a focus on New York City, see Chipkin 1936; for a slightly later period, see the detailed nationwide empirical survey of Katzoff 1949, which strongly confirms the impression that Conservative Hebrew schools focused on competence in ritual performance and with rare exceptions did nothing to teach actual linguistic and text-interpretive skills: even the most committed students did not normally emerge with the ability to study the Bible, still less rabbinic texts, in the original languages. Two years after his bar mitzvah the president of his synagogue invited Finkelstein to deliver a brief sermon on the second day of Shavuot, in the rabbi's absence (a photograph of the letter was sent to me by Dan Tompkins). It would be a mistake to infer too much from this beyond the likelihood that the local dry-goods magnate wanted to show off his prodigious young congregant.

But there is a revealing epistolary exchange dated 1980 between Finley and Eli Ginzberg, the Columbia economist, and Finley's precise contemporary (died 2002), which provides some evidence for Momigliano's claim.[34] Ginzberg sent Finley a brief note after reading *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, reminding Finley of his visit to Ginzberg's father Louis in 1927, and how Finley's mother had wanted him to study at JTS, certainly for the rabbinate though Ginzberg does not specify; Ginzberg also mentioned his own book *Studies in the Economics of the Bible*, largely about the pentateuchal laws of slavery. This was in fact Ginzberg's Columbia master's essay, published by the Jewish Publication Society in 1932, presumably, to be honest, thanks to Ginzberg's family connections. Finley responded by recalling the visit to Louis Ginzberg, and reminding Eli that they had frequently met at the home of (the much older Columbia law school professor) Frank Schechter (1890–1937). He does not mention JTS, or Eli Ginzberg's youthful foray into ancient economic history. So, Ginzberg offers Finley some Jewish bait which Finley fails to take; instead, he responds by changing the subject. This was apparently Finley's tactic whenever Momigliano raised Jewish subjects, too. There may have been more to the old connection: Eli Ginzberg grew up to be one of the architects of the Great Society and an ardent liberal Zionist but not surprisingly was flirting with radicalism when he knew Finkelstein. His master's essay, written in 1930, which is unimpressive as biblical scholarship, nevertheless, raises the likelihood that he and Finley had once enjoyed a close intellectual kinship: it is an unusual Boasian and Weberian reading of Exodus 21–2, Leviticus 25, and Deuteronomy 15, with nods to Marx throughout.[35] Frank Schechter, for his part, may have done more than flirted with communism, but if so his radical sister's legal troubles, exacerbated, he thought, by the intervention of communist lawyers, led to a break.[36] I will leave the exploration of this connection to others and will note here only its prosopographical implications. Ginzberg's father, Louis (1873–1953), was

---

[34] Ginzberg's letter and a copy of Finley's response are among Finley's papers in the Cambridge University Library. Once again, I thank Dan Tompkins for providing me with photographs.

[35] The author was nineteen years old; by his own admission in his memoirs, he knew very little Hebrew, though his German was excellent (and so he could read as yet untranslated bits of Weber), and relied for his biblical philology mainly on his father.

[36] Amy Schechter (born c. 1892) was one of the communist union organizers involved in the Loray Mill strike in Gastonia, North Carolina, in 1929, indicted for murder but not convicted: Taylor 2009, 42–49. On the impact of the case on Frank, and Eli's friendship with him, and flirtation with communism, see Ginzberg 1989, 21–22.

still another Lithuanian rabbinic dynast who had modernized, become an academic Talmudist—indeed one of the two or three greatest in the history of the field—and a professor at JTS. Finley, Eli Ginzberg, and Frank Schechter, were all members of a very small and very distinctive club, since Schechter's father of course was Solomon Schechter, still another important modernizing rabbi-scholar.[37]

Prosopography is in theoretical terms a highly problematic undertaking. It is network analysis in the absence of enough evidence to determine whether the attested social contacts actually bound their principals by meaningful ties. But I am not making great claims for Finley's elusive and heavily repressed youthful connections. I am only suggesting that when Finley was an adolescent this was presumably where he fit, with intellectually high achieving sons of prominent, somewhat deracinated, rabbi-manqué fathers. There was an unusual concentration of such people in Morningside Heights. When Finley grew up, he left such associations behind, unlike Eli Ginzberg, who always retained very strong Jewish connections, and was clearly looking to revive one such connection, with Finley.

Finley's father had a university degree in engineering, and his mother had grown up in a traditional but acculturating and, in Jewish terms, elite (though hardly wealthy) household, in a burgeoning industrial city in the western Russian Empire. His parents attended not an orthodox synagogue but a formal and already venerable synagogue bordering on Reform. Finley's story is not actually typical for his generation—his parents were better off, better educated, more westernized, and probably less traditional than the norm. On the other hand, for a time he clearly did retain a sense of his family's elite rabbinic connections. If Eli Ginzberg's memory did not fail him, and if Anna Finkelstein's ambitions for her son were realistic, then it may follow that Moses had a more thorough background in the Hebrew and Aramaic languages, and in Jewish texts than we might otherwise have guessed. That such attainments were presumably rare among the adolescent membership of Temple Adath Yeshurun does not prove that Finley did not have them. His later disengagement from

[37] Schechter (1847–1915) was born to a Hasidic family in Rumania, received rabbinic ordination and a PhD in Semitics in Berlin, became the Reader in Rabbinic (a highly ambiguous position which lay outside both the University faculties and the college system) at Cambridge—he was responsible for acquiring the Cairo Genizah for the Cambridge University Library—and from 1902 the head of JTS in New York. Schechter hired Ginzberg that year. Schechter's complex attitude to traditional Judaism has been much analyzed. See most recently Cohen 2012.

Jewish concerns and in particular his failure ever to exploit what he knew in his scholarship would in this case be even more remarkable. But we may never know. In any case, Finley's drift from Jewishness cannot be completely subordinated to a stock narrative about the sloughing off of a parochial immigrant past. His past was not so parochial and his destiny and the destinies of his youthful associates showed that certain kinds of elite rabbinic connections—*yihus*, again—could be quite useful even in secular America. At least they may have provided a measure of social ease for an absurdly young student at Columbia, whatever other doors they opened.

The Ancient Economy

This brings us back to the *Ancient Economy*. I am not the first person to notice how amazingly inadequate Finley's definition of his topic is:[38] he restricts himself to Greece and Rome because these civilizations were organized radically differently from the river valley empires of the Near East, which, in Finley's definition, include not only Sumerians, Babylonians, Assyrians, and Egyptians, but also Hittites, Canaanites, Hebrews and Phoenicians. The Greco-Roman world was a world of cities bound by a broadly shared political and social ideology which featured dry farming, private ownership of land, and the concept of citizenship. So fundamental a word as *eleutheros* cannot be translated into any eastern languages. Finley thus apparently imagined ancient history as a succession of regimes with shifting geographical centers: the Bronze Age was dominated by the oriental despotisms of Egypt and Mesopotamia, which incorporated the polities of the eastern Mediterranean basin, the Iron Age by the rising city-state with its distinctive social patterns and ideologies further west, and the succeeding period by the Roman heirs of Classical Greece (27–9). There follows (31–2) a brief account—summarizing Braudel—of the Mediterranean basin as a climatic region and in very loose terms an economic zone closely linked to the interior of Europe by the great rivers (no mention of Braudel's mountain passes and overland routes), but this account appears to be relevant only to the Roman imperial period.

---

[38] See Scheidel et al. 2007, 8–9; but their critique remains too mild and misses the points elaborated below. They fundamentally accept Finley's definition. Ironically, Rostovtzeff was in this respect more progressive than Finley, presumably because his reliance on archaeology made him grasp that networks of exchange constantly transgressed cultural boundaries.

These pages are fantastically confused in part due to Finley's undoubtedly a priori decision to speak in terms of an undifferentiated Near East as opposite to a none-too-differentiated Greco-Roman world. He admits that there was some private landholding in the Near East, and towns and trade, but the 'evidence does not permit quantification'; nevertheless, 'I do not believe it is possible to elevate these people [near eastern landowners, traders, etc.] to the prevailing pattern of economy, whereas the Graeco-Roman world was essentially and precisely one of private ownership' (28–29). Admittedly the Romans incorporated many of these strange places and other still stranger ones in their empire, and emphatically did not (in Finley's view) transform them, or even try to transform them, into a single economic system; what bound the diverse economies of the Roman Empire, rather, was a single political system, and a 'common cultural-ideological framework' (34).

Finley observes in this passage that 'even Hebrew' lacks a word for freedom, the crucial concept in the classical political ideology Finley wishes to consider. This may indeed be almost true of biblical Hebrew, though not of later registers of the language in which the equivalent term unproblematically exists. But the Hebrew Bible makes it clear that ancient Israel was animated by political and social conflicts which are markedly similar to those which are supposed to have been important in classical Greece. Furthermore, the Bible's civic and social ideologies, far from being polar opposites of those of the emerging archaic Greek city state, are actually their close relatives. The Hebrew Bible has a strong concept of quasi-egalitarian citizenship but also hints at competing ideologies not unlike classical oligarchy, not to mention monarchy. The civic agent presupposed in all pentateuchal legislation is neither a transhumant pastoralist nor a serf, but precisely a free small landowner. These observations are not original to me,[39] and should have been known to Finley, since they are made in detail in chapter 3 of Weber's *Das antike Judentum*;[40] part of Weber's argument here is that although it is easy to detect the influence of Babylonian law on some of the details of biblical law, structurally the latter is most comparable to Greek and Roman law, to the extent that Weber routinely imports Greco-Roman terminology into his analysis. The poetics of Israelite socio-political ideology are different, and theology—in the literal sense of discourse about a god—looms larger in the Bible than

---

39 Though I went into some detail about them in *Were the Jews a Mediterranean Society? Reciprocity and Solidarity in Ancient Judaism* (Schwartz 2010).

40 Weber 1921; see the English translation, Weber 1952, 61–89.

in classical literature, but the basic economic and social regime that the Hebrew Bible reflects, emerged from and prescribes bears an extremely close family resemblance to that of Greece. In particular, the Pentateuch promotes a regime that is close to Athenian democracy especially if we follow Finley himself, in *Politics in the Ancient World*, in minimizing the importance for democracy of what he called the 'electoral regime'. One could go further—the late Assyrian world definitely had notions of citizenship and private ownership; the evidence that Phoenician cities were basically not unlike Greek cities is overwhelming; one could easily view the whole complex as unified—both the east coast of the Mediterranean and the Greek world were shaped by their situation on the peripheries of the river-valley-empire world. The Hellenistic kingdoms and the Roman Empire both absorbed and reshaped all these structures.

Finley's academic life was largely devoted to the project of decoupling ancient history from the canon of classical literature. He adamantly argued that it should be considered a subfield of history, not an ancilla to the writings of classical Athens and late republican and Augustan Rome. It follows that it should be concerned with the history of a region over a long period, not just with central places and golden ages. Finley was a master of impassioned and convincing polemic, yet the introduction to *The Ancient Economy* reads like a weak, sloganeering, rationalization for a reactionary construction of the field. Why?

I assume that Finley's 'orientalism' in *The Ancient Economy* is of a piece with his avoidance of the Jews elsewhere in his work, but it is not a simple phenomenon. His neglect of Weber's analysis of the Israelite socio-legal regime seems related to his youthful dismissal of Wellhausen, and to his later self-distancing from the positivistic project of extracting historical information from fragmentary and generically inapt evidence using some sort of hypothetico-deductive methodology. If Finley read Weber's *Ancient Judaism* then he might have known enough about Weber's sources to see that Weber's account relies for its developmental structure on the work of Wellhausen and his followers. This may have been enough to disqualify it despite the brilliance of its analysis of each of the individual Pentateuchal codes and despite the fact that Finley was avowedly interested, in *The Ancient Economy*, in socio-political ideology, for which the Pentateuch is an excellent source. Still, Finley did hint that one of his problems with 'the Near East' is evidentiary: we do not know much about it, so he thought. It is perhaps, at least, to his credit that he does not spend the book citing biblical or Near Eastern 'parallels' abstracted from their original contexts.

There was another benefit, too: Finley could have produced a structural functionalist account of 'the ancient economy' which was not limited to Greece and its successor, but such an account would have been massively longer and more complicated, and would have been very difficult to cover adequately in the series of lectures which was the source of the book (most of his books started as lectures). By eliminating 'the orient' Finley could conflate Greece (meaning Athens) and Rome into a single neat, clear and powerful account. If he had not done so, he would have been required to introduce more chronological specificity, to spend more time describing the ebb and flow of empires, among other things. Finley was predisposed by his structural-functionalism to distrust developmental schemes, but the temptation to introduce a story of development in order to account for the shifts from Achaemenid to Macedonian to Roman, might have been too powerful to resist. Alternatively, he could have produced successive snapshots of systems as it were in equilibrium. He might have ended up with something like an even longer and more complicated version of *The Corrupting Sea*. More likely, he would have thought longer and harder about how to produce an account as spare, elegant and powerful as *The Ancient Economy* in its extant form.

But Finley did pay a price in his work. He could have used ancient Judaism to de-essentialize or deprivilege Greece and Rome, not to mention ancient Israel itself. Indeed, though at certain moments—in the early 1930s and the early 1960s—he was clearly reading quite a lot about the subject, he never made any use of it at all. By contrast, Momigliano and Bickerman both made extensive use of Judaism in their work, first of all because they regarded the Jews as part of the world they studied as Greek and Roman historians—Momigliano exaggerated the importance of the Jews in the ancient world—but also because they, especially Bickerman, understood that when all is said and done the Israelites and Jews were in some respects exemplary: they could teach us a way other than the Attic way of being a Mediterranean smallholder. And they can contribute to our exploration of the meaning of imperial domination, a topic which Finley did not totally neglect.

Finley embodied a process—the consignment of the Jewish past, in both personal and intellectual senses, to oblivion—which in Europe belonged more to the nineteenth than to the twentieth century, but probably fits in twentieth century America well enough: he was arguably fleeing from Jewishness into Greek history, to state matters crudely, whereas his European counterparts, including Pierre Vidal-Naquet, were finding a type of Jewishness through the study of antiquity. The evidence that Finley's flight

was substantial, that he personally had an unusually meaningful Jewish background, from which he fled in a conscious way, that his obliviousness was the product not of drift but of a more dramatic break which occurred on several fronts—personal, social, familial, political and intellectual—is slight, at most suggestive. Finley himself would have dismissed it.

THE YOUNG MOSES FINLEY AND THE DISCIPLINE OF ECONOMICS

Richard P. Saller

The focus of this paper is the influence of the discipline of economics, narrowly construed, on the intellectual development of Moses Finley.[1] By 'narrowly construed', I exclude for instance economic sociology and economic anthropology (e.g., Weber and Polanyi) and concentrate on economists in the classical and neoclassical tradition. The topic may seem a dead end, given Finley's repeated disavowal of the applicability of modern economic analysis. It is prompted by a couple of unexpected observations. Nearly a decade ago the Nobel Laureate Robert Fogel observed in conversation that he had read *The Ancient Economy* closely and judged it 'sound' in its economic reasoning. The second observation is that at times Finley could be scathing about 'the quality of [his critic's] economic thinking'—something of a paradox if modern economics was inapplicable to the ancient world.[2] More broadly, it is worth exploring what exactly Finley was rejecting when he eschewed 'modern economics'. I believe that a more precise knowledge of *his* understanding of certain core modern economic concepts can shed light on some of his disagreements with other classicists, who often did not realize the precision and depth of his economic concepts. This paper will try to describe what little we know of Finley's reading and education in economics and also a more general picture of the discipline of economics in the 1930s and 1940s, and then go on to show where the influence is detectable. My claim is not that neoclassical economics of the second quarter of the 20th century accounts for most of his intellectual formation, but that it is a neglected and not very visible influence that helps to explain certain conundrums.

A few words of personal disclosure may be in order. Finley was my teacher and mentor from 1974 until his death in 1986; consequently, I would not claim to be a detached, neutral interpreter. In pulling together some of his essays in *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*, Brent Shaw

---

[1] Several friends read early drafts of this paper and made helpful suggestions: my thanks to Peter Garnsey, Paul Millett, Ian Morris, and Brent Shaw. Daniel Tompkins generously shared his unsurpassed knowledge of the archives.

[2] Finley 1985b, 252 n. 81.

and I were motivated by pietas as much as anything. The editors' introduction was meant to be a brief sympathetic—not a critical—account of his intellectual biography. He read it and, as far as I can recall, made no suggestions or corrections. Having said that, I have never taken the position of 'Finley infallibility'. Even in the seminars in the 1970s a couple of things occurred to me: first, Finley could become the captive of his own polemics at times; second, he could occasionally be ferocious beyond reason in defense of his own students and friends.

If we try to piece together Finley's intellectual formation in economics from 1927, when he entered Columbia's Masters program at age 15, to 1947, when his relationship with Polanyi began, it is necessary to work from bits of information and from inference. The standard narrative of intellectual influences highlights Marx, Weber, Bücher, Hasebroek, and Polanyi, and with good reason.[3] Finley cited Weber and Hasebroek in his 1935 article on Greek terms for 'trader,' but he gives few hints about which mainstream economists he may have read.[4] And yet, he seems to have had a clear, precise idea of what concepts from modern economics he was rejecting as inapplicable to the ancient world. Decades later in Chapter 1 of *The Ancient Economy* he wrote that the title of Alfred Marshall's standard economics textbook, *Principles of Economics*, 'cannot be translated into Greek or Latin. Neither can the basic terms, such as labor, production, capital, investment, income, circulation, demand, entrepreneur, utility, *at least not in the abstract form required for economic analysis*' (my emphasis).[5] The last phrase needs emphasis: he was writing not about casual, popular usage, but about the particular concepts in the way that they were used by mainstream economists of the time.

There is good reason to believe that this particular use of terms with their disciplinary meanings goes back to Finley's earlier days. In a footnote to the *emporos* article he noted the confusion over the term 'capital' and the unfortunate consequences for the debate over 'the extent of capitalism in antiquity',[6] as pointed out by Weber. And in his 1937 review of Ciccotti's *Civiltà del mondo antico* he praised the discussion of the ancient economy on the grounds that 'his training in economics enables him to correct those misconceptions which have vitiated so much of the writing

---

[3] Morris 1994, 1999.
[4] Finley [Finkelstein] 1935.
[5] Finley 1985b, 21.
[6] Finley [Finkelstein] 1935, 320 n. 2.

on this subject, Eduard Meyer's, for example'.[7] But what was Finley's training in economics that prompted him to make this judgment?

I find few, if any, references to mainstream economists in Finley's early articles and reviews to offer any clues, but his dissertation fellowship proposal to the Social Sciences Research Council in 1947 may offer some valuable insights. The proposal was discovered by Brent Shaw in the Heichelheim archive at Toronto and was published in 1993.[8] Heichelheim wrote a letter of support and hence was sent a copy. Shaw rightly (and briefly) noted that this proposal foreshadowed a number of themes that appeared later in Finley's published work from *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500–200 B.C.* to *The Ancient Economy*. Though the SSRC did not fund the proposal, it was passed along to the American Council of Learned Societies, which did. In any case, it provides a point of entry into Finley's early education and ideas about economics. The date, 1947, is significant, because it preceded Finley's involvement in Polanyi's famous seminar at Columbia.

Before taking a closer look at the proposal, it needs to be acknowledged that it was written in a politically charged environment that influenced the presentation in ways we cannot know today.[9] For example, the lack of any mention of Marx or Marxian ideas should not be taken at face value. The proposal comprises a few preliminary comments, an outline of the dissertation, a sketch of an introduction, a statement of Finley's academic training and work experience, and a list of his articles and reviews.

What, then, can be gleaned from this proposal for a fellowship to support the write-up of his dissertation? First, the title is 'Business Practices in the Greek City-States'. The chapter headings include 'Money and credit', 'Partnership and agency', 'Bookkeeping practice and theory', 'The market (in its economic, not physical sense)', 'The organization of production', and 'Commercial law and administrative regulation'.[10] What is interesting about this title and outline is that it already features one of the primary characteristics of *The Ancient Economy* noted by Mohammad Nafissi: the 'unity of AE is underwritten by its concentration on showing that the ancients did things differently from modern "economic" men'.[11]

---

7 Finley [Finkelstein] 1937, 278.
8 Shaw, 1993, 188–98.
9 Tompkins 2006.
10 Shaw 1993, 189–92.
11 Nafissi 2005, 241.

Finley's sketch of his introduction argued that 'to understand the Greek economy it is important . . . to turn away from the whole modern economy, its institutions, theory and thought habits. Until we are prepared to understand Greek institutions and thinking on their own terms, to "feel into" their way of acting and thinking [in the mode of Dilthey]. . . . we are examining not the economics of the Greeks but modern economics through a trick mirror'.[12] Some might find Finley's approach to 'feeling into' Greek habits of thought odd: after all, terms like 'Business practices' or 'Bookkeeping practice and theory' are hardly Greek categories. Finley's traditional philological article on *emporos* would seem a more obvious way to feel our way into Greek categories. The point is that already in 1947 Finley was committed to a negative approach to defining Greek practices and values in economic activity, not a positive one (see below for more detail).

The questions I want to pose now are: where did Finley come up with those particular modern economic concepts, and why? Emphasis on Marxian influences does not take us very far. After all, the proposal contains far more about bookkeeping than about slavery, which gets only three sub-points in the outline. The description of Finley's background in the proposal offers some clues.

Finley's 1927 bachelor's degree from Syracuse was in psychology and included a course in statistics. At Columbia, likely as part of his degree work for the masters in public law, he took an economics course from Edwin Seligman, an accounting course, and a course on 'Trust Problems'. There is reason to give close attention to Finley's relationship with Seligman, because the year after taking his masters degree, Finley went to work for Seligman as a fact-checker in the major project, the fifteen-volume *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (1930–1935), for which Seligman was the General Editor. Finley highlighted this experience in his SSRC proposal: 'Three years on the staff . . . meant a broad training in the social sciences comparable to many years of course work on the graduate level'. Finley later cited several articles from the *Encyclopaedia* in his *Land and Credit*.

Edwin Seligman, the McVickar Professor of Economics at Columbia, may well have been the person who introduced Finley to some of the most influential ideas as early as the late 1920s. Seligman took his Ph.D. at Columbia in 1885, and a few years earlier had studied at Heidelberg and

[12] Shaw 1993, 193.

Berlin, just before Weber arrived as a student there.[13] Seligman was a major figure in the American economics profession at the turn of the century—a founder of the American Economics Association and also of the American Association of University Professors.[14] His politics were distinctly progressive—e.g., as a proponent of a progressive tax system—but anti-socialist and anti-communist. He wrote one of the standard textbooks in economics, first published in 1905 and then in multiple editions and a digest. This book, *Principles of Economics*, provides some sense of his thinking, which turns out to bear a noticeable resemblance to Finley's. To summarize his 700-page textbook, he started off with an extended discussion of historical stages of business practices and economic thought. Against the Austrian formalists, he argued that the economy was embedded and that economic institutions were changing and relative. He eschewed the Smithian dogma of universal, individual self-interest. The first bibliographical entry for his chapters on 'Development of Economic Life and Thought' and 'The Historical Forms of Business Enterprise' was Karl Bücher's *Industrial Evolution*, and his first stage of historical development of the economy was the *oikos*. Antiquity was characterized by petty handicraft as the *dominant* form of industrial organization. He was very clear that he was interested in dominant forms of behavior and was not claiming that in the *oikos* stage there was no trade. The textbook then covered the standard concepts of mainstream classical and neoclassical economics, with Alfred Marshall as the first bibliographical entry. Those concepts included value, price as set by market, marginal cost and marginal utility, with emphasis on the fact that marginal utility was *social* utility, not simply individual utility. One final point of personal interest to me: for Seligman, the term 'human capital' could only mean slavery. This fact underlines how much modern economic concepts evolved in the later 20th century.

Finley encountered Seligman in the late 1920s when he was in his teens. If, as seems likely, this is where he first encountered the concept of *oikos* as a historical stage of economic development, it was within a neoclassical framework, as Seligman was drawing on both Bücher and Marshall. At this early stage, young Finley had an intellectual model who differentiated the ancient economy from the medieval economy from the modern capitalist economy not merely on the basis of scale but on the basis of fundamental concepts and institutions—and all of this in the context of

---

[13] See Tribe 2003 for background.

[14] Applebaum 1988.

insisting on precise modern economic concepts. In addition, Seligman, like Finley later, focused on dominant forms, while acknowledging exceptions to ideal types.

Seligman's text makes it clear that he had a better than superficial knowledge of classical antiquity. The contrast with Marshall is striking. Marshall's textbook of the same title was published slightly earlier in 1890 and covered many of the same modern economic concepts. It was the leading economics textbook of the early 20th century. Marshall emphasized the centrality of measurement in modern economic analysis to understand supply and demand, which established prices in the market. Although Marshall had a dominant position in mainstream economics in his day, aspects of his history of economic development in the textbook sound silly today. For instance, his account of the decline of the Greeks: 'A genial climate slowly relaxed their physical energies; they were without that safeguard to strength of character which comes from resolute and steadfast persistence in hard work; and at last they sank into frivolity'.[15] Finley cites Marshall in the first chapter of *The Ancient Economy*, but it is unclear when he first read him. Nevertheless, Marshall's ideas represented the mainstream of modern economics that permeated the Anglo-American discipline, including Seligman's textbook and the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*.

For three years from 1930 to 1933 Finley was immersed in the *Encyclopaedia*. Clearly, this experience was a very broad exposure to the social sciences of the early 20th century, and (I cannot help but speculate) it may have nurtured a fact-checker's impatient insistence on precision. Unfortunately, apart from Heichelheim's entry, we do not know which ones Finley checked or whether he read other entries in addition to those he checked.[16] Despite this uncertainty, since Finley regarded his three years at the *Encyclopaedia* as an important educational experience and cited it in later publications, it is worth a sampling of some entries for their possible influence. Perhaps the most interesting for my purposes is Werner Sombart's entry on 'Capitalism'. Against the universalists, Sombart characterized economics as a 'cultural science' requiring a historical approach to grasp 'historical singularity'. Of course, he placed great emphasis on the spirit of capitalism, dominated by acquisition, competition, and rationality. Sombart saw 'artificial and self-conscious creation of

[15] Marshall 1961 [1890], 729.

[16] Shaw 1993, 180. Finley wrote that he checked the facts in 'all articles', but that is implausible for fifteen dense volumes, as Dan Tompkins has pointed out to me.

economic rationality' as a *distinctive* trait of 'full capitalism'. The organizational manifestation was the firm or corporation, which takes on a life of its own 'over and above the individuals who constitute it . . ., a material monster'.[17]

Frank Fetter, an American economist of the Austrian School, wrote the entry on 'Capital'. He briefly described different conceptions of capitalism and concluded: 'consistently with the value concept capitalism is merely a price system, the commercial exchanging organization of industry, where valuations, incomes and property take on financial expression'.[18] In other words, the defining feature of capitalism is the market in the abstract sense of establishing prices or financial values. Charles Hardy wrote in the entry on 'Market': 'A market in economic parlance is the area within which the forces of demand and supply converge to establish a single price. It may be viewed geographically as a physical extent of territory, or it may be viewed as a more or less organized group of individuals whose bids and offers disclose the supply and demand situation and thereby establish the price. Popular parlance generally centers on the first view, economic theory on the abstract conception . . . '.[19] I have quoted at length because of the centrality of the concept of 'market' in the debates still swirling around Finley's claims.

Finally, in connection with the economic thought of the 1930s I want to make a few additional points, even though I cannot prove that Finley read these works. First, the Great Depression made business cycles a dominant topic of discussion in the economics profession. Above all, John Maynard Keynes's *General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money* (1936) was the focus of debate in the most pressing policy matters. Joseph Schumpeter's most influential work was *Business Cycles: a Theoretical, Historical and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process* (1939). One can understand that 'business cycles' and all the statistical expertise that went into analyzing them would have had little relevance to ancient historians. This preoccupation of mainstream economics just served to illustrate how alien modern capitalism was from the ancient economy.

To return briefly to the Austrian economist Schumpeter, Finley's attitude toward him in some respects encapsulates his attitude toward neoclassical economics in general. In *The Ancient Economy* Finley cited repeatedly and approvingly Schumpeter's *History of Economic Analysis*

---

[17] Sombart 1930, 200.
[18] Fetter 1930, 189.
[19] Hardy 1933, 131.

(1954) for the distinction between 'pre-scientific' economic thought and an abstract system of thought. On the other hand, Daniel Tompkins has drawn my attention to a letter from Finley to Polanyi with the complaint that Schumpeter 'makes every single market-oriented mistake' (6/27/54). That is to say, Finley was prepared to insist both on precision of use of modern economic concepts (as opposed to non-scientific, casual usage) and on the inapplicability of those concepts as universal laws.

But I want to look at a different work by Schumpeter, The *Theory of Economic Development* (published in German in 1912 and in translation in 1934), because it was one of the leading works of early 20th century economics (not economic sociology) on what differentiated modern capitalism from prior forms of economic organization and what propelled the development. In an introduction to the 1983 republication, John Elliott suggests that the book represented 'the only truly comprehensive rival intellectual "system" to that of Keynes in the first half of the 20th century'.[20] Schumpeter aimed to identify those distinctive features that were the essence of capitalism leading to economic growth—issues at the foundation of Finley's differentiation of ancient from modern. Schumpeter sharply distinguished between slow incremental growth and real disruptive development. Achievement of real development required banks for the creation of credit and entrepreneurs, who borrowed from banks to pursue entirely new ventures by putting together elements of production in entirely new combinations. By definition, Schumpeter's entrepreneur was not using his own capital. The essential money markets for that capital did not exist in earlier eras, and Schumpeter specifically dismissed bottomry loans as only a 'technical expedient of exchange'.[21] Schumpeter has been described as 'the first great modern student of economic growth.' Given that reputation, and given Finley's preoccupation with the lack of growth in antiquity, it is not unlikely that Finley was exposed to Schumpeter's formulation of the problem of growth, either directly or indirectly. Certainly, there are resonances of Schumpeter's framework in Finley's later work.

Now I want to examine some of the primary motifs of that later work in order to tie them back to the mainstream economic principles described above.

---

[20] Elliott 1983, vii.
[21] Schumpeter 1983 [1912], 102.

1) The primary problematic of modern economics is the understanding of growth. As Alfred Marshall wrote in his textbook, the 'chief and highest interest of economics' is whether through economic progress poverty can be extinguished. The major concepts and theories are oriented to this end, and it is no accident that the discipline of economics emerged as the British economy opened the prospect of sustained growth. As early as his 1953 article, 'Land, Debt and the Man of Property in Classical Athens' Finley framed his claim about money-lending with a view to growth, acknowledging that money-lending was widespread, but denying its role 'in production and in economic growth'.[22] This view is entirely consistent, both in its theoretical framing and its conclusion, with Schumpeter's view about the banking institutions necessary to produce real growth and with Schumpeter's distinction between mere incremental accumulation and real growth.
2) The concept of an 'enormous conglomeration of interdependent markets' is perhaps the most contentious focal point of debate over *The Ancient Economy* today. That debate stems in part from the lack of understanding of what Finley and the economists meant by 'market'. Marshall, Seligman, Schumpeter, and the authors of the *Encyclopaedia* articles were in agreement that 'market' is the mechanism whereby supply and demand are brought into equilibrium by price reflecting social value. When Robin Osborne in his useful and much cited article, 'Pots, Trade and the Archaic Greek Economy', sought to demonstrate the existence of 'interdependent markets' in archaic Greece, and then started out with a disclaimer that 'I am not concerned with the value of pottery, with why people bought Athenian pottery rather than local or Corinthian pottery', he engaged in perhaps the most fundamental non-sequitur possible in modern economic analysis.[23] 'Market' is about nothing but value and why people buy X rather than Y. Osborne's study is useful in establishing patterns of trade, but is irrelevant to the question of markets in the abstract sense. This is the distinction that Finley explicitly made in his 1947 proposal with a chapter on 'The market (in its economic, not physical, sense)'. Kessler and Temin in their recent paper, 'Money and Prices in the Early Roman Empire', rightly tackled

22 Finley 1953, 198.
23 Osborne 1996, 31.

the issue on Finley's—that is, modern economists'—terms of price as evidence of a unified market.[24]

3) There is another cluster of concepts underlying Finley's thought about 'economic rationality', 'double-entry bookkeeping', and the 'entrepreneur'. His 1947 dissertation outline cites Mickwitz in support of the conclusion about 'the absence of economic rationalism'. Today, in the wake of Herbert Simon's formulation of 'bounded rationality' we may not be inclined to interpret economic history along the lines of a stark opposition between 'economic rationality' and pre-rational or irrational, but this polarity and its consequences for the distinctiveness of full capitalism were widely held views in the 1930s. Sombart was one of the leading exponents from the historical camp, but Schumpeter also stressed the profound difference. It was not only Mickwitz who advanced the view that double-entry bookkeeping was essential for enabling businessmen to calculate and optimize the rate of profitability of the cost centers in their operations. For Finley with his accounting course and (to quote from his proposal) his 'considerable detailed experience, in a supervisory capacity, with bookkeeping and accounting procedures', the value of double-entry bookkeeping must have seemed self-evident. Hence, his proposal included discussion of the ancient Greeks' 'failure to devise a system of double-entry bookkeeping' and 'the absence of accounting as opposed to bookkeeping'.[25]

'Economic rationality' was the distinctive mindset of the 'entrepreneur' in full capitalism. Seligman's textbook could have introduced Finley to the definition of 'the entrepreneur in the technical sense'.[26] For Sombart the entrepreneur was driven by a single-minded, soul-destroying pursuit of profit. For Schumpeter the entrepreneur was the key to positive economic development in his capacity to bring disruptive change and 'creative destruction'. Despite their entirely different valuations of the entrepreneur, Sombart and Schumpeter shared a

[24] Though Kessler and Temin 2008 clearly understand the centrality of price to the concept of market, their demonstration of an integrated grain market in the Roman Empire is flawed: see Bransbourg 2012, with the reply of Temin 2013 which was in turn critiqued by Scheidel 2013.

[25] A similar point was made in Finley 1985b, 110–11, 116–17, 142. The view that the advance represented by double-entry bookkeeping (e.g., in Rathbone 1991, 332) has been vastly overstated is a source of continuing debate. See Macve 1985 and Carruthers and Espeland 1991.

[26] Seligman 1909, 297.

view of the basic characteristics and the key role that the 'entrepreneur in the technical sense' played in modern capitalism. So when W. E. Thompson published his 1982 refutation of *The Ancient Economy* entitled 'The Athenian Entrepreneur' and wrote that Athenian landowners and wealthy merchants were 'entrepreneurs' who might not show up in the *horoi* because they 'had their own capital' and hence no need to borrow, it is not surprising that Finley briefly dismissed the claim as bad economics.[27] By definition, according to Schumpeter as well as others, the entrepreneur 'in the technical sense' does not operate on the basis of his own capital; 'he can *only* become an entrepreneur by previously becoming a debtor' (my italics).[28]

4) The creation of credit is too complex a topic for me to go into detail. Suffice it to say that Finley's dissertation outline and then his later publications highlight distinctions in types of loans—especially between loans for production and consumption—and contrast Athenian banking practices with modern institutions. The emphasis on the contrast between consumption and productive loans and on bankers as the capitalists making productive loans in modern capitalism is evident in Schumpeter's *Economic Development*, which argued that interest on productive loans makes no sense in a pre-capitalist, static economy: 'only in the course of development can I obtain a higher return for my product, that is, if I carry out a new combination of the productive forces which I bought for 100 monetary units and succeed in putting a new product of higher value on the market'.[29] For Schumpeter and Finley, the lack of productive loans is fundamentally of a piece with a pre-capitalist economy.
5) Finley's SSRC proposal noted the general absence of corporations in antiquity and planned a whole chapter devoted to 'Partnership and agency' with a conclusion on 'the failure [by the Greek city-states] to develop the basic capitalist institution of the corporation'. The point about the absence of corporations had been made by Seligman with reference to Max Weber. Seligman's textbook explained the significance: 'The economic advantages of corporations are threefold—joint stock, limited liability, perpetual life.... With all its shortcomings ... the corporation is indispensable to modern business activity. Without it the

[27] Thompson 1982, 64.
[28] Schumpeter 1983 [1912], 102.
[29] Schumpeter 190.

> world would revert to a more primitive state of economic well-being, and would virtually renounce the inestimable benefits of the best utilization of capital'.[30]

To sum up, neoclassical economics is a neglected part of Finley's intellectual development. It is explicit in the concepts of his 1947 proposal, in *Land and Credit*, in 'Aristotle and economic analysis,' and in *The Ancient Economy*. We would like to know more about what he read in the 1920's and '30's, but we know that he took an economics course with Seligman and an accounting course (probably in the late '20's), and if Seligman's popular textbook is a guide, he learned about Bücher, the *oikos* stage of development, as well as standard neoclassical concepts of the market, supply and demand, entrepreneur, creation of credit, and the corporation in modern capitalism. Seligman, Sombart, and possibly Schumpeter imprinted on Finley a sharp contrast between pre-capitalist and capitalist institutions long before Finley participated in the Polanyi seminar at Columbia. His stint as a fact-checker for the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* in the early '30's may well have been the source of his prickly precision about the concepts deployed in modern economic analysis. None of this is meant to detract from the influence of Weber on Finley, though there is a good chance that Seligman touched young Finley before he read Weber. Since Seligman almost certainly introduced Finley to Bücher's work long before he met Polanyi, the influence of the latter may have been less than usually thought, as Tompkins has suggested.[31]

Let me end with a final, personal reflection. I do think that in his later years Finley became entrenched in a polemic to defend *The Ancient Economy*. Instead of scathing critiques of efforts to use archaeological evidence, a more productive approach would have been to collaborate with archaeologists to define what kinds of data would genuinely address basic questions concerning economic growth in antiquity.[32]

[30] Seligman 1909, 96–97.
[31] Tompkins 2008, 134.
[32] Finley 1985a, 18–26.

MOSES FINLEY AND THE ACADEMIC RED SCARE

Ellen Schrecker

Moses Finley was perhaps the most eminent academic to have tangled with the anticommunist inquisition of early Cold War and to have lost his job. Unlike many other victims of the academic red scare, he was able to salvage his career and, to put it mildly, Sir Moses landed on his feet. Even so, it is possible that he was scarred by what had happened to him. In the late 1970s, when I was doing research about higher education's response to McCarthyism, I tried to contact Finley as I tried to contact the other academic victims of McCarthyism. Most responded. Finley did not. I later heard through a third person that he was unhappy with my treatment of his case.[1]

As it turns out, I could not have avoided dealing with Finley's experiences, not because of his eminence, but because his case was central to the development of the academic red scare. When he was fired from Rutgers University at the end of 1952, Finley was one of the first, if not the first, academic to lose his job specifically for taking the Fifth Amendment before a congressional investigating committee. His dismissal and subsequent blacklisting set important precedents and precipitated the formulation of the academic community's quasi-official policy on such cases.

What happened to Finley in 1952 and after was to happen to about one hundred other academics who also refused to cave in to the anticommunist inquisition. Accordingly, an examination of Finley's case will reveal much about the way the academy's response to McCarthyism operated. It is not a pretty story, for it exposes how adroitly the nation's leading educators and intellectuals came to rationalize firing and blacklisting so many college and university teachers whom they knew had done nothing wrong.

As we analyze Finley's experiences, we need to realize that the academy was responding to external political pressures. Had outside investigators left the nation's campuses alone, it is likely that few faculty members would have lost their jobs. But the nation's colleges and universities did

[1] Schrecker 1986. This volume contains more information about many of the issues I deal with in this essay.

not—and do not—operate in a vacuum. During the late 1940s and 50s, faculty members and administrators shared many of the same fears and assumptions about Communism and its adherents as other Americans. They often had little knowing contact with actual members of the Communist party (CP) and so were unaware of how much variety it encompassed. Instead, they subscribed to a demonized stereotype that portrayed Communist professors as mindless robots under Kremlin control, devious conspirators who were trying to undermine the American system and indoctrinate their students.

At the same time, however, the nation's colleges and universities are institutions dedicated to rational discourse and intellectual autonomy. That mission creates considerable tension when outsiders demand political or intellectual conformity. Over the years, the academic community has dealt with those tensions by elaborating the concept of academic freedom. It is a concept that stresses the specific protections professors need in order to do their educational work of teaching and research. It also seeks to defend the activities of college teachers as citizens in the public sphere. As long as they exercise 'appropriate restraint' and make 'every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution', they should not be punished by their academic employer. Or so the traditional formulation by the American Association of University Professors says in its authoritative 1940 'Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure'.[2] Although most major institutions of higher learning (Rutgers included) had adopted that statement or something very like it in their governance documents and by-laws, it was a formulation that, as Finley's experiences show, was readily flouted when external political forces demanded it.

The event that led to Finley's dismissal from Rutgers was his appearance on March 28, 1952, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (SISS) of the Senate Judiciary Committee or the McCarran Committee as it was then known. Though the committee focused on the scholars and diplomats who had supposedly 'lost' China to the Communists, its counsel, Robert Morris, had previously worked for a New York State legislative committee that had questioned Finley before the war during a probe into communism in New York's municipal colleges. Since some of the principals in the China investigation were academics, the opportunity that

[2] American Association of University Professors, '1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure', http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1940statement.htm.

it offered Morris to reopen the New York City one was too tempting to pass up.

At the time of his hearing before McCarran, Finley was teaching at the Newark campus of Rutgers University. The school's administrators had known for several months that Finley might receive a subpoena. He had been named as a Communist by two witnesses before the SISS the previous August. One, the eminent East Asian specialist Karl Wittfogel, described Marxist seminars at Finley's apartment in the 1930s, the other, a former CCNY instructor named William Canning, identified Finley as a member of the City College faculty unit. Finley had immediately alerted his superiors at Rutgers to the possibility of trouble. He gave them a signed statement, denying that he had ever been in the party and refuting in detail the charges that Wittfogel and Canning had made.[3]

Since he was already something of a superstar at Rutgers—someone his dean considered 'brilliant' and 'an unusually strong addition to the University Faculty' as well as 'likely to develop into the University's most distinguished historian'—the administration was willing to let the matter lie, especially since it got no publicity.[4] Nor was there much of a flap about his appearance before the Committee seven months later. The Rutgers administrators he consulted had apparently assured Finley that his job was not in danger.[5] McCarran was looking for the people who had 'lost' China and was after bigger game than an assistant professor of ancient history at Rutgers-Newark.

At his hearing, Finley took what came to be known as the 'diminished Fifth'. He answered many of the Committee's questions and denied that he was a current member of the Communist Party. But he invoked the Fifth Amendment when asked if he had ever belonged to the party.[6] The whole hearing lasted all of about twelve minutes. The Rutgers authorities did not seem concerned about it. In fact, they loaned Finley the money for his attorney, published his first book, and invited him to speak to the trustees about Greek law—all after his congressional appearance.

---

[3] M. I. Finley to Dean Herbert F. Woodward, Sept. 5, 1951, Records of the Rutgers University Office of the President (Lewis Webster Jones) Series II, Academic Freedom Cases, 1942–1958, RG/C No: 04/15/02, Alexander Library, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., Box 4, Folder 1 (hereafter, Jones papers).

[4] Promotion Rating Blank, Herbert Woodward, May 14, 1949; Promotion Rating Blank, Herbert Woodward, Mar. 10, 1950, Jones papers, Box 4, Folder 1.

[5] Herbert Woodward to Edward Fox, Jan. 15, 1958, in Jones papers. Box 4, Folder 1.

[6] Finley testimony, March 28, 1952, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, 'Hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations', 4152–58.

Actually, it is likely that Finley might have kept his job had the McCarran Committee not called up Simon Heimlich, another Rutgers professor in the fall of 1952. Heimlich, who seems to have been a very principled fellow, refused to answer any of the Committee's questions about himself or others. At that point, under considerable pressure from the New Jersey media and political leaders, Rutgers' top administrators felt compelled to act. The school's president, Lewis Webster Jones, who claimed that he was 'shocked and deeply concerned' about Heimlich's behavior, summoned him to his office to ask him to explain why he had not cooperated with McCarran. Jones also had Heimlich dictate a statement, affirming that 'I am not a member of the Communist Party and never have been one'.[7] The Rutgers authorities had no plans to investigate Finley, but after a university public relations official ('improperly' in the dean's opinion) took it on himself to tell reporters at a press conference that the university would 'of course' examine Finley as well as Heimlich, the school's administrators believed they had no choice, especially since Finley had just been named yet again by another ex-Communist witness before the McCarran committee.[8]

By the fall of 1952, as Rutgers was figuring out how it would deal with its Fifth Amendment witnesses, it was widely known that current members of the Communist Party were not welcome on the nation's faculties. That had been the case for quite a while. Even before the Second World War, during the supposed heyday of the Old Left in the 1930s when many schools housed party units, Communist faculty members tended to keep their political affiliation a secret to avoid losing their jobs. Whatever we may feel about the ethics or wisdom of that secrecy, it was not unreasonable. During the 1930s, right-wing newspapers and politicians had been charging that Communists had infiltrated higher education. And there were a few cases of left-wing academics losing their jobs because of their political activities.[9]

Then, in 1940, during what one scholar has called 'a rehearsal for McCarthyism', at a time when the Nazi-Soviet Pact destroyed the Popular Front and rendered the party particularly unpopular,[10] a special

[7] Statement of Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, President Rutgers University, September 26, 1952, in 'It Did Happen at Rutgers: Basic Documents', *The Educational Record* (April 1953) (hereafter *Educational Record*).

[8] Woodward to Fox, Jan. 15, 1958, Jones papers, Box 4, Folder 1; Minutes of President's Special Advisory Committee, Oct. 3, 1952, Jones papers, Box 1, Folder 2.

[9] Johnson 1970; Iversen 1959, 199; *AAUP Bulletin* 23, No. 5 (May 1937), 256–81.

[10] See Jones, this volume, p. 128.

New York State legislative committee, the so-called Rapp-Coudert Committee, decided to investigate Communists within New York City's municipal colleges. It called up dozens of faculty members. A few, including William Canning, who became the committee's key witness, admitted they had been in the party and identified their comrades. The rest simply denied that they were Communists. They felt they had little choice in the matter, since the Board of Higher Education had decreed that party members would be automatically fired.

After Rapp-Coudert finished with them, the Board took over. Because it operated in a quasi-judicial manner, it required that two witnesses identify a tenured teacher as a Communist before that person could be fired. Over thirty faculty members from Brooklyn College and the City College of New York lost their jobs. Belonging to the party was bad enough, lying about it—since it was obvious that most of the people Canning and the other informers had fingered were Communists—was even worse. It was, the Board ruled, 'conduct unbecoming a member of the staff' and a 'violation' of the faculty member's 'academic duty' to conduct his 'extra-curricular affairs openly, with candor and without resorting to deceit or concealment'.[11]

Finley, who was then teaching at City College while he worked on his Columbia dissertation, was named by Canning. But he was not fired. Unlike most of the people Canning identified, Finley lacked tenure and so was simply not rehired. And, in any event, his politics became moot once the U.S. entered World War II and the campaign against academic and other Communists fizzled out.

That campaign resumed with the advent of the Cold War. At that point, Communists were no longer viewed as members of an undesirable political organization. Because of their party's connection to the Soviet Union, they had become a potential threat to national security. Ambitious politicians and journalists rushed to expose these dangerous individuals wherever they were lurking—in the federal government, the entertainment industry, the labor movement, and the academic community. Though lacking the sex appeal of Hollywood or the State Department, the nation's campuses did attract some investigators in the late 1940s. As the academic community scrambled to deal with those investigations, it began the collective process of formulating a policy that would exclude

[11] Schrecker 1986, 81.

Communist teachers from the nation's faculties without a formal violation of academic freedom.

The most important development in that formulation occurred in response to an investigation by the Washington state legislature's Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities in July 1948 under the chairmanship of a former deputy sheriff named Albert Canwell. The University of Washington's president, Raymond Allen, planned to accommodate the committee. Accordingly, he warned the potential witnesses on the faculty to cooperate with Canwell and, when a few did not, he brought charges against them.

During the course of their hearing before a faculty committee, two of the unfriendly witnesses admitted that they were still in the Communist party. At that point the administration decided to drop all other charges against them and base its case on the grounds that Communists were unqualified to teach. The academic community had not yet reached a consensus about that proposition. In 1947, for example, the AAUP insisted that belonging to the CP should not 'in and of itself' be grounds for dismissal.[12] Thus, in order to gain credibility for firing its Communist professors, the University of Washington not only had to comply with the AAUP's procedural requirement that the accused professors receive a hearing before a panel of their peers, but it also had to produce such an intellectually and professionally compelling rationalization that it would not appear to have violated academic freedom.

Surprisingly, the administration did not examine the two professors' teaching and research. In fact, even President Allen admitted that neither man had abused his classroom or slanted his scholarship. Instead, he asserted that simply belonging to the Communist Party disqualified someone from academic life. The university had imported a batch of professional anticommunists to describe the party's operations. And, basing his assessment on that hardly unbiased testimony, Allen insisted that the CP's demand for uncritical obedience to the party line interfered with the quest for truth 'which is the first obligation and duty of a teacher'. As a result, Allen went on to explain, 'by reason of their admitted membership in the Communist Party', the two men were 'incompetent, intellectually dishonest, and derelict in their duty to find and teach the truth'.[13]

[12] 'Report of Committee A', *AAUP Bulletin* 34, No. 1 (Spring 1948), 126.

[13] For a detailed discussion of the University of Washington dismissals, see Countryman 1951.

Washington's dismissal of the two Communist teachers along with a third professor (who had refused to cooperate with the university as well as the Canwell committee) sparked a national debate. President Allen's statement about the case was widely circulated, as were similar formulations by such intellectual heavyweights as the philosophers Sidney Hook and Arthur O. Lovejoy. As a result, by the beginning of 1949 a consensus had developed within the academic community that favored the exclusion of Communists.

From Stanford to Harvard, college and university presidents rushed to put their institutions on record. 'There will be no witch-hunts at Yale', President Charles Seymour proclaimed, 'because there will be no witches. We do not intend to hire Communists'. That theme pervaded the year's commencement addresses. And, on many campuses special committees were established to devise new regulations banning party members. The notorious loyalty oath that tore the faculty apart at the University of California in 1949–50 was a product of a similar move by the Regents and administrators to ensure a Red-free campus.[14]

Actually, by that point, there were few, if any, Party members on the nation's faculties. The anti-communist repression combined with the CP's own rigidity and irrelevance as well as the demands of their own careers and families led most of the academics who had joined the party during the 1930s and 40s to drop out. And, although they may have retained their sympathy for many of the causes they had formerly embraced, they were, like Moses Finley, no longer politically active.[15] As a result, I can't think of any public cases during the 1950s of professors losing their jobs specifically because they belonged to the Communist party.

* * *

Instead, as Finley's experiences reveal, the issue that was to roil the nation's campuses during the early 1950s was not that of card-carrying Communists, but of former ones who did not want to name names. By that point, HUAC and the other committees were requiring their ex-Communist witnesses to identify their former comrades as a sign that they had actually broken with the CP. Many of those witnesses would have been willing to talk about their own activities, but they did not want to discuss those of other people. Unfortunately, however, the Supreme Court left these people with few good options.

---

14 Blauner 2009.

15 Mason W. Gross to Benjamin F. Wright, Dec. 19, 1952, Jones papers, Box 3, Folder 6.

In the early days of the Cold War, the men and women called before the anti-Communist investigators—and their lawyers—believed that the First Amendment covered their refusal to answer questions about their political beliefs and activities. Several Supreme Court decisions of the mid-1940s had seemed to imply that such behavior would be protected; but the times and the Court's personnel had changed and, by the late 1940s, the federal judiciary refused to allow such a defense. Unfriendly witnesses who relied on the First Amendment, risked contempt of Congress and could, like the Hollywood Ten, end up in prison. As a result, the only way that witnesses could avoid a contempt citation without having to name names was to invoke the Fifth Amendment's privilege against revealing information that might result in a criminal charge against them. Since the 1940 Smith Act had essentially made membership in the Communist Party illegal, the Supreme Court did allow the Fifth Amendment to protect witnesses who refused to talk about their relationship to the party.

Unfortunately, however, the Court had also ruled that people who were willing to talk about themselves but not about others had 'waived' their privilege under the Fifth Amendment and could be prosecuted for contempt. This meant that ex-Communists who did not want to name names could not explain why they had joined the party and why they had left it. They had to invoke the Fifth Amendment when questioned about their relationship to the CP. From the perspective of ordinary citizens, who rarely understood the 'waiver doctrine', such a stance looked bad. It looked as if the witnesses were concealing something. The committees, of course, pushed the notion that such 'Fifth Amendment Communists' were hiding their subversive activities behind the Constitution. As Senator Joseph McCarthy put it, 'a witness's refusal to answer whether or not he is a Communist on the ground that his answer would tend to incriminate him is the most positive proof obtainable that the witness is a Communist'.[16]

It is, to say the least, disheartening to realize how many of the nation's institutions of higher learning acted as if McCarthy's dicta were true. In any event, whether or not the professors and administrators who dealt with the Fifth Amendment witnesses on their faculties really believed that those individuals were dangerous Communists, they certainly knew that they created a disaster for public relations.[17]

---

16 Schrecker 1986, 176.
17 Minutes, Special Committee of Review, Oct. 31, 1952, Jones Papers, Box 1, Folder 5.

Such was the case at Rutgers, where Heimlich's appearance before the McCarran committee created a storm of pressure from the local press and politicians—including the governor of New Jersey who proclaimed that 'the professors should have answered the questions or get out'. Since the state funded 60 percent of his budget, President Lewis Webster Jones felt compelled to act.[18] He did so by creating a special advisory committee of trustees, alumni, and faculty members under Tracy Voorhees, a former Undersecretary of the Army and trustee, to review the case in order, as Jones put it 'to protect the University against any possible subversive influences and to protect the rights of Professor Heimlich'.[19]

There were no precedents for the Voorhees committee to follow. Though a few other academics had taken the Fifth before congressional committees and lost their jobs, they either tended to be junior people who could easily be denied reappointment or else Rapp-Coudert survivors in New York's municipal colleges who were automatically dismissed under a section of the New York City Charter that required city employees to cooperate with official investigations. But because Heimlich had tenure and Finley was such an administration favorite, the Rutgers authorities decided to offer them all the procedural protections available. The two men, therefore, became the first Fifth Amendment witnesses to face a full academic investigation.

The Voorhees committee met four times, questioned both men, and sought information from the McCarran committee's staff. Then, on October 14, less than three weeks after its formation, it issued a unanimous report recommending that the faculty open a formal investigation. It noted that the Board of Trustees had (as had their peers elsewhere) recently revised the University's by-laws to stress the teacher's 'special obligations' to ensure that his 'utterances' did not threaten the institution's standing with the public and to 'seek at all times to conduct himself appropriately'. Since those 'utterances' could also, the committee explained, 'include a failure to speak in circumstances in which such appropriate conduct requires that the person should speak', the refusal of Finley and Heimlich to answer the Senate committee's questions does 'raise a real question as to their fitness to continue as teachers on the University faculty'. Then, perhaps reflecting its chairman's position as a leader of the recently formed hawkish Cold War Committee on the Present Danger,

---

[18] Ibid.
[19] Jones, 'Statement', *Educational Record*.

the report discussed the evils of Communism and the clear and present danger that it posed to the University as well as to the nation. Voorhees and his colleagues obviously wanted a quick decision, but recognized that such a decision would have more credibility if it was rendered after a faculty investigation in accordance with AAUP regulations.[20]

Thus, a Special Faculty Committee of Review was duly selected and set to work right away. It consulted widely, quizzing Finley, Heimlich, and their lawyers, Joseph Fanelli and Leonard Boudin, as well as students, administrators, alumni, members of the Voorhees committee, and such outside experts as the General Secretary of the AAUP. Its members read up on the relevant legal literature. They also tried—and failed—to get the counsel of the McCarran Committee to explain why it had subpoenaed the two men or to offer them the opportunity to recant. The Special Faculty Committee also received from the administration what was probably something that the FBI called a 'blind memorandum', four typed pages of plain paper listing Finley's suspect affiliations.[21] Most significantly, it gave itself a crash course on the Fifth Amendment, for it wanted to know the answer to what it considered 'the crucial question': 'why anyone should refuse to answer the questions of a duly constituted committee of the Senate of the United States'?[22]

While endorsing the school's stated policy that 'a member of the Communist party should not be permitted to teach at Rutgers University', the committee's December 3rd report noted that its members had originally felt that there was something wrong with taking the Fifth, but came to realize that Finley and Heimlich had good reasons for relying on their privilege against self-incrimination. It would protect them from having to give information that might become 'a link in the chain' of evidence against them. Finley, after all, had been named by three people and he feared that anything he said to rebut their testimony could become the basis for a perjury indictment, while Heimlich claimed that the Senate subcommittee's questions not only set him up for an indictment, but also

[20] 'Report of the Special Trustee-Faculty Committee', Oct. 14, 1952. *Educational Record*.

[21] Memo, 'MOSES ISAAC FINLEY', Nov. 15, 1952, Jones papers, Box 4, Folder 1. This memo was probably prepared in accordance with the FBI's 'Responsibilities Program' which had been instituted in the early 1950s to give high public officials, including some college presidents and school system superintendents, information about the supposed subversive affiliations of people in their employ. In the course of my research in academic archives, I saw many similar documents.

[22] 'Report of the Special Faculty Committee of Review Concerning Simon W. Heimlich and Moses I. Finley', Dec. 3, 1952, *Educational Record*.

violated his right to privacy. The committee recognized that faculty members did have a special obligation to their school, but it believed that such an obligation should not require them to waive their constitutional rights. Accordingly, the committee unanimously recommended that the university take no further action in the matter.[23]

The Trustees disagreed. Unless Finley and Heimlich returned to the SISS before the end of the year and answered all its questions—something neither man would do—they were out of a job. In its December 12 resolution, dismissing the two men and ordering the immediate dismissal of anyone who took the Fifth with regard to membership in the Communist party, the Board invoked the 'special obligations' of college teachers. It stated that by taking the Fifth, a faculty member 'impairs confidence in his fitness to teach' and 'is also incompatible with the standards required of him as a member of his profession'. With its reference to professional standards and the faculty member's 'privilege of freedom to search out and to teach the truth', the Trustees' resolution was, to a large extent, echoing the earlier rationales for disqualifying Communists.[24]

The faculty was outraged. At its meeting on December 18, the University Assembly endorsed the Special Faculty Committee's report, as did a subsequent poll of the faculty which also requested that the Board of Trustees reconsider its decision. On January 19, a self-selected twenty-three-person faculty Emergency Committee submitted a statement opposing the dismissal of the two men. It began by criticizing the Trustees' failure to consult with the faculty before imposing a blanket prohibition on taking the Fifth Amendment. The statement also decried the lack of any specific charges against Finley and Heimlich or any concrete evidence of problems with their 'fitness to teach'.[25]

And, just as University of Washington president Allen supplemented the dismissal of his school's Communist professors with a formal statement, so too President Jones rushed to deliver a rationalization for the Rutgers Trustees' action. By the beginning of 1953, he seems to have convinced himself that Finley and Heimlich had essentially dismissed themselves by refusing 'to reconsider their stand'. He felt strongly that the two men were

[23] Ibid.

[24] 'Resolution of the Rutgers University Board of Trustees, Adopted at Its Meeting December 12, 1952', *Educational Record*.

[25] Emergency Committee of Rutgers Faculty on the Trustees' Decision of December 12, 1952 to Members of the Board of Trustees of Rutgers University, Jan. 19, 1953, Jones Papers, Box 1, Folder 12.

'ill-advised': though they 'had the right to claim privilege under the Fifth Amendment . . . the legal and civic wisdom of its exercise is questioned'. In particular, they had not given enough consideration to the well-being of the university. Their refusal to testify had made Rutgers 'vulnerable to disastrous demands for public control'.[26] Thus, in order to head off such demands as well as to placate such partisans of academic freedom as the AAUP, Jones released a formal statement on January 24, 1953. He did so, he explained, because Rutgers was, in his words, 'setting a precedent for the larger university community'. Accordingly, he wanted to clarify the reasoning behind that precedent—especially since the faculty was up in arms over the Trustees' rejection of the Special Faculty Committee's findings and the rest of the academy was bracing for further congressional investigations.[27]

Jones based his argument on a narrow view of academic freedom, one that protected teaching, research, and the 'right to hold unorthodox opinions'. Since the questions Heimlich and Finley refused to answer 'did not relate to their opinions, but to their membership in the Communist party', their behavior would not be protected by academic freedom, especially since 'such membership is not compatible with freedom of thought'. Not surprisingly, he emphasized that along with the privileges of academic freedom, professors also had 'special obligations'—one of which just so happened to be 'the obligation to render an explanation, as clearly and rationally as possible, whenever such an explanation is called for by duly constituted governmental bodies acting within the limits of their authority'. In particular, because of 'all the circumstances of our relations to world communism', professors owed it to the University to 'state frankly where they stand on matters of such deep public concern, and of such relevance to academic integrity, as membership in the Communist party'. This 'minimum responsibility' held, Jones explained, even if 'they believe they might incur certain personal risks'. In other words, faculty members were to surrender their constitutional rights in order to prevent 'damage to the entire University, and to the profession to which the two men belong'. Finally, of course, there was the ultimate value—the need

[26] Notes on the memorandum of the Emergency Committee, n.d., Jones Papers, Box 1, Folder 13.

[27] 'Statement of President Lewis Webster Jones of Rutgers University on the Heimlich-Finley Cases, January 24, 1953', *Educational Record.*

to uncover the 'Communist conspiracy' which invocations of the Fifth Amendment served to shelter.[28]

Jones insisted—and his later correspondence reinforces his public statement on that account—that if Finley and Heimlich had exposed themselves to criminal prosecutions by answering the McCarran committee's questions, the Rutgers administration and Board of Trustees would have backed them to the hilt. Tracy Voorhees had advocated a similar policy, directly urging both men to take the 'clean and honorable way for you out of this morass' by unburdening themselves before the committee.[29] The issue was moot, of course; neither man was prepared to recant and the Senate committee was not about to give them the opportunity. Nor was it likely that, given the political situation in early 1953 at the height of the red scare, the University would have offered them much support if they had admitted a Communist connection and then been indicted for perjury or sedition. That two such presumably well-informed and conscientious individuals as Jones and Voorhees would make such an unrealistic request speaks volumes about the willingness of the American establishment to go along with the witch-hunt.

For all its flaws, however, Jones' statement received wide attention. It was known that the main congressional investigating committees planned to question college teachers in the spring of 1953 when Congress would be in Republican hands. And, as they prepared to deal with potential witnesses, many schools looked to Rutgers for guidance. Jones willingly supplied it. He had taken the precaution of printing 5000 copies of his statement and shipped them out in bulk to his fellow college presidents, as well as to individual faculty members, trustees, politicians, and ordinary citizens.

Jones was not alone in formulating a policy for dealing with unfriendly witnesses on the faculty. Harvard's leaders, who assumed—correctly—that their school would soon attract the investigators, wanted to be prepared. At the request of a member of the institution's governing Corporation, two Law School professors, Zechariah Chafee and Arthur Sutherland, produced an analysis of the Fifth Amendment that purported to discuss the legal issues involved. Since Chafee was perhaps the nation's most eminent civil libertarian, the document had considerable impact. While not speaking to the issue of academic freedom, it stressed the 'duty of the

[28] Ibid.
[29] Tracy S. Voorhees to Simon Heimlich, Dec. 16, 1952, Jones Papers, Box 3, Folder 7.

citizen to cooperate in government'. According to Chafee and Sutherland, a witness can only use the Fifth if engaged in some kind of criminal venture and 'is neither wise nor legally justified in attempting political protest by standing silent when obligated to speak . . . the Fifth Amendment grants no privilege to protect one's friends'. Published initially as a letter to the Harvard student newspaper, January 8, 1953, the Chafee-Sutherland statement soon received wide circulation. It was, in fact, cited repeatedly in a private memo that President Jones used as he prepared his formal statement on the Rutgers case.[30]

An even more influential document appeared in March. Released by the Association of American Universities, a group composed of the presidents of the 37 leading universities in the United States and Canada, it explained why the academic community had to cooperate with the anti-Communist investigators. Its dissemination subsidized by the Rockefeller Foundation, this statement was as close as the academic community came to an official policy. It deviated little from the earlier formulations we have seen. After reiterating the by-then standard position that because of the party's 'use of falsehood and deceit' as well as its reliance on 'thought control', Communists could not be teachers, it noted some of the scholar's special obligations, including that to 'maintain' the university's reputation. 'Above all', the statement continued,

> he owes his colleagues in the university complete candor and perfect integrity, precluding any kind of clandestine or conspiratorial activities. He owes equal candor to the public. If he is called upon to answer for his convictions it is his duty as a citizen to speak out. It is even more definitely his duty as a professor. Refusal to do so on whatever legal grounds, cannot fail to reflect upon a profession that claims for itself the fullest freedom to speak and the maximum protection of that freedom available in our society. In this respect, invocation of the Fifth Amendment places upon a professor a heavy burden of proof of his fitness to hold a teaching position and lays upon his university an obligation to reexamine his qualifications for membership in its society.[31]

If nothing else, these various pronouncements made it clear that prospective witnesses would not encounter the kinds of mixed signals that Rutgers had given to Finley. They would have to cooperate with the committees

---

[30] For a more detailed discussion of the Chafee-Sutherland statement, see Schrecker 1986, 183–5; Notes on the memorandum of the Emergency Committee, n.d., Jones Papers, Box 1, Folder 13.

[31] *The Rights and Responsibilities of Universities and their Faculties.* A Statement by the Association of American Universities, March 24, 1953, Princeton, New Jersey.

or lose their jobs. And over the next few years, most of the fifty or so academics who took the Fifth Amendment in public found themselves unemployed, usually, though not always, after their own universities mounted a quasi-judicial proceeding before a faculty committee.

* * *

And, like Finley, they would find it nearly impossible to obtain another teaching position within the United States.

An academic blacklist was in place. Actually, it had already been in operation for several years before Finley tangled with the McCarran Committee. The three faculty members fired by the University of Washington sent out hundreds of letters seeking jobs, but received not a nibble and had to leave the academy. One became a carpenter, another went on the dole, and the third, a social psychologist, went into private practice as a therapist. A group of young physicists who had become enmeshed in a HUAC investigation of the atomic bomb project in 1948 and 1949 also found themselves unemployable in academe unless they could emigrate. The Rapp-Coudert hold-overs in the New York City municipal colleges who were fired at the same time as Finley and Heimlich patched together careers outside the academy in fields ranging from psychoanalysis to public relations. Heimlich, who at the time of his dismissal told President Jones that 'I haven't the faintest idea, at the present time, of any possibility of earning a livelihood', apparently went into business.[32] By the 1960s, however, as the anti-Communist furor receded and the academy expanded, many of those defrocked academics were able to return to college teaching, though their decade and a half absence from the campus did take a toll on their careers.

Finley, of course, managed to find another—and arguably better—university position rather quickly. Even so, at least at first, his experiences on the academic blacklist were not unusual, though the support he received from the Rutgers administration was somewhat unique. For it was clear that his superiors deeply regretted having to let their brilliant classicist go. And they did what they could to find him some kind of alternative employment. Thus, for example, presumably on the assumption that private institutions might be more amenable to a politically controversial teacher than a public school, the provost tried to persuade the President of Smith College to hire him. But even in the bucolic setting

32 Heimlich to Jones, Dec. 23, 1952, Jones Papers, Box 3, Folder 8.

of Northampton, Massachusetts, Smith's president explained that Finley's 'refusal to answer a question for the McCarran Committee would make him ineligible'. This was especially the case since the Committee was planning to investigate Smith in the beginning of 1953 and it was 'obvious that the appointment of someone who has already refused to testify before that committee would not be in the interests of the College'.[33] There was a possible opening at Columbia and Barnard, but, as his correspondent there explained to the provost, though Finley's qualifications would be considered, 'just how great a disadvantage his refusal to testify will prove to be, I cannot say in advance, although it is certain that this aspect of his record will not be listed among his strong points'.[34]

The Rutgers administrators kept pushing, nonetheless. They wrote to prospective employers at foundations as well as universities, explaining the situation and touting Finley's virtues. Nonetheless, the academic blacklist was impermeable. There was an attempt to place his name before a hiring committee at a major Ivy League university. Though Finley was already recognized as perhaps the leading ancient historian of his generation, the committee members would not even read his folder. 'Why ask for trouble?' was the response. Even as late as 1958, when Finley was in contention for a position in ancient history at Cornell, for which he was viewed as by far the strongest candidate in the running and 'the only man on this list of clearly outstanding achievement and promise', Cornell's president, Deane Malott, scotched the appointment. He had spent years fending off demands to fire the eminent—and ex-Communist—physicist Philip Morrison and he obviously did not want another controversial figure on the faculty. Accordingly, Malott claimed that Finley's refusal to cooperate with McCarran was a 'serious moral and civic error'. When the History Department appealed that decision to the faculty's academic freedom committee, Malott solicited secret information from Rutgers to convince the faculty committee that hiring Finley would be unwise. Though the members of the faculty committee remained unconvinced, they did not dispute the president's power to block the appointment.[35]

Although Finley remained unemployable at major American universities, he did gain a belated vindication from the AAUP. Because of the failure of its executive secretary to act on any of the McCarthy era cases,

---

[33] Mason Gross (Provost) to Benj. Wright, Dec. 19, 1952; Wright to Gross, Dec. 29, 1952, Jones Papers, Box 3, Folder 5.

[34] Dwight C. Minor to Mason Gross, March 21, 1953, Jones Papers, Box 3, Folder 5.

[35] Schrecker 1986, 267, 272–73.

it was not until 1955 that the Association put together a special committee of eminent academics to examine these academic freedom violations. Its 1956 report on 'Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Quest for National Security' reiterated the organization's earlier assertion that belonging to the Communist party did not automatically disqualify someone from an academic position. It then went on to specify that 'the invocation of the Fifth Amendment by a faculty member under official investigation cannot be in itself a sufficient ground for removing him'. At the same time, it also stated that 'if a faculty member invokes the Fifth Amendment when questioned about Communism, or if there are other indications of past or present Communist associations or activities, his institution cannot ignore the possible significance for itself of these matters' and would be justified in examining that person's fitness to teach.[36] While the AAUP report did not contain the same kind of digressions about the evils of communism as, for example, the AAU's statement did, it nonetheless seemed to imply that under certain circumstances the academy could impose a political test for employment. Even so, the report did not exonerate Rutgers. The Board of Trustees' policy of automatic dismissal for taking the Fifth Amendment 'violated the right of a faculty member to a meaningful hearing in which his fitness to remain in his position would be the issue, and attempted to turn the exercise of a constitutional privilege into an academic offense, without reference to other relevant considerations'. Accordingly, the special committee recommended that Rutgers be censured.[37]

By then, of course, Finley was no longer unemployed. Like quite a few other blacklisted professors he had been able to find an academic position outside the United States. Most of those émigrés were scientists and most, unlike Finley, returned to the U.S. during the 1960s. But except for occasional visits to pick up honorary degrees and to deliver the Sather lectures at Berkeley as well as the first endowed lecture series at Rutgers, Sir Moses remained in England, where his career flourished.

Would his work have been different had Finley remained at Rutgers? Scholars in other fields have described how they reshaped their research agendas during the 1950s to eliminate vestiges of Marxism or avoid controversial social issues. Thus, it is possible that Finley's emigration may have freed him from such constraints. In any event, the extent to which

[36] 'Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Quest for National Security: Report of a Special Committee of the American Association of University Professors', *AAUP Bulletin* 42, No. 1 (Spring, 1956), 58.

[37] Ibid. 78.

Finley's dismissal from Rutgers and his relocation to Cambridge affected his scholarship is a question that I am not equipped to deal with. Perhaps his colleagues in the field of ancient history can answer that question.

There is a post-script, however, for Rutgers did learn something from its treatment of Moses Finley. In 1965, when the recently tenured historian Eugene Genovese told a university teach-in on the Vietnam war, 'I do not fear or regret the impending Viet Cong victory in Vietnam. I welcome it', there was a huge outcry. Even the former Vice President, Richard Nixon, entered the fray. This time, however, the Rutgers' administration, headed by Mason Gross, the provost at the time of Finley's dismissal, stood its ground and refused to fire Genovese. The AAUP, which had censured the institution less than ten years before, now gave Rutgers its annual academic freedom award. But, like the story of Finley's dismissal, nothing within the world of higher education is quite what it seems. The Rutgers' authorities, while keeping Genovese on the faculty, also made it clear to him that, as he later recalled, 'I was going to be a second class citizen in salary and promotion possibilities'. Since he was on the verge of producing his path-breaking work on American slavery, Genovese left New Brunswick for a more hospitable institution in Canada.[38]

Rutgers was not unique here; for, despite the turmoil of the 1960s and 1970s, the academic community did not repeat the flagrant dismissals of the McCarthy era. Today other problems threaten the nation's faculties. Financial constraints now challenge academic freedom in unprecedented ways. A contemporary Moses Finley might not lose his job because of his politics, but in an age of austerity where vocationalism is undermining the humanities, he might never have found one in the first place.

[38] Wiener 1989, 416.

DILEMMAS OF RESISTANCE

Alice Kessler-Harris

The swift ending of Moses Finley's American career as a result of Congressional inquiries into his political past raises a set of broad questions about how the American academy polices itself and, as well, about how institutions that announce themselves to be independent of political pressures nevertheless repeatedly lose their compass. Separating the right and the just from the politically appropriate or necessary, it turns out, is harder than we think. The process of trying to do so suggests how difficult is the historian's task as he/she seeks to interpret the behavior of protagonists who must choose among difficult options.

Finley, as we know, when faced in late 1952 with a call to testify before the U.S. Senate Committee on Internal Security (the McCarran Committee) chose not to cooperate.[1] His refusal to provide the committee with the names of individuals with whom he had associated in the late 1930s at first created few ripples. After all Finley was a very small fish in a huge pond. If he had once been a member of the Communist Party he had certainly never been an actor of any consequence. And if, as rumors attested, he had entertained Party members at weekly discussions about Marxism, there was nothing subversive about that in the late 1930s. Perhaps, when the committee asked him, he had no names to name. Eventually he lost his job at Rutgers for no crime other than refusing to cooperate with a government investigating committee. He was lucky enough and talented enough to be offered another job in England, and ultimately gave up his American citizenship. That story has a happy ending. Finley's removal to Cambridge, outside the jaws of American political pressure, surely played a role in his becoming one of the twentieth century's leading classicists.

But it elicits another set of questions that, in this 21st century moment of increasing ideological tension, deserve attention. Finley's own experience raises a relatively limited problem: how does a left-leaning intellectual (perhaps a Marxist) function in a political context that dismisses or reviles dissenting thought? For us, the question is broader: how does an intellectual maintain integrity in the face of ideological coercion?

---

[1] Shrecker, this volume pp. 70–71.

I hesitate to pose this in the conditional. How *should* an intellectual respond? Moral as well as political questions are at stake. As political economist Albert O. Hirschman long ago noted, a reactionary moment poses only limited alternatives.[2] Some of these clearly emerge from perceptions of political boundaries that take no account of moral principles. Finley was caught in such a moment.

In the early 1950s, fuelled by fear of an expansionist Soviet Union that had just acquired atomic weapons, motivated by persuasive accounts of Stalin's murderous and paranoiac purges, stunned by the apparent attraction of communist ideas to the world's poor, Americans experienced an intense wave of fear of the Soviets. Part of that reaction involved building up military defenses and rooting out spies. About these much has been written. Americans also sought to cleanse their country of communist influence, to resist an apparent threat to their way of life by stifling incipient empathy for an economic system that seemed antithetical to their own. Hirschman has grouped the rhetorical strategies adopted by those he calls reactionaries into three tendencies that he labels perversity, futility, and jeopardy. Reactionaries, in his view, might declare that planned innovations would simply exacerbate prevailing evils (perversity), or they might insist that they would simply fail (futility). But the most powerful message they could convey—and the one on which I want to focus—was that of jeopardy. The most effective argument of reactionaries in Hirschman's view was that forward-looking radicals could endanger previous national accomplishments. In the early 1950s reactionary arguments successfully frightened Americans into believing that a deceptive communism threatened to destroy liberty and democracy, the object of America's very special charge.

And yet, as Finley and others discovered, the campaign to quash communism could sacrifice the very freedoms it claimed to protect. To stifle communism would require defining it as not merely politically unattractive, even dangerous, but as morally evil. There were plenty of grounds for moral accusations. The slaughter engendered by the Soviet Union's collectivization process in the 1930s, the purges, show trials, and executions of the latter part of the decade, Stalin's continuing paranoia and the tyranny of repression—all of them indefensible—drew justifiable horror and condemnation from the left and the right. Against an image of a God-fearing, well-intentioned America, reactionaries constructed a Communism so

---

[2] Hirschman 1991, 7.

inherently evil, so lacking in humanity that it constituted a fundamental threat to human freedom. 'All evil', as Alfred Kazin would later assert, 'was now to be attached to communism . . .'.[3]

Once the debate descended into the moral sphere, civil and political considerations became secondary. Unlike in much of Western Europe, to accuse someone of being a communist in the post World War II United States was to slander his character as well as his politics, to place that individual within a powerful closed circle. To have once been a communist, no matter how briefly, or to have had communist friends and participated in conversations with communists required explanation and purging. Loyalty oaths; fervent displays of patriotism that relied on positive acts of one's own; denouncing others, and wielding a language that conflated socialism with Stalinism, and communism with totalitarianism, all helped to construct unity of purpose that fostered national pride in the Cold War period.

In contrast, denying communist associations merely affirmed the truism that Communists were liars; admitting it, and claiming that any affiliation was the product of an aberrant youth or naivety, required expiation by naming the names of others who had sinned. Guilt was generally not determined by courts of law, but by state and Congressional hearings that revealed the identities of the accused without permitting a defense. Refusal to answer questions provided no protection because, to quote Joseph McCarthy, 'A witness's refusal to answer whether or not he is a Communist on the ground that his answer would tend to incriminate him is the most positive proof obtainable that the witness is a Communist'.[4] The innumerable hearings were not, as journalist Victor Navasky tells us, meant to elicit information so much as they were tests of character, of citizenship. The price of what Navasky fittingly identifies as an ongoing morality play, might be high, but its cost was redeemed in the eyes of politicians by the expiation of sin evidenced by clear and complete testimony.[5]

Finley responded to this morass by taking the best route available to him. Unwilling to cooperate with expressions of loyalty demanded by the

---

[3] Kazin 1978, 186.

[4] Quoted in Schrecker 1986, 176.

[5] Navasky 1980, ix. In this respect, the American experience differed from the British and from that of most European countries that fought on political rather than on moral grounds. The difference helps us to understand why Americans engaged in what many called a 'cover-up'.

committee; too insignificant a player to effectively raise his voice and fight back, he acknowledged the futility of confrontation by leaving the country and eventually giving up his American citizenship.[6] He was by no means the only intellectual to take this path, and he was lucky that it was open to him. But every path posed its own contradiction, exacted its own price, and each individual called to redeem himself faced a wrenching decision.

Historians have explored at length the exit strategies of Hollywood celebrities caught in the mire: names like Berthold Brecht and the filmmaker Hannah Weinstein (who escaped to London, turned Robin Hood into a 20th century movie legend, and employed countless black-listed writers) come quickly to mind.[7] But as historians Ellen Schrecker, Alan Wald and others have suggested, for intellectuals in and outside the academy, the paths of resistance posed a complicated set of conundrums.[8] Since they lived by ideas that required expression, their identities and livelihoods vested in their capacity to think critically, writers and artists found particularly repugnant demands that they repudiate previous belief systems, even if they no longer adhered to them. The insistence that they name (or betray) friends and colleagues for living by their own belief systems often caused genuine anguish.

Finley was by no means the only American intellectual to choose a path that enabled freedom of conscience and allowed the possibility of continuing to write without fear of interrogation. Confronted with the circular logic of reaction, some chose to exit even before they faced the committees; others, like Finley, were ejected after the fact. Queens College Economics professor Vera Shlakman resigned a tenured academic position when she received notice of an impending call to appear before an investigatory committee. Only years later did she manage to find another academic job. Finley was summarily removed from his post at Rutgers University not for refusing to provide satisfactory answers, but for providing none. A very few of those investigated were lucky enough to find alternative employment in the academy. Most academics accused of communist thought or action did not have offers from outside the country.

---

[6] I am indebted to Daniel P. Tompkins for sharing information about Finley's early left-wing activities. Like Lillian Hellman, who we shall consider later, he became deeply involved in anti-fascist activities in the 1930s, and refused, even after the 1939 Molotov-Ribbentrop pact to walk away from the Soviet Union. See Tompkins this volume.

[7] Lardner 2000, 140.

[8] Schrecker 1986; Wald 1987.

Their choices were fraught: cooperate or be fired; confess previous sin and demonstrate penance by naming names; lie, or be asked to betray conscience and friendship.

Under the circumstances, an astonishing number of intellectuals who thought of themselves as moral and good ended up not only cooperating with the committees, but convincing themselves that their failure to defend their colleagues amounted to patriotic virtue.[9] The alternatives amounted to one among several dilemmas of resistance. Faced with a choice of bowing to political pressure or choosing to defend an unpopular position, many intellectuals believed they could both cooperate and resist. Their tactic was to accept an admittedly ill-advised McCarthyism as a necessary tool to root out communism. These were the liberal anti-communists, among them men, not yet famous, like Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. They saw themselves as champions of freedom, a delusion made possible by clinging to the moral divide. After all, defending against a moral evil required girding oneself against an enemy within, and rooting it out no matter the cost.

The conflation of communism with abstract evil legitimized the adoption of tactics designed to contain it, and provided intellectuals with justifications for participating in strategies antithetical to civil liberties and to the democracy under attack. Few academics protested the loyalty oaths demanded by state universities in the Truman years. Moral claims sustained tactics that required witnesses called before congressional committees to name the names of others they might once have known in order to demonstrate that they had truly separated themselves from the evil called communism. In the name of freedom, intellectuals shared in the finger pointing, whispering suspicions and accusations of guilt by association. Such tactics drew sharp lines between those labeled as potentially subversive and loyal Americans.

Among the consequences of failing to cooperate with the general spirit of the times, one might have one's right to travel abroad revoked. The Internal Security Act of 1950 gave the State Department's Passport Division the right to withhold passports from members of the Communist party and of communist front organizations—a regulation quickly expanded to include anyone sympathetic to communism.[10] In practice, this gave the Passport Division wide discretion, allowing it to refuse passports from

---

[9] Schrecker 1986, Chapter 6.
[10] Kutler 1982, 97.

time to time to historian and political activist W. E. B. DuBois, playwright Lillian Hellman (about whom more later), script writer Ring Lardner, and, famously, Paul Robeson. The then young playwright Arthur Miller was denied a passport in the early 1950s, purportedly under a rule that denied passports to 'citizens believed to be supporting the communist movement whether they are members of the Communist Party or not'.[11] Ruth Shipley, head of the Passport Division for many years, believed in withholding passports from those 'who might bring grave discredit on this country', or who, though not members of the CP, 'supported its goals'.[12]

The taint associated with communism spread rapidly. Anything that could be attached to it absorbed the taint of evil. The notion of a popular front for social change, which in the 1930s implied the shared participation of all kinds of left-wing groups, including communists, anarchists and social democrats in pursuit of a particular cause, gave way to a new definition. By the 1950s, popular front could only mean a group put to the purposes of Soviet-dominated communists. Advocacy of racial equality placed one under suspicion because the CPUSA, in the early fifties, espoused that cause. Participating in organizations that spoke up for birth control, or women's economic equality and political rights, attracted the epithet 'pink'. Trade union advocacy inspired mistrust. In the eyes of the public, and soon in the minds of intellectuals, communism became conflated with Stalinism, and Stalinism, like Fascism, seemed merely another form of totalitarianism that placed democracy in jeopardy. Reflecting the growing mistrust, at the order of President Truman, the Attorney General constructed a long list of organizations in which communists might once have participated.

To shed the taint of evil, some left-wing intellectuals not only distanced themselves from communism but shared in the attack on it. This strategy turned its adherents into uncomfortable bedfellows of McCarthyism, tacitly sustaining the unprincipled campaign against communism, even as they sought to condemn the campaign's unfounded accusations and bullying style. Left-wing groups of Trotskyists (Irving Howe, for example), Socialists and Social Democrats (like Lionel Trilling) sought cover by freely attacking communists in the hope that they could thus distinguish their politics from those of the Soviet Union. So did

[11] Kazin 1978, 187; Arthur Miller's own story can be found in *Timebends: A Life* (Miller 1987, 365–66).

[12] Kutler 1982, 97.

the premier liberal organization of the day, Americans for Democratic Action. Founded in 1948 by liberal anti-communists including Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Joseph Rauh, and philosopher Sidney Hook, the ADA shared the conviction that communism was morally wrong, and agreed on that basis to support all progressive causes *except* those linked in any way with the Communist Party or communism.

The last step in this process was to demand that liberal and left-leaning people divest themselves of their past associations and recant their former beliefs. The issue was not, to paraphrase a Pennsylvania attorney general, whether any individual 'is a communist or ever was', but whether he or she had ever had 'Communistic sympathies and leanings as shown by her associations, her acts and her utterances'. Communist sympathizers, otherwise known as 'comsymps', found themselves as vulnerable as die-hard party functionaries. As William Barrett, for many years an editor of the liberal *Partisan Review*, noted: 'So long as they remain tied to their past with its pro-Soviet leanings, their efforts are bound to be compromised and therefore less effective than they otherwise would be'.[13] The core of the struggle within the left quickly became the question of whether individuals would disassociate themselves from the Soviet Union and repudiate their sympathy with that government. The demand for apologias created deep rifts that ultimately undermined any possibility of a unified resistance to McCarthyism.

In acquiescing to the high state of alert necessary to protect the nation from communism, anti-communists of all stripes opened the gate to the proverbial slippery slope, at once providing solace for those who thought of communism as evil and removing restraints on those who sought to attribute 'communism' to random victims. Having accepted communism as a moral evil, even well intentioned liberals found it difficult to distance themselves from political behavior and constraints on civil liberties designed to root out the evil. In this climate, loyalty oaths for teaching positions and non-communist affidavits for passport applications became routine. Congressional hearings, which lacked judicial rules of evidence and inquiry, substituted for court trials in which evidence could be challenged and accusers confronted. Guilt by accusation or association no longer seemed outrageous violations of the presumption of innocence. The mere suspicion of communist affiliation might produce a call to clear one's name that would result in instant job loss or blacklisting. Paid

[13] Barrett 1982, 97.

informants contributed hearsay evidence before credulous audiences. The protection of the Fifth Amendment vanished as pleading it was interpreted as a confession of guilt. Efforts to preserve decency or dignity by failing to turn over friends or family members could be construed as marks of bad faith.

Who, under these circumstances could claim the moral high ground? At what point did good liberals draw the line? At what point did anti-communists who declared their opposition to McCarthyism begin to fight for the civil liberties that the anti-communist crusade so quickly crushed?

Fighting political battles on moral grounds jeopardized the civil liberties of a huge range of individuals for whom communism had never been a source of comfort. Take for example the well-known case of China expert Owen Lattimore. Lattimore had never been a communist, nor politically sympathetic to communism, but his experience in China in the 1930s and again in the forties had taught him that a Communist victory was a likely occurrence there, even if an undesirable one. Lattimore's insistence on facing the political realities of a probable communist success placed him at odds with members of the Senate who believed that his warnings merely comforted Communists everywhere. To Lattimore, however, this was beside the point. As he told the Senate Sub-committee on Internal Security just a day before Finley's appearance, he aimed to 'establish beyond question, beyond dispute, and beyond further challenge, the right of American scholars and authors to think, talk and write, freely and honestly, without the paralyzing fear of the kind of attack to which I have been subjected'.[14]

Lattimore was never more eloquent than when he articulated the dangers of suppressing free speech. 'We ourselves can cause the decay of capitalism and democracy', he wrote later.

> The sure way to do this is to permit the destruction of the basic wellspring from which capitalism and democracy derive their vitality, namely freedom of research, freedom of speech, and freedom for men stoutly to maintain their diverse opinions. . . . It is only from a diversity of views freely expressed and strongly advocated that sound policy is distilled. He who contributes to the destruction of this process is either a fool or an enemy of his country.[15]

[14] Lattimore 1950, 189.
[15] Ibid. 95.

But Lattimore, like Finley and others, would be abandoned by intellectuals who refused to challenge the logic of the process itself. Lattimore's ordeal continued for five years after he was exonerated by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, fuelled by what historian Blanche Wiesen Cook has aptly described as an America in 'a state of siege'.[16] In the end, Lattimore lost his position at Johns Hopkins University, spent several years partially employed by the University's History Department, and then, like Finley, headed for England, where he completed his distinguished career.

Lattimore's experience suggests the folly of resistance. Since every citizen had a duty to protect and to be loyal to one's country and the measure of loyalty excluded any communist association, not to cooperate with the committees suggested a prima facie case of disloyalty. Put another way, if resisting McCarthy and McCarthyism proved one's communism, then, as William Phillips, an editor of the liberal, non-communist *Partisan Review* put it, good citizens could not come to the defense of those hauled before the committees, because, after all 'some were communists, and what one was asked to defend was their right to lie about it'.[17] Since the only way to cooperate was to name names, one had a choice of being a good citizen or being a fink. Journalist James Wechsler who loudly and publicly berated McCarthy nevertheless cooperated in the end with the House Committee on Unamerican Activities (HUAC), returning to name names not, he said, out of any contrition, but merely to convey the message that loyal citizens cooperate with their government.[18] This he defended as a necessity in order that his voice would carry weight when he attacked McCarthyism.

There was no point in engaging in discourse with communists, argued anti-communists of all kinds, because their moral compasses were such as to completely distort all argument. Since lying was a natural trait of communists, to deny communist affiliation was to reveal one's communist attachment. One version of this justified the behavior of Columbia University Professor of English Literature Lionel Trilling. Asked to chair a committee to develop a university stance in relation to the investigatory committees, Trilling, in 1953, helped to create a statement with two parts. The first opposed federal investigations of educational institutions as unnecessary and harmful. But the second, which declared that

[16] Cook 2004, xvii.
[17] Phillips 1983, 174–5.
[18] Navasky 1980, 55.

membership in the communist party almost certainly implied 'submission to an intellectual control at variance with principles of academic competence as we understand them' provided the university with all the rationale it needed to investigate and fire not only suspected communists but those suspected of associating with communists.

This dilemma was exacerbated by the use of language that conflated many forms of left politics with communism and its more vicious variant, Stalinism, turning what should have been a struggle of progressive against reactionary forces into a struggle among progressives. When reactionaries adopted a language of Stalinism, they conflated a fragmented left. Tense internal conflicts between and among socialists and social democrats of many stripes did not prevent most Americans from lumping together these and others on the left as architects of economic and social planning. By the early 1950s, all the left drew fire as antagonists of the market, and willing allies in limiting human freedom. Such a conflation led those on the left to try to distinguish themselves from each other, promoting the sectarian conflicts that limited a collective resistance to McCarthyism. Try as they might to distinguish their own particular forms of left activity from those of the CPUSA or the Soviet Union, intellectuals on the left found themselves caught in nets of their own making.

Though Trotskyists and Lovestone-ites routinely attacked Stalinism, the popular mind identified them all with communism, itself understood as a synonym for the totalitarian regime identified with Stalin. The bottom line then was that if one tried to play the political game, denying Stalinist sympathies and Communist Party membership while sanctioning for the left in any form, one was labeled a communist. To exonerate oneself from charges of continuing sympathy with communism, required cooperating with the investigatory committees, no matter how reprehensible they seemed, by naming names. In this closed system, resistance to accusations of communism provided only unpalatable options.

Playwright Lillian Hellman was among the few who chose to challenge the circular logic of the argument, taking on its moral and political assumptions and illuminating the trap. She was certainly not the first or the only person to do so, but perhaps the one with a voice eloquent enough to resonate in the public media. At the time she was a famous playwright (author of *The Little Foxes* and *Watch on the Rhine* among other critical plays), not yet the celebrity she became in the sixties nor the author of the best-selling memoirs that would earn her a small fortune in the seventies. Hellman had plenty that she did not want to talk about. She had briefly been a member of the Communist Party from 1938–

1940; and lived for years with mystery writer Dashiell Hammett, whose communist sympathies were well known. She was a staunch supporter of the Soviet Union during the latter part of the 1930s and had remained so until after World War II.

Blacklisted from the film industry, an organizer and advocate of peace conferences, she had several times fought to acquire the passport she needed for her frequent travels abroad. Still, whatever her past sins, by the time she appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on May 19, 1952, just a few weeks after Moses Finley testified before the SISS, even the FBI had stopped keeping watch on her. Stubborn and insistent, she insisted on clinging to moral rectitude.

Advised by her counsel, the liberal anti-communist Joseph Rauh, Hellman told the committee that she was not then a communist, and had not been a member of the communist party for the past three years. It was no business of theirs, she declared, pleading the Fifth Amendment, whether she had ever been a party member.[19] Nor was it any business of theirs to inquire into who she had befriended or known in past years. Others had made this argument before Hellman and gone to jail for their pains, but Hellman and Joe Rauh had laid the groundwork for their argument well. Weeks before the hearing, they drafted a letter to Committee Chair John Wood that articulated the moral basis of Hellman's position. With ringing eloquence, she told the committee that though she would happily testify about herself, she could not testify about others. 'I was raised in an old-fashioned American tradition', she wrote, and there were certain homely things that were taught to me: to try to tell the truth, not to bear false witness, not to harm my neighbor, to be loyal to my country'. She continued: 'To hurt innocent people ... in order to save myself is to me inhuman, and indecent and dishonorable'.[20] If the committee would not allow her to testify only about herself, she would plead the fifth. That, in the end, is what she did. It was a position neither more nor less than others had taken, but put forward with a startling elegance.

Hellman's letter, inadvertently made public by the Committee, temporarily stymied it. Its release enabled Hellman to evade a contempt citation and jail. Briefly she found herself an American heroine. She had managed to find a way to resist the reactionary notion that she and others like her were putting the United States in danger. Turning the tables on the committee

---

19 This story is more fully told in Kessler-Harris 2012.
20 Hellman 1976, 53.

she insisted that their tactics undermined dearly held American values, and threatened democracy itself. If she had ever seen any subversion, she wrote, it would have been her duty to report it. The committee had confused subversive activity with unpopular belief systems, thus bringing harm to innocent people who asked only to be heard. The right to believe whatever one wanted had been hard won, she argued. She, for one, would defend civil liberties to their core.

For a while it looked as though her strategy had succeeded. Admiring responses to her valiant stance followed Hellman for months and years after the 1952 hearings. They faded under continuing allegations, at first whispered, and then reaching a rising crescendo, that because she had never denounced the utopian dreams in which she had once believed, she must be a continuing advocate of the legacy of Joseph Stalin. To her, such denunciations smacked of simple cowardice: she had never witnessed subversive acts, she insisted; she and most other true believers had once (wrongly she now agreed) believed that they could change the world for the better. Why should they now repudiate those beliefs? To do so would merely affirm the power of others to dictate what she should once have believed. But to claim the moral high ground, one had to be purer than the pure. And in the end, Hellman found herself hoist on her own petard.

A quarter century after her appearance before HUAC, after she had recouped her fortunes and become something of a celebrity, Hellman published *Scoundrel Time*, her account of the HUAC experience. The real enemies then, she argued, were not the McCarthyites who claimed, and genuinely feared that communism threatened liberty and democracy, but those who had succumbed to fear, who had failed to see that their silent acquiescence to the committees, their refusal to defend the victims (whatever their politics) was itself the greatest threat to liberty and democracy. Citing her own courage, Hellman insisted that disputes about the military and ideological threat of the Soviet Union were no more than red herrings: the threat to American civil liberties posed the real danger in the 1950s, and, by implication, continued to do so in the continuing Cold War of the 1970s.

Anti-Communists of all stripes quickly rose in their own defense. Hellman did not deserve the moral high ground, they argued. She had misinterpreted history: she was simply wrong to assume that the Soviet Union and Communism posed no danger to the American republic. And besides, she was a hypocrite who had claimed to fear going to jail, but had never been in danger of doing so; who had employed an anti-communist lawyer (Rauh had a reputation for refusing to represent communists); and who

had the skill to write an eloquent letter and the celebrity to call public attention to it. Worse, she had lied about her association with the Communist Party, claiming that she had never been a member of the party when in fact she had been. To top it off, her reputation and her finances had hardly suffered. She had quickly recouped both celebrity and income.

The conflict, fought in the context of a continuing Cold War, demonstrated the growing ineffectiveness of moral claims to civil liberties in the face of continuing evil. In some sense, it provides a coda for those, like Finley who chose to exit rather than to stand their ground. To be sure, in the 1960s, there seemed briefly to have been a lull in the battle against civil liberties. When Eugene Genovese, a historian of slavery and the south, and in his youth a member of the Communist Party, faced political charges at Rutgers University, the faculty strongly supported him. Genovese had identified himself as a Marxist and a socialist in a 1964 public speech in which he also declared that he would welcome a Viet Cong victory. This time, the Rutgers History department (with Finley still on its mind) unequivocally declared 'none of these beliefs disqualifies a man as a teacher or a scholar'.[21] The Board of Trustees concurred. And yet, in the end, political pressure prevailed and a year later, Eugene Genovese was quietly encouraged to take a position in Canada. By the late 1960s and the early 1970s, an active Federal Bureau of Investigation had once again resumed efforts to root out those with left-wing, anti-war, and civil rights sympathies, all of whom it loosely labeled communist.

Only since the decline of communism and the fall of the Soviet Union has the taint of communism waned. Long after her death in 1984 and into the nineties Hellman was widely cast as a 'Stalinist'. In 1994, Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, wielded the notion of communism to characterize democratic opposition to his right-wing programs. And in the 2012 political campaign, Florida Congressman Allen West accused 78–81 Congressional Democrats of membership in the Communist Party.[22] But more recently, the Communist Party affiliations and sympathies of folk heroes like Woody Guthrie and Pete Seeger have surfaced with no trace of negative influence on their reputations. Indeed communist party affiliation now takes its place in the obituary columns as a mark of political commitment and of continuing resistance. When labor historian David

[21] Board of governors, Rutgers, the State University, *A Report on the Genovese Case* (pamphlet, August 6, 1965) *3, 7*.

[22] Moyers and Winship 2012.

Montgomery died in December, 2011, columnists casually noted his party membership continued into the early fifties when he found himself no longer useful and chose to enroll in graduate school instead. The January 2013 death of the well-known historian of women, Gerda Lerner, drew similar acknowledgements of her youthful Communist Party membership as simply part of a lifetime of activism.[23]

Like Lillian Hellman, Finley, if he was ever a member of the Communist Party, was never a heavy hitter. But in Finley's American experience, there was no way to be a communist without committing a moral transgression that placed one outside the bounds of community. Barring celebrity—and even that protected Hellman for only a few years—the taint of communism cast one among the untouchables. Whatever else it did, the McCarthy period constructed a unity of purpose that fostered national pride in the Cold War period. In that sense, the anti-communist campaign, the loyalty oaths, the committee hearings and threats of exposure were enormously successful. But the price was the undermining of the fabric of civil liberties that held democracy together, the silencing of dissent, and the exile of scholars and others who could not abide repression. Finley's appearance before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security in April 1952 occurred in the course of a great assault on civil liberties in which the hunt for communists provided a moving target. In that context, Finley's exit from the United States can be read as a defense not of any particular political position, but of a commitment to believe freely. His departure reveals the depth of the attack on democracy mounted in the fifties, and the difficulties of resisting it.

[23] *New York Times*, December 8, 2011; Grimes 2013.

FINLEY'S DEMOCRACY/DEMOCRACY'S FINLEY

Paul Cartledge

For Dan Tompkins, Finley scholar extraordinary

Introduction: Biographical

William Harris asked me to discuss Finley's book, *Democracy Ancient and Modern* [*DAM*], and I shall mainly do that. He also asked me to talk about Moses as a practical politician, in Cambridge, and I shall do that also, in a small but not insignificant way, as regards his specifically academic or pedagogical politics at both the local (Cambridge) and the national (England and Wales) levels. This is particularly congenial territory for me, both intellectual and personal.[1] But I begin my discussion of the background, contexts and contents of the two English editions and several translations of *DAM* by taking a leaf out of the Book of 'Mom' (Arnaldo Dante Momigliano).[2] That is to say, before we study the History we must study the Historian; and a quite extraordinary, indeed in several ways unprecedented and unparalleled, Historian Finley was too. In this case, a mere 'Life and Times' would not be adequate, since the Times Finley lived in and through not only seriously influenced his Historiography but in the fullest sense eventually determined his Life as a whole. 'Look to the End', as Finley's ancient Greeks might have said.

I apologise for rehearsing and repeating what may well be utterly familiar material. I do so solely to contextualise *DAM* properly. Born in 1912 into a New York City Jewish family, Moe Finkelstein, as he was then known, was

---

[1] For such autobiographical details, see my contribution to the parallel Cambridge commemorative volume (Osborne et al. forthcoming).

[2] Momigliano (1908–1987) was a firm friend of Finley's, and their intellectual admiration was mutual too; e.g., Momigliano gave an exceptionally warm welcome to three of Finley's books (including *DAM*) in the *New York Review of Books* (Momigliano 1975), Possibly indeed the admiration was a little too mutual, at any rate so far as Finley's regard for Momigliano was concerned. Momigliano's idiosyncratic variety of intellectual histor(iograph)y was hard to imitate, let alone emulate; Finley's attempts—e.g., in the first chapter of *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (Finley 1980/1998)—were markedly less successful and, moreover, distracted him somewhat from his own earlier distinctive and highly persuasive style of essay-writing.

a child prodigy, more specifically a math genius, from a very young age. In 1923, when only 11, he began attending Syracuse University, NY, graduating as a psychology major in 1927 aged just 15.[3] From Syracuse he transferred to Columbia, to do an MA—in modern American legal history. But when it came to moving on to do a PhD at Columbia, in the early 1930s, still aged under 20, he decided typically enough to attend lectures by the ancient historian W. L. Westermann, significantly a specialist in ancient Greek and Roman slavery.[4] It was those lectures, Finley said, which determined his turn towards the ancient world, a turn which bore published fruit in his first two academic papers, in 1934 and 1935 respectively.[5]

By then, however, deep into FDR's first term as a President committed to at least alleviating the worst effects of the Great Crash and the great depression, Finley's purely or narrowly academic interests and endeavours were taking second place to a powerful and powerfully active political involvement—quite near to the extreme left of American politics, indeed.[6] This was a commitment reinforced by the probably even more leftist views of his lifetime soulmate, his wife Mary,[7] and it carried him on into and through the Second World War. It helped, of course, that Finley was able constantly to relate his practical political work to the marxist and weberian historiographical theory that he was imbibing and developing through his association from the later 1930s with the transplanted German-Jewish refugee Institut für Sozialforschung (for 'social' research read 'marxist' research), the so-called Frankfurt School.[8] But, given my topic and focus here, I single out for special mention the fact that in the

[3] All such early biographical details are most easily accessible in Whittaker's necrology: Whittaker 1997.

[4] Westermann's article 'Sklaverei' appeared in Pauly-Wissowa in 1935; it was the basis of his *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Westermann 1955), which was not well reviewed. One suspects that it was partly as an act of *pietas* to a former doctoral supervisor that Finley, who had reviewed Westermann when still a graduate student of his in 1936, chose to reprint two articles by Westermann in the collection he edited entitled *Slavery in Classical Antiquity* (Finley 1960), though, if that is so, a letter by Westermann on Finley unearthed by Dan Tompkins might, had he known its contents, have given him pause.

[5] See the bibliography in Finley 1982b.

[6] This was an aspect of his past that the English or post-1952 Finley did not care to dwell upon, indeed to mention either publicly or privately, but that it was the case has been shown incontrovertibly by Dan Tompkins.

[7] *Née* Moscowitz, later Thiers, a fellow Columbia graduate student, whom he married when he was aged 20; on learning of her death 54 years later, he soon suffered a stroke, from which he died the following day.

[8] On Finley's association with the Frankfurt School in exile, see Tompkins 2006.

key year of 1939 Finley—or Finkelstein as he still then was—became executive secretary of a Franz Boas-figureheaded Columbia committee significantly entitled the 'American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom'.[9] Finley, who embodied the 'executive' part of his title to the full, fully endorsed the marked anti-racist orientation that Boas's influence had imparted to it.

Yet, from the viewpoint of Finley's own research into and publication on ancient history, what stands out, rather, is the very long hiatus between 1935 and 1951. It was not until that latter year that he published his first major study, and his only monograph (as opposed to collections of lectures or essays), a powerful socio-economic volume entitled *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens 500–200 BC*. Somehow, while resuming his pre-War Columbia doctoral studies in 1947, Finley (as he had become in 1946) had made a decisive turn to Greek rather than to Roman ancient history, and, because since 1948 he had been teaching at the New Jersey state university of Rutgers (on the Newark campus), it was that University's press that published in 1952 a more or less unchanged version of his 1951 Columbia PhD dissertation (awarded in History, as he was keen to emphasize, not in Classics).[10]

It is this chequered history that accounts, in part, for the background of *DAM*, and for its dedication, both as originally stated in 1973 and as repeated for the enhanced second edition of 1985, to 'My Friends and Students at Rutgers University, 1948–1952'. Only in part, for here the word 'Friends' must be allowed to carry an unusually powerful freight—or rather charge—of associative meaning. For in 1952, at or near the height of the anti-communist witchhunt chiefly and indelibly connected with the name of Senator Joe McCarthy, Finley, having been informed against by an erstwhile comrade and colleague (Karl Wittfogel), was summonsed before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, chaired by Pat McCarran (Democrat, Nevada), and accused both of being currently associated with the left-oriented Institute of Pacific Relations (founded 1925) and of having run a pre-War Communist study group in his house.[11] To

[9] This is emphatically not to be confused with Sidney Hook's and John Dewey's coeval 'Committee for Cultural Freedom'.

[10] The 1985 reprint, by Rutgers University Press (Finley 1952/1985), came with a republished essay, by way of an introduction, from his former Cambridge doctoral student, Paul Millett. When applying to Rutgers, not incidentally, Finley seems to have chosen not to make mention of his spell of teaching between 1934 and 1942 at City College, a position from which he had been sacked on political grounds.

[11] See Schrecker 1986; and Schrecker this volume.

give a flavour of those appalling times, it might suffice to mention that in 1953 Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were executed as communists convicted on a charge of conspiracy to commit espionage.[12]

Finley in response took (or threatened to take?) the 5th Amendment, i.e., he availed himself of the provision of the U.S. constitution that allows a person to avoid self-incrimination, and so declined to answer allegations about his past membership of the Communist Party.[13] It was for that decision that Rutgers University's Board of Trustees sacked him, on the grounds that that was the inevitable penalty for unwillingness to testify before a Congressional committee. So when, in somewhat happier times, Finley was invited back to Rutgers 20 years on, to deliver the Mason Welch Gross Lectures in 1972, it is not terribly difficult to divine at least one reason why he chose Democracy as their overall subject, and freedom of speech and thought as one of their major sub-themes. It is, however, characteristic of Finley's paradoxographical mindset that it would not necessarily have been clear from the start that he would end up opposing, rather than likening, ancient Athenian to contemporary American democracy; the trial of Socrates, which was to be the subject of the third and final lecture (below), could certainly have been played either way. At all events, the full force of that dedication to 'My friends' at Rutgers may now be better appreciated.

To conclude the biography, I trace very briefly our subject's steps both physical and intellectual between 1952 and 1973. Unsurprisingly, he decided that his days not only as a U.S. resident but also as a U.S. citizen were numbered, and, although he managed to complete and publish his *The World of Odysseus* in the U.S. in 1954, that was also the year that he left the United States to settle in Britain, for good.[14] Here he settled into a new academic life and career, in Cambridge, although he had spent time teaching before that in Oxford, thanks to his Classicist sponsors there (who became, at least for a time, his good friends as well as colleagues):

---

[12] So foul was the atmosphere that their two sons had to be adopted, since their relatives were too frightened to take them on and raise them; happily, their adopters were Anne and Abel Meeropol, the latter being the author of the poem that became Billie Holiday's famous 1939 anti-lynching song 'Strange Fruit': Margolick and Als 2001 (it is estimated that there may have been as many as 4000 lynchings in the preceding half-century).

[13] The literature on the Fifth Amendment is of course huge, but students of Antiquity may be especially interested in the contemporary essay 'Why the Fifth Amendment?', by the author of the novel *Spartacus* (1951): Fast 1954, accessed online at http://trussel.com/hf/fifth.htm.

[14] On this still controversial sociohistorical reading of the *Odyssey*, see Osborne et al. forthcoming.

Antony Andrewes (coincidentally, the new Wykeham Professor of Greek History from 1953), Geoffrey de Ste. Croix (appointed Tutorial Fellow in Ancient History at New College also in 1953, thanks to the patronage of A. H. M. 'Hugo' Jones, by then Professor of Ancient History in the University of London), Peter Brunt (who was then more of a Greek than a Roman historian, and had published his brilliant study of the 'Hellenic League against Persia' in 1953), Hugh Trevor-Roper (later Lord Dacre, a classicist in origin and then, rather unpredictably, a fan of Finley's), and, not least, Sir Maurice Bowra, Warden of Wadham College (since 1938), who contributed an introduction to the 1956 U.K. edition of *World of Odysseus*. A genius for friendship, by no means confined to friends in high places, moreover, was something Moses Finley always nurtured and cherished—even if it did have its other, dark side of enmity too.

From 1953 on, there issued a steady stream of Finley's more or less scholarly articles, some of them collected in the popular *Aspects of Antiquity* (1968), others in the academic *Use and Abuse of History* (1975, rev. repr. 1986) and *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* (1981). These and a number of edited volumes and books ensured his rise first to a personal Readership in Ancient History, then—on the untimely death of Hugo Jones in Greece in 1970—to the established Professorship of Ancient History at Cambridge. It was thus to Finley as Cambridge's Professor of Ancient History that there came two enticing distinguished-lecture invitations, both of which he accepted with alacrity. The one that gave rise to *DAM* has already been mentioned. The second, which was to deliver the distinguished Sather Lectures at Berkeley also in 1972, gave rise to his 'other'—and much more famous and influential—book of 1973, *The Ancient Economy*.

Democracy Ancient and Modern

Now I shall offer a critical account of what Finley says, and of where he is coming from and going to, in *DAM*; this account will be confined to the original edition of 1973.[15] The original published version of *DAM*

[15] For the immediate and longer-term impact or reception of *DAM*, see my parallel essay in Osborne et al. forthcoming. The second edition of 1985 looks like this:
Chapter 1 'Leaders and Followers'
Chapter 2 'Athenian Demagogues' [originally *Past & Present* 21 (1962) 3–24, slightly revised here; first repr. in Finley 1974, then in Rhodes 2004]
Chapter 3 'Democracy, Consensus and the National Interest'

contained just three chapters, based on the three lectures delivered at Rutgers in 1972. Finley was by inclination and habit a polemicist, that is, he would typically advance his own case, or cause, through polemical argument against a rival position or positions. The danger of such an approach or method, of course, or one danger anyhow, is to lapse into caricature: in order to distance one's own position from, and to set it above, that or those of one's opponents, and partly also for the sake of clarity of argument (one's own), one reduces opposing positions to more or less caricatural versions of those that their authors would themselves have wished to advance. Finley, arguably, but not I think fatally, is a little guilty of this in *DAM*.

In the first chapter, 'Leaders and Followers', Finley the master-comparativist again and again sets out his stall as stressing two essential points of difference: first, 'the great divide from contemporary democracy' (27), by which he meant to emphasize above all the essential face-to-faceness and participatoriness of ancient direct democracy; and, second, the untenability of the 'elitist' theory or thesis of modern, representative democracy. The notion of 'face-to-faceness', which can in some sense be traced back ultimately to Aristotle, he took more immediately from Peter Laslett, one of the founders of the so-called 'Cambridge School' of meta-political philosophers and historians of political thought.[16] It is, I believe, a defensible position to hold still, despite attacks upon it from serious scholarly quarters.[17] About its participatoriness there can be no shadow of a doubt, of course, following especially the detailed researches of Mogens Herman Hansen.[18]

But for Finley, in 1972, it was the second point that mattered the more and that he sought rather to hammer home. Exponents of the 'elitist' theory against which he was arguing, or rather polemicizing, included Robert Dahl and especially Seymour Martin Lipset, who claimed that, for modern representative democracy in any sense to work, it was crucial that the People (whoever they might really be, as opposed to any ideal construction of them) should not actually be entrusted with any decisive say in the political governance and the daily running of their own lives. Finley

---

Chapter 4 'Socrates and After'
Chapter 5 'Censorship in Classical Antiquity' [originally a lecture published in the *TLS* July 29, 1977].

[16] Laslett 1956.

[17] See my parallel essay on reception for further discussion of this point.

[18] Sinclair 1988 and Hansen 1999 (originally 1990) stand out. Also Finley 1983, Chapter 4.

rejected that 'elitist' theory or thesis outright. His particular bugbears were twofold: the notion or nostrum of Apathy, intellectual-political passivity, promoted positively not least by the mass media; and what he called the 'staggering' growth of the bureaucracy that had interposed itself between ordinary citizens and the ruling elite of professional politicians. Against which he counterposed, as no more but also no less than a 'valuable case-study' (33), his understanding of democratic Athens. For, even though the Athenian democracy lacked in his view the corroboration of a 'theory' of democracy properly so called (28), it could at least display a very long, very successful, and very unapathetic history of popular, participatory, direct self-rule.[19]

That concern remains salient, if not more salient today.[20] Chapter 2, by contrast, 'Democracy, Consensus and the National Interest', is in some ways the chapter that has 'travelled' least well since 1973, partly since 'the national interest' is no longer quite the contested theoretical issue that it was thirty or even twenty years ago. Finley begins the chapter pragmatically enough with the issue of war.[21] Was the Peloponnesian War (for conspicuous example) in Athens's 'national interest'? That in turn takes him on to a discussion of empire, and it was his already firm view in 1972[22] that it was the Athenian empire that explains—in the sense of being a necessary condition of—why, uniquely, it was Athens that developed the fullest, most thorough going of all Greek democracies.[23] But there then follows a far too long rigmarole about what 'the national interest' might be construed as meaning or being, which leads up to, as intended, a further reconsideration (and excoriation) of 'the place of apathy in the elitist theory of democracy' (67), namely the fact that apathy has been converted into a positive virtue. So the chapter, overall, is much more about 'Modern' than 'Ancient' Democracy, which reflects the overall direction of Finley's interest in the book as a whole, and it includes also a hint perhaps of one of Finley's underlying motivations. This I detect

[19] Debate has continued over whether Athenians (or other Greeks) developed a theory properly so-called of democracy: see e.g. Farrar 1988 (a former pupil of Finley).

[20] See e.g. Dunn 1993 (another former pupil of Finley).

[21] This foreshadows the Cambridge J. H. Gray lecture he would devote to that subject (published in his final collection, *Ancient History: Evidence and Models*: Finley 1985a).

[22] The point was reinforced in a fundamental article: 'The Athenian Empire: a Balance-sheet' (Finley 1978).

[23] That there were other democracies in Greece, indeed other kinds of democracy too, is acknowledged here, but only barely. The index is an index of names only, and so not helpful for tracking thematic discussions.

in an interesting pre-'communitarianism' reference to 'our community-less society' (68–9).[24] But that hint remains undeveloped, and there are, I suggest, far better ways than this of addressing the theme of 'war, democracy, and culture in classical democratic Athens'.[25] Equally questionable is Finley's claim that there was an 'absence of ideology' (51, in the Marxist sense of false consciousness) about empire at Athens due to 'the openness of domination in antiquity'.[26]

Chapter 3, 'Socrates and after', can usefully be read in conjunction with a couple of his more popular essays[27] And it is here too, surely, that the strongest charge of autobiography is to be found and felt: was not Finley himself, like Socrates, an intellectual cast out without honour from his own society (though not, like the Rosenbergs, actually executed)? And one convicted, moreover, for his beliefs and thoughts, rather than for any directly subversive let alone illegal actions? One can see why he might well have wanted to speak particularly about that at Rutgers in 1972. It is here, then, that Finley meditates most forcefully on the meanings of freedom ancient and modern—or rather ancient as opposed to modern. There was in classical Athens, Finley insists, no constitutional guarantee, no possession of the inalienable right, of freedom of speech, nor were there any Greek pacifists or conscientious objectors created by religion. On the other hand, there were 'no theoretical limits to the power of the state' (78), and no 'private sphere beyond the reach of the state' (78). We can contest that use of 'state' perhaps, to mean a separately instituted entity (with a 'national interest').[28] But in my view at least there is no good reason to contest Finley's overall historical judgment of the Socrates case, namely his claim that what was done to Socrates by popular will and

[24] Communitarianism as an ideal can in some form be traced back to the 19th century, but it took off in a big way again in the 1990s, as part of an appeal to the merits of 'civil society', following the collapse of Soviet socialism.

[25] See, for instance, the recent volume with this title edited by David Pritchard (Pritchard 2010).

[26] The alleged 'absence of ideology' is in my view belied by the extreme attention paid by the Athenians to, on the one hand, spreading the myth that all allies, regardless of history or ethnicity, were 'colonists' of Athens and, as such, sharers on grounds of common ancestry in the cult of Athena Polias/Parthenos celebrated at Athens magnificently every four years, and, correlatively, to exporting the cult of Athena 'Queen of Athens'.

[27] 'Socrates and Athens' (60–73) and 'Plato and Practical Politics' (74–87) were already republished in his relatively popular *Aspects of Antiquity* collection (Finley 1968a).

[28] For the debate between M. H. Hansen and M. Berent over the validity of applying what we might call a capital-S sense of 'State' to the ancient Greek world, see Miyazaki 2007, accessed online at http://www.waseda.jp/prj-med_inst/bulletin/bull05/05_13miy.pdf.

decree, although it may have been unfair, was not—technically, legally—unjust. Above all, perhaps, as Finley saw it, the trying and sentencing of Socrates had the special merit of having required of the jurors, ordinary Athenian citizens most of them, an exercise of civic responsibility and honesty in appraising the law and the evidence.

This is not, shall we say, quite the traditional or standard view held of the trial and its outcome, even today, even by those who were or are the Athenian democracy's supporters in principle (the minority of thinking persons, ever since 399).[29] It is a separate historical issue that Finley, who considered that Socrates could not have been 'thought impious or a blasphemer in the usual sense of those terms' (92), placed the burden of the jurors' decision to convict on the second of the two main charges levelled against him, that of political corruption. But I note that taking this view did also, not incidentally, enable Finley to blame Athens's elite 'leaders' for misleading the masses, rather than blaming their mindless 'followers' for following their leaders too blindly. Moreover, in the fourth century, post-399 (and down to 322), as Finley was careful to emphasise, 'political debate remained open and fierce, democracy unchallenged as a system' (102).[30]

Academic Politics

So much for *DAM* in and of itself, which clearly was not an un-political let alone un-polemical work. I move from that, finally, to consider briefly Finley's own 'practical politics' after his emigration to the UK and to Cambridge. In 1980 an otherwise unknown Mr Richard Winkler conducted an interview with Sir Moses Finley, as he had by then become.[31] Winkler's second question was this: 'Are you still a man of the left?'[32] To which

[29] The modern scholarly and not so scholarly bibliography on the trial of Socrates, going back at least to the mid-18th century, is huge; for an attempt to cut through the thicket, see ch. 7 of my *Ancient Greek Political Thought in Practice* (Cartledge 2009).

[30] Finley returns to this in Finley 1981 and Finley 1983, Chapter 3. See my parallel essay in the Osborne collection (Osborne et al. forthcoming) for further reflection on, and especially reflection on the reception of, *DAM*.

[31] The interview was unearthed by Dan Tompkins, who kindly made it available to me; it was conducted in the year of publication of the first edition of *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (Finley 1980). See Tompkins this volume, p. 5 n. 2.

[32] Finley's acceptance of a knighthood, a feudal title, seems to have suggested to Winkler, as it certainly did to me, that he was so no longer. When I asked him why he had accepted it, he told me it was because Britain had welcomed him as a political and academic outcast and refugee, and made him feel accepted.

Finley replied: 'In Britain, basically not, simply because I've played no political role at all', which he later qualifies only by saying that 'nobody thinks I'm a Tory'.

That all depends on how one defines 'political', I suppose. Certainly, he did not play a public and/or active role in British *party* politics—and I would guess that he was not and never had been a member of the British Labour Party (which in the late 1970s and early 1980s was going through one of its periodic fits of what one might want to call infantile leftism). However, as I have discovered from talking to many academic colleagues in Cambridge of a senior generation or generations,[33] Finley was a consummate academic politician. Not only did he usually get his way on the Classics Faculty Board, but he was also able to persuade other Cambridge Faculty Boards—History, and Archaeology & Anthropology—formally to recognise the Classics Faculty as an institutional, educational partner. Typically, I understand, he exerted his influence by as it were chairing the meetings from the floor, which suggests to me that he would have been in his element on the Athenian Boule, though, alas, that would have been possible to do only twice in a political lifetime and not in consecutive years.[34] What he did not do, so far as I can ascertain, is practise persuasive rhetoric at major public decision-making gatherings, along the lines of the ancient Athenian Assembly (and this despite his taste for published polemic).

On the other hand, he did play what I would call a major political role in the educational system of the country *outside* Cambridge University. It was widely known from his Encyclopedia Britannica 'Heritage of Isocrates' lecture/essay of 1972 (originally published under the more arresting title *Knowledge for What?*), and from his 'Crisis in the Classics' essay of 1964, that Finley was profoundly concerned with educational, pedagogical matters at the higher or further levels, but it is with another aspect of his academic politics, conducted at the secondary rather than tertiary level of education (High School in the U.S.), that I shall close.

Peter Garnsey's obituary notice for Moses Finley in the *Annual Report* for 1986 of his first Cambridge college (Jesus, of which he was elected an Honorary Fellow in 1976) alluded to this with some seeming understatement: 'It was characteristic that he devoted much energy to great effect

---

[33] Among them the late Dick Whittaker, and Joyce Reynolds, Geoffrey Lloyd, Pat Easterling and Peter Garnsey.

[34] For all facets of the Athenian Boule or 'Council of 500' under the democracy, see Rhodes 1972.

to improving the teaching of ancient history in our schools'. In fact, he was instrumental in the founding of 'JACT', the Joint Association of Classical Teachers, and in the pioneering of a national examination course, 'JACT Ancient History', that still vigorously lives on and is taken up voluntarily by many 17- and 18-year-olds. In the preface to a volume devoted to ancient Greek religion and society that was presented as a *Festschrift* for John Sharwood Smith, Finley handsomely and rather over-modestly credited Sharwood (as he was always known) with transforming the teaching of ancient history in the Schools, not least *via* the foundation of JACT and the JACT Ancient History A-level paper.[35] But in truth Finley himself deserved at least a very big share of the credit and honour for those innovations. JACT was founded in 1962/3, and Finley's contributions to its growth and development began early. In the first (1963) issue of JACT's house journal, *Didaskalos*, the founding Editor (Sharwood) noted that the contents of the second issue, slated for May 1964, were expected to include 'Sixth Form Studies: Ancient History' by M. I. Finley and C. M. Haworth. In fact, their articles did not appear until issue 3 (vol. 1.3, 1965), under the title 'Ancient history in the senior forms—I and II', and in an issue which also included a small symposium on 'Ancient History at A-level' by three other writers.[36]

By 1965, too, Finley had already made a published contribution to pedagogical debate in his essay on 'Classics' in a Penguin collection edited by Jack Plumb addressed to what was billed more generally as a 'Crisis in the Humanities' (1964).[37] Nothing new under the sun, there. An overt anti-elitist message was common to both papers.[38] So far as the study and teaching—and examining—of ancient history in the schools went, Finley laid out his manifesto against pseudo-comprehensive historical 'outlines' and in favour of 'a few first steps in an understanding of (and thinking about) what is involved in "discovering" history, of a few historical questions which still retain their relevance (and which can be studied in sufficient detail and depth to invite reasonable student assessment and even

[35] Finley 1985c. One of his rare explicit forays into ancient Greek religion.

[36] One possible reason for the delay was that their papers had been discussed by a number of university and school sixth-form teachers at London University's Institute of Education (Sharwood's base of operations) and required further modification. Finley's paper was reprinted in 1982, in a *Didaskalos* anthology edited by Jean Mingay and Sharwood.

[37] Finley 1964a.

[38] This was later reinforced in an essay entitled 'The Heritage of Isocrates' that Finley included in his *Use and Abuse of History* (Finley 1975b).

judgement), and of the interplay between ancient literature and society (*our* society, too)'.

The tone and the emphases as well as the content are utterly characteristic of Finley. He had been proud that his Columbia University PhD dissertation (1950) was in History—not Classics. After falling foul of McCarthyist anti-Communist witch-hunting in the United States, he quickly found his feet in his adopted Cambridge with teaching and writing that emphasised first and foremost historical conceptualisation and historiographical method. But we must note no less the firm emphasis on practical application and realisation. Finley was a man of action as well as ideas, and it was for the crucial role that he played in translating the notions put forward in that *Didaskalos* article into first an experimental A-level syllabus and then a fully-fledged A-level syllabus plus exam that in 1981 JACT Council decided to ask him to be its next President, for 'his great services to JACT in its early years'.[39]

For Finley had chaired the first JACT Ancient History Committee, which had been formed to monitor the new syllabus and exams. The JACT Bulletin notice of 'Our Next President' laid stress on the vital role played by his intellectual authority and charm, his charisma and skill, to the time and energy he had devoted to the cause—up until his resignation on health grounds in 1970. In 1986 Sharwood repaid the compliment Moses had paid him the year before, in a most moving 'In Memoriam' notice in JACT *Bulletin* no. 72. Again, glowing mention is made of Finley's charisma: 'Those JACT members who worked with him found him at once exotic and reassuring, not only infinitely stimulating but also kind, sympathetic and interested'. But the nub—what Thucydides might have called the *xympasa gnome*—of Sharwood's valedictory laudation is contained in the following complex sentence:

> It took the logic and authority of Moses Finley to demonstrate that a pupil might learn more of what was significant about Fifth Century Athens from reading, in translation, Thucydides, some plays of Aristophanes and a handful of Plutarch's Lives together with a very few well-chosen books and articles by modern scholars, than by the slow and painstaking study of two Greek texts of modest length, with the focus on language not argument, form not content.

[39] I write as the current President of JACT.

I stress that '. . . in translation . . .'. Finley the enlightened pedagogue was concerned above all with bringing across the thoughts and values of the ancients, especially the ancient Greeks, into the school rooms and lecture halls of contemporary Britain—not merely for contemplation, let alone adulation, but for active engagement and criticism including self-criticism. 'The dead past', he once wrote, 'does not bury its dead'; in fact, as his work supremely well demonstrated, it is not even dead.[40]

[40] This is the penultimate sentence of 'Christian Beginnings: Three Views of Historiography', Finley 1968a, Chapter 14, reprinted and revised from Finley 1964b.

POLITICS IN THE ANCIENT WORLD AND POLITICS

W. V. Harris

Questions

What I want to do in this paper is to combine some reflections about the historical content of Finley's book *Politics in the Ancient World* (1983), with some reflections on how it fits into the author's politics. All this in the light of Finley's other writings, especially *Democracy Ancient and Modern* (1973) and *The Ancient Economy* (also 1973).

Moses Finley had one of the most penetrating intellects I have ever encountered, and proposed some of the most stimulating ideas about how ancient history should be studied—he was arguably the most important leader in his generation. In addition to his own huge contribution, his example fostered notable quantities of highly original research by others. He probably did more than any other ancient historian anywhere to rescue ancient history from its partly self-imposed isolation. And his influence, transmogrified of course by later intellectual developments, continues to be felt. So one wants to understand how he operated, what his vision was—and how he became what he was. And all this gains fascination, obviously, from the fact that his development was to some extent determined (exactly how much is one of the hardest questions) by the global political struggle between capitalism and communism.

An apparent paradox lies right before us: the author of *Democracy Ancient and Modern* and *Politics in the Ancient World* was in some sense a man of the left, and at one time of the fellow-travelling left (see below), but neither book is consistently left-leaning, let alone *marxisant*. (This is not the only major paradox in Finley's writings: Seth Schwartz's paper in this volume describes another). I wonder whether his own complex political views caused him to write in the preface of *Politics in the Ancient World* that he had 'found the subject not an easy one'.[1] But before confronting this paradox, I must describe the book and contextualize it.[2]

---

[1] 'Especially once I took the decision to discuss Greece and Rome comparatively': Finley 1983, vii.

[2] A personal note before I proceed. I was not Finley's student, but I saw him quite often in the last ten years of his life at 12 Adams Road and elsewhere (twice in Rome), and I owe

The Book

It is essentially a comparison of Athenian democratic politics in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. with Roman republican politics from the beginnings to 49 B.C., with the Roman emphasis mostly on the pre-Gracchan period. Virtually no one, as Finley remarks, had undertaken this Athenian-Roman exercise before in any sort of detail. Among recent publications that merited, and received, some particular reaction were, on the Athenian side, Christian Meier's *Die Entstehung des Politischen bei den Griechen* (1980),[3] and on the Roman side, various works by Peter Brunt and Claude Nicolet. It was that period.

What was this comparison meant to achieve? We are left to infer this, but we may suppose that the main questions will include why Athens became more democratic than Rome did, and why Rome established a much larger and more durable empire. But soon our author clarifies: his concern is 'primarily with the internal functioning of the state' (18).[4]

Like *The Ancient Economy*, the book started out as a set of lectures, but whereas the earlier book was carefully honed, and re-honed after the publication of its first edition, *Politics*, though clearly the work of a master, is the work of a master in a hurry, who, as Peter Wiseman pointed out, gave a distinctly crude description of republican Rome.[5] *The Ancient Economy*, somewhat similarly, had been—such is my view at least—damagingly indifferent to what distinguished the mature Roman economy from the economy of classical Greece before Alexander. Finley became more and more expert about Rome in his last years, as *Ancient History: Evidence and Models* (1985) demonstrates, but to some extent it remained true, as Momigliano had written in 1975, that 'only the Greeks warm Finley's heart. They are the real subject of his historical meditation'.[6]

Finley's definition of politics in *Politics* is a narrow one. First, politics only exist inside states, and not between states or in smaller localities

much to his friendship and conversation. In New York (as well as of course in Britain) we had a number of friends in common, including Arthur Schiller and Meyer Reinhold.

[3] Later translated: Meier 1990.

[4] At one point (106), however, he seems to explain successful imperialism by reference to internal stability.

[5] Wiseman 1983. Finley's Roman errors were indeed rather numerous. They are balanced by useful insights, for example about the suppression of the Bacchanalia in 186 B.C. (*Politics* 20–22).

[6] Momigliano 1975, 37 = 1980, 318. He could more accurately have said 'the Athenians', not 'the Greeks'; cf. Vlassopoulos 2007, 58, 200.

or inside institutions. Secondly, he excludes monarchies of all kinds, and pays attention exclusively to states in which '*binding* decisions are reached by discussion and argument and ultimately by voting' (52), which is taken to mean oligarchies as well as democracies. This limitation is rephrased several times. What justifies it in Finley's eyes is primarily what he calls a 'radical socio-political innovation' of the Greeks and Romans, the incorporation of peasants and artisans into the 'political community' (15). So what we have before us is a discussion of *republican* politics, or rather *citizen* politics. Immediately we realize that we are probably about to encounter a re-statement of the somewhat idealizing view of Athenian government which critics detected in *Democracy Ancient and Modern*.[7]

Later in the book we meet a still further restriction: as soon as '[Roman] political conflict . . . is under permanent threat of massacres, proscriptions' and military intervention, it 'ceases to be the politics which we have been studying' (117). That seems highly arbitrary,[8] as well as having the effect of practically eliminating the late Roman Republic, and with it the one existing author, Cicero, whom Finley regards as a good source about practical Roman politics.[9] It also has the deleterious effect of largely removing from serious consideration the one period in all of knowable Roman history when, in spite of the murder of so many tribunes, the Roman *plebs* achieved some temporary political success.[10] In practice, however, Finley discusses the late Republic when it suits him to do so.

Politics in the Ancient World starts from Aristotle's famous assertion (*Politics* 3.7.1279b6–40 and elsewhere)—highly relevant to the modern West—that democracy is not the government of the majority but government to the advantage of the poor (the *aporoi*).[11] For the Greeks and Romans (of all periods?), 'the state [was] an arena for conflicting interests, conflicting classes'. He castigates the foolishness and bad faith of the modern historians who have failed to realize this and have seen the institutional practices of the Greek and Roman rich as somehow politically

7 Fears 1973 (partially, but only partially, answered in *Politics* 84), Jones 1987, 234.

8 And inconsistent, given what he says elsewhere (101) about the frequent violence of city-state politics: cf. Wiseman 1983, 398.

9 He paid too little attention to Sallust, and vastly under-estimates the value of Polybius (for reasons that are not clear to me).

10 That implies a somewhat pessimistic view of how much we know about the politics of the period from the 360s to the 280s, not a matter to be pursued here.

11 One wonders how Finley would have proceeded if he had started from the subtly different, and more democratic, formulation in the Funeral Speech: Thucydides 2.37.1.

neutral.[12] Bracing assertions, flatly contradicting, at least at first glance, what Finley had asserted a decade earlier in *The Ancient Economy* about the inappropriateness of the language of class in ancient history.[13] (I shall return to this matter later). These social classes, he tells us, were simply the rich and the poor, and this always remained true in Athens and Rome even though, as time passed, there was 'diversification of the social structure' in both states (14).

Given this potentially conflictual situation, how did the magistrates of the Athenian, Spartan and Roman states enforce official decisions and make the citizens obey the laws in the absence of sizeable police forces (Finley recognizes that Roman magistrates had considerable coercive powers, but brushes that aside)? His answer is fascinating. It is essentially psychological: he invokes 'the psychological need for identity through a feeling of continuity' and

> its concomitant feeling that the basic structure of social existence and the value-system inherited from the past are fundamentally the only right ones for that society (25).

To make this metaphysical theory more plausible (or to limit its significance?), Finley next weaves together some Graeco-Roman social realities, the acceptance of social hierarchy in a 'pre-literate' and 'face-to-face' society,[14] patronage of one kind and another, and a tax regime in which the poor paid little.[15] But the question remains, 'what was the power exercised by the few over the many individually' (43)? The answer: mainly the disbursement of wealth by the well-to-do. In other words, the power of the few rested on 'the material relations among the citizens or classes of citizens' (49). This seems a startling claim as far as Athens is concerned,[16]

[12] 'Only the most blinkered modern historian can maintain total silence about class divisions' under the Roman Republic: Finley 1983, 3. He illustrates his case by means of two examples, the 'Final Decree' of the Senate and the class bias of Roman civil law (where he invokes Kelly 1966). Badian, Lintott, Kaser, and Frederiksen are variously pilloried (the latter a little unfairly: the phrase 'I nevertheless believe . . .' does not appear in Frederiksen 1967). Frederiksen had written a penetrating review of *The Ancient Economy* (Frederiksen 1975).

[13] Finley 1980 also avoids the language of class for the most part (but see 144), Finley 1982c avoids it entirely.

[14] Pp. 27–31 discuss Greek and Roman literacy. For the claim that Athens and Rome were 'face-to-face' societies (28, 81), see below, p. 113 n. 26.

[15] As to how psychological and material factors are to be combined, this chapter of *Politics* gives only hints (45, 49).

[16] It led Meier 1986, 498, to say that we hear 'so gut wie nichts' about the patronage of the individual rich in classical Greece, which is true on a narrow definition of patronage.

but Finley quotes the passage in *The Constitution of Athens* which describes how Cimon, who was wealthy, fed his fellow demesmen and allowed 'anyone who wished' to help himself to the fruit on his estates.[17] Pericles' alternative was of course state pay (but he too was in some sense a patron).

How then did practical politics work? Finley aims, he says, to 'brush ... aside the moralizing veil [of the Greek philosophers and historians] in the search for political reality' (56). Another veil is constitutional law. But his chapter 'Politics' lacks a connecting argument,[18] partly I think because there now comes into view the fact that democratic Athens was, like republican Rome though on a much smaller scale, a 'conquest state'. Finley's tactical problem here is imperialism. He wants Athens to be an exemplary democracy but cannot escape the fact that in the fifth century in particular it was a highly belligerent state. To protect Athens, Finley makes several questionable assertions, such as the claim that 'there were ... few years in the history of most Greek city-states ... and hardly any years in succession, without some military engagements' (60; cf. 106 and 113, where this claim is made in deplorably sophistic terms)—thus Athens, in going constantly to war, was merely normal.

Athenian democracy continues to receive a good press as the book continues. Most scholars, then as now, believed that the assemblies of mid- and late-republican Rome were poorly attended. But Finley took a much more 'optimistic' view of Athens.[19] He unfortunately wrote just at the moment when Mogens Hansen had demonstrated that the seating capacity of the Pnyx, where the Athenian assembly met, was 6,000, which seems to confirm the view that only about a fifth, at most, of the citizens could ever have been present at one time, which in turn may be thought to point to the domination of Athenian political decision-making by a minority of the citizens, most of them presumably resident in the city itself.[20]

---

[17] *Ath. Pol.* 27.3; cf. Plutarch, *Pericles* 9. For further evidence and discussion see *Politics* 45–46. Rhodes 1981, 338–9, sets out the sources for Cimon's wealth and generosity.

[18] As Meier observed (ibid.).

[19] For other somewhat optimistic observations about Athenian politics see e.g. *Politics* 83.

[20] Hansen 1982. 'As a percentage of the enfranchised population, this is nevertheless awesomely large by modern standards': Hornblower 1992, 13. But Hansen's conclusion has been disputed: Stanton 1996. The most important question is not capacity but how many really attended. A single passage of Theophrastus gives the game away, for his time at least: it is a mark of a rustic, i.e. a fool, that he tells 'the hired labourers working on his land' the news from the *ekklesia* (*Characters* 4.6); it was no concern of theirs.

However large or small the citizens' participation in Athenian or mid-republican Roman politics may have been, it is worth asking what motivated them to take part. Having convinced himself that there was wide popular participation in both cases, Finley comes to the unsurprising conclusion that material interests are the key. The mass of the citizens, he says, were politically concerned mainly, on the one hand, about getting fair treatment from the law, and, on the other, about debt and land. In reality, participation was narrower, and the citizens' concerns were wider. Which is not to endorse the opposing view of Athens proposed by Meier—one of the chief targets of *Politics*—, according to whom 'we may say that the Athenians, as *homines politici*, were less concerned with their economic needs and hardships than we *homines oeconomici*',[21] a crude dichotomy which leaves us wondering *how much* less concerned Athenian citizens were with their economic interests than 'we' are, and how a historian could find out.[22]

But there are always interestingly provocative observations in *Politics in the Ancient World*. Both in Greece and in republican Rome, says Finley, 'rivalry within the political elite had an all-or-nothing quality: one sought not merely to overcome competitors for leadership, but to destroy them, figuratively and sometimes literally' (118). That is not really true of the Romans of the middle Roman Republic (say 338 to 133 B.C.): what was most radically new about the tribunate of Tiberius Gracchus was precisely that political competitors at Rome had *not* previously planned each others' death or even exile. But the explanation of this 'all-or-nothing quality', very obviously present in the late Republic, does indeed require explanation. Finley perceptively, as I think, points the way ahead: the answer lies in social psychology.

> Most historians shy from psychological explanations . . ., partly from an understandable fear of the moralizing rhetoric that flows in their wake, partly from ignorance or distrust of social psychology, but largely because of hardened professional traditions (120).[23]

---

[21] Meier 1990, 146.

[22] As to the subsequent fate of *homo oeconomicus* cf. Harris 2011, 288.

[23] On the significance of this emphasis on psychology for Finley's supposed Marxism see below, p. 119.

That was plainly true in 1983, and is only a little less so now. One might have hoped for some follow-up (and one wonders what Finley had studied when he was a psychology major at Syracuse in the 1920s),[24] but the most he offers us is the intensified 'power drive' of the politicians of the late Roman Republic, followed, in the next chapter, by the notion that 'obedience to the authorities became so deeply embedded in the psyche of the ordinary Roman citizen that it carried over into his explicitly political behaviour' (130).[25] These are both valid observations, but it is up to us to develop them. From the standpoint of nowadays this in fact strikes me as the most suggestive aspect of *Politics in the Ancient World*, its occasional and unsystematic references to passions, prejudices and other psychological factors.[26]

The Historiographical Context

In some ways *Politics in the Ancient World* now seems an old-fashioned book, inevitably. A lot has happened in the history of politics, including Greek and Roman politics, in the intervening thirty years. What is most dated, to the eye of a current reader, is, I suppose, its conception of power, which is fairly strictly a matter of state-power (see 8–9). Foucault maintained that

> relations of power . . . necessarily extend beyond the limits of the State . . . first of all because the State . . . is far from being able to occupy the whole field of actual power relations, and further because the State can only operate on the basis of other, already existing power relations. The State is superstructural in relation to a whole series of power networks that invest the body, sexuality, the family, kinship, knowledge, technology and so forth.[27]

---

[24] Tompkins 2006, 99. The interest of the Frankfurt School in social psychology is also relevant here: cf. Shaw and Saller in Finley 1982b, xvii.

[25] Why did the soldier-citizens of Rome not demand more power? 'For the decisive element we must look to the ideology, the whole complex of beliefs and attitudes which have been a leitmotiv of this book' (141). Finley very much underestimates both the popular opposition of the late Republic and the forces that, until 49 B.C., succeeded in repressing it.

[26] References to Greek cities and specifically Athens as 'face-to-face' societies (28, 81) and to the latter as a 'Mediterranean society' (82) are too casual to lead us very far, and one wonders how important a role they were meant to play in the Finleyan scenario. The 'face-to-face' view of Athens was successfully challenged by Cohen 2000, Chapter 4.

[27] Foucault 1980 [1977], 122.

We may or may not accept this in its totality, but unless I am mistaken most contemporary historians accept something like this doctrine.

The other significant way in which *Politics in the Ancient World* shows its age is by its lack of interest in the material culture of antiquity. In this respect Finley stood with the old guard, Syme, Momigliano, Brunt, simply to mention those who then dominated in Britain. Not only did Finley ignore the so-called 'power of images' (but it is not difficult to imagine the acid critique he might have written of those who have used that concept naively), he seems to have been uninterested in such relevant questions as where the Athenian and Roman assemblies met and what those physical locations may have signified. But here we once again have the elusive Finley, for seven years earlier he had written a long perceptive review of books about ancient portraiture (in which he showed a good first-hand knowledge of Winckelmann, Bianchi Bandinelli, Gombrich, and others),[28] and two years after *Politics*, in his last book, *Ancient History: Evidence and Models*, he remarks that 'gone are the happy days when historians of antiquity . . . could relegate archaeology to a minor ancillary activity'.[29] And in several remarkable pages he shows himself to be up-to-date and really very judicious about several different sub-fields of classical archaeology.[30] (Much earlier, he had shown a real interest in some aspects of the material culture of Graeco-Roman antiquity, as his journalism and broadcasts amply demonstrate: I thank Mary Beard for information on this topic).[31] Finley has been seriously misrepresented on this score.[32]

Politics in the Ancient World allows the reader to see the depth and originality of Finley's historical scholarship.[33] He had a wide knowledge of ancient law, for example (this was normally a strong point of the Columbia graduate students of his period who worked with A. Arthur Schiller).

---

28 Finley 1976a.

29 Finley 1985a, 7.

30 Finley 1985a, 18–26. Many of the details are now naturally out-of-date.

31 Her assessment will appear in Osborne et al. forthcoming.

32 When Mayer (2012, 227 n. 32), with reference to *Ancient History*, says that Finley 'was highly skeptical that archaeology *was of any help* [my italics] in reconstructing ancient social and working lives', he is clearly in error. His remark in the text (16) that Finley was among those who thought that 'archaeology was ill suited to uncover social structures or broad social trends' also seems to err: what Finley maintained was that archaeology *by itself* was ill suited to uncover social structures, a very reasonable point of view, though one which Mayer's book attempts to subvert.

33 Its influence is hard to assess: it was translated into some ten or more languages, according to Whittaker 1986, 10, but it is rarely cited now by historians of Greek or Roman politics.

To put it frivolously, who else in America or Britain, or indeed in Germany, had learned from Rudolf von Jhering's *Scherz und Ernst in der Jurisprudenz* of 1885?[34] He was also the only leading ancient historian of his period who knew the contemporary literature of political theory very thoroughly, and could debate with and correct political theorists. And he always offers us penetrating asides that cut through the clichés. For instance: the banal view of Athenian ostracism—the system whereby the citizens of Athens could send politicians into temporary exile if thousands of them voted in writing to do so—was, and is, that it was an indication of an emerging literate society. Rather, says Finley, it is 'a neat illustration of one implication of an oral culture: remove a man physically from the state and he has no lines of communication with the citizenry' (55).

Where does this book stand with respect to historical method? The tension in Finley's work between 'all-history-is-ideology' and the search for better models and better explanations, a tension best analysed by David Konstan in a review of *Ancient History: Evidence and Models*,[35] is scarcely glimpsed. There is no mention of historical models as such, but neither do we hear anything about the ideological positions that may have influenced historians' views about the political disputes and actors of Athens or Rome. *Politics* shoots off methodological ideas (about psychology for example) but does not develop them.

Labour and Class

But two ancient-history problems are in need of further discussion if we are to understand Finley's thinking in *Politics*: one concerns the nature of the ancient economy, the other concerns social class. My point here is not to convict him of inconsistency—though there was some inconsistency—, but to work out how his opinions changed and why.

On certain vital questions *Politics in the Ancient World* diverges from Finley's major earlier statement, *The Ancient Economy*. According to the latter, to begin with, there was no labour market in classical antiquity, as is proved, in his view, by the fact that 'wage rates . . . were . . . fairly stable locally over long periods'—'to speak of a "labour market" . . . is

[34] Finley 1983, 107.
[35] Konstan 1988.

immediately to falsify the situation',[36] an assertion that has some force to it but is not backed up with citations of evidence, and is ultimately I think misleading.[37] According to *Politics in the Ancient World*, however, there was indeed a labour market, both urban and rural, in the classical city-state, though because of slavery it was 'qualitatively different from the kind prevailing in present-day Mediterranean or South Asian communities' (why these comparisons I wonder) (41). (Apparently he means to include the Roman world as well as Athens in this judgement). Now, if one wanted to be jesuitical about it one might just about be able to reconcile these two statements, but there is at least a serious change of emphasis and it is away from the anti-modern world that is described in *The Ancient Economy*, and away from Karl Polanyi. I hypothesize that Finley simply saw that 'fairly stable' wage rates were an inadequate basis for his claim. *Of course* there was a labour market, just as there was in the southern United States before emancipation; as usual with ancient history, we can model how it worked, and we get numerous little glimpses of how it worked from ancient texts, most vividly of all perhaps in this case from the accounts of the Appianus estate in Egypt, which were analysed in print only after Finley's death.[38] Loomis has argued strongly for market wages in classical Athens.[39] There is no reason to believe that there was a widespread 'conventional' wage under the Roman Empire, and stable wages over long periods are no evidence that they were exempt from the law of supply and demand.[40]

A still more complex question concerns social class, which as Michael Mann observed, has a central role in *Politics in the Ancient World*.[41] The first point is: can we and should we use this framework to describe a pre-modern society?[42] (This is a question about which Marxists have never agreed, some answering yes, others claiming that (a) social classes only came into being with capitalism, and (b) that social classes only exist

[36] Finley 1973b, 23. The accompanying reference in the second edition (1985b, 212 n. 19) to the work of Michael Crawford is mysterious.

[37] For some bibliography on this question see Harris 2011, 43–6.

[38] Rathbone 1991.

[39] Loomis 1998, Chapter 16.

[40] The most sophisticated discussion continues to be that of Banaji 2001, 197–206, concentrating on late antiquity.

[41] Mann 1985, 297.

[42] See now Harris 2011, Chapter 1, Mayer 2012, Chapter 1. For Marx-inspired views see De Ste Croix 1985 and Rose 2012, 1–55.

when they are self-conscious, and (c) that such conditions did not obtain in the ancient world).

In *The Ancient Economy* Finley denied the applicability of the concept of class to the Graeco-Roman world, partly for reason (b), there were no self-conscious classes—the Greeks and Romans concentrated on status, he says; and partly for the (in my opinion entirely superficial) reason that some people did not fit comfortably into any one social class (which could be said about any complex society).[43] He had argued, as he says (*Politics* 10 n. 29), that ' "status" and "order" [were] preferable to "class" in analysing the ancient economy'. 'My return in the present work to "class" ' (that is, in *Politics*), he continues, 'does not imply a change of view. I merely find the conventional terminology more convenient, and harmless, in an account of ancient politics'. In a brief discussion in his Institute of Historical Research interview with Keith Hopkins in 1985,[44] Finley stressed status but admitted the existence of social classes, which, however, were a 'secondary phenomenon'.

But there plainly was a change of some kind, and the question here is why.[45] Possibly nothing more was involved than an attempt to connect with an audience (but *The Ancient Economy* too began as lectures). Something more is going on. Why was the terminology of class 'convenient' in a discussion of politics but not in a discussion of Graeco-Roman economic life? A possible reason is that in the former case a conscientious historian could not avoid the conflict between the rich and the poor in ancient states (though goodness knows how many historians have in fact avoided it), whereas a book about the economy, just like the standard capitalist handbooks of macroeconomics, can if it really wants to ignore such conflicts. But *Democracy Ancient and Modern* also avoids the terminology of class. Perhaps we should see the move away from status language to class language as primarily another step away from Max Weber: Weber is in general notably less present in the book of 1983 than he had been in 1973.

In my view, Finley's division of Greek and Roman society into two classes makes it impossible to answer satisfactorily what is probably the

---

[43] This argument was reiterated in the 'further thoughts' that accompanied the second edition (Finley 1985b, 184). In the original text he very occasionally employed such locutions as 'upper classes' (38, 77); for his rejection of class terminology see 48–51.

[44] October 18, 1985. The interview is still available: http://store.london.ac.uk; a transcript is in the press (Naiden and Talbert forthcoming 2014).

[45] Nafissi 2005, 253, sees 'genuine bewilderment' here, but Finley was seldom bewildered.

central question in *Politics in the Ancient World*—why the poor accepted the government of the social elite. The problem is especially difficult in the case of democratic Athens, where the well-to-do had nothing like a Roman magistrate's *coercitio* to help them. The 'peasants and artisans' whose incorporation into the political body aroused Finley's admiration (14) deserved more attention. If they have the security of enough land and/or a valuable skill, they are categorically different from the desperately poor and the typical slaves. In other words, we need a tripartite class division as a tool of analysis.[46] The middle group, only with discomfort to be called a middle class—but what else are we to call them?—, was naturally happy to make sure that the well-to-do performed their liturgies, that is to say paid the bulk of the taxes; but their interests were sharply different from those of the indigent, the *ptochoi*, and the ordinary slaves. This is not the place to expand this argument, but when Euripides (and I think that we can say Euripides, though the speaker is Theseus) says in the *Supplices* (238–245) that there are three classes (*merides*) of citizens, the wealthy, the indigent (the *spanizontes biou*)—who are dangerous, envious, and deceived by their leaders—and those in the middle, who are the city's salvation, he must be describing recognizable categories.[47] What Euripides' motives were in 422 or 421, and who in his opinion belonged to these groups, are not questions that can be pursued here, but this text and many others show that it is possible to delineate three sharply differentiated groups among the inhabitants of classical Attica.

Finley and Marxism

There is a good deal more to say about Finley and Marxism, but I will treat the subject briefly. *Politics in the Ancient World* offers, in a sense, a class-based analysis, and it is much concerned with material interests; but it neglects the *spanizontes biou* of Athens, and its way of treating the politics of the non-rich Romans is insensitive to their more radical leaders and methods and has nothing to do with Marx. I take a wholly different view of Finley's supposed early Marxism from Mohammad Nafissi (see below), and I suggest that none of his historiography goes beyond the

[46] For a more detailed argument to this effect see Harris 2011, Chapter 1. Cf. Christ 1990, 320–1.

[47] Lines 403–408 show that Athens is presented in contemporary terms. For Finley's use of this play in *Politics* see 136, 139.

so-called 'anti-anti-Marxist' position he refers to in his Institute of Historical Research interview. That expression refers, I take it, to Finley's fully justified complaint (*Politics* 9–10) about 'the current bad habit of pinning the Marxist label on any and every political analysis that employs the concept of class' (a habit that lives on among the more unscrupulous kind of right-wing historian)? *Politics in the Ancient World* cannot in any case by any stretch of the imagination be described as Marxist or even *marxisant*: once its author apologetically uses the term 'base' in a Marxist sense (32), but we hear virtually nothing about the means of production, alienation, or class struggle.[48]

Nor, more surprisingly, is there any commitment to Marxism visible in those of his early writings that are known to me. Finley chose to review Ettore Ciccotti's *marxisant* book *Civiltà del mondo antico* in 1937, and according to Mohammad Nafissi this review 'contained the clearest and most extensive statement of Finley's Marxism in this period'.[49] The review is generally laudatory, and its main criticism (that Ciccotti does not effectively support his contention that 'ideological aspects of society have their roots in the objective conditions of existence') might have been made by a Marxist scholar, but 'the actual achievement is very uneven', he says, and (more significantly) the one other ancient historian who is praised is the conservative Rostovtzeff. Finley stops short of endorsing anything in Ciccotti that is specifically Marxist,[50] and it is no quibble to say that he stops well short of a 'statement of Marxism' (let it be clear: I am referring to *published* statements). Nafissi looked hard for Marxism in the early writings but could cite nothing else.[51] In Finley's post-war publications there is not a Marxist thought of any kind; *The World of Odysseus* (1954), in so far as it had theoretical foundations, is Polanyian and Maussian not Marxist. A fleeting allusion to French and Italian euro-communism in *Democracy Ancient and Modern* hints at some fantasy of radical solutions,[52] but it is

[48] De Ste Croix (1985, 185 n. 39) argued, with a fair amount of justification, that Finley's emphasis on the basic importance of psychological constructs, which we noticed earlier, set him far apart from Marx. For Finley's interest in Max Horkheimer's views about social psychology see Tompkins this volume, p. 18.

[49] Nafissi 2005, 205, referring to Finley [Finkelstein] 1937. That is a heavy burden for a three-page review.

[50] Nafissi does not make it clear that the passage he quotes is mostly a summary of Ciccotti's views not a statement of Finley's own views. Another intriguing review of this period concerned *Cambridge Ancient History* XI (Finley [Finkelstein] 1939), with forthright mockery of Last and Syme; it has no Marxist overtones.

[51] Nafissi 2005, 200–208.

[52] Finley 1973a, 78.

embedded in a text that steers clear of all reference to Marx's writings (Gramsci comes in once). The most that might be said is that the 'anti-anti-Marxism' in Finley's journalism on one occasion took the form of an adulatory review of a Marxist scholar—Perry Anderson in 1975, who is defined as a 'post-*Grundrisse* Marxist'.[53]

What sort of political Moses Finley emerges from *Politics in the Ancient World* and his other writings of the same period? A ghost, one might almost say; there is almost no political Finley there. There is certainly no overt alignment.[54] Those with a good knowledge of academic prosopography will see that while some of the targets of Finley's barbs were highly conservative (Badian, R. Sealey), others were to varying degrees on the left (Frederiksen, De Ste Croix). Another target in *Democracy Ancient and Modern* was the profoundly liberal (in American terms) political scientist Judith Shklar, whose theory of 'salutary apathy' admittedly annoyed a lot of left-inclined people. As I remarked before, the tendency of his account of the late Roman Republic is not by any means left-leaning, in fact one might say that it is objectively, though unwittingly, reactionary. The book does not return to Finley's *bête noire* Joseph Vogt, a one-time Nazi-sympathizer who was one of the principal stimuli of Finley's 'anti-anti-Marxism'.[55]

Nafissi also makes far too much out of an article about Finley that appeared in the *Washington Post* of 7 April 1971, under the title 'Making the Break with America'.[56] In the first place the article should not be described as an 'interview'. The author, Alfred Friendly, had evidently met Finley (he describes his facial features), and his bye-line was Cambridge, but the only sentences quoted are these, in response to the question 'Isn't communism inherently, inescapably totalitarian?': 'No, I don't think that it's inherently totalitarian. If I'm wrong, then disaster. Then I would find no hope. Anywhere'. According to Friendly, Finley told him that 'he no longer [took] Marx and dialectical materialism as gospel' [quotation marks

---

[53] Finley 1975a, reviewing *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism* and *Lineages of the Absolutist State*.

[54] As far as I know, Finley in his British period rather studiously avoided political commitment of any kind, even during the Vietnam War, while of course expressing many opinions in private.

[55] For Vogt's involvement with Nazism see Losemann 1977 and in more detail Christ 1990, 80–95, Christ 1995. Deissler, an admirer of the later Vogt, has provided a useful review of the controversy between Vogt and Finley but avoided this key element in Vogt's past: Deissler 2010.

[56] Nafissi 2005, 275.

mine, not Friendly's], implying that he once had. It is not to be believed that Finley (whatever he may have thought or known) said any of this to a visiting journalist.[57] Contrast what he said to Hopkins in the IHR interview (which is consistent with things he said to me and no doubt others): he had never been a Marxist 'in the *Science and Society* sense', that is a doctrinaire party-line sense;[58] which of course implies that he had been in some looser sense. And to return to the quotation about totalitarianism, far from being, as Nafissi claims, 'a faithful summary of Finley's general ideological stance throughout his career' (!!),[59] it is probably a confection of some kind or decontextualized.[60] The reference to hope might be characteristically Finleyan, as we shall see. But the quotation is implausible: anyone on the communist or fellow-travelling left would presumably have replied to Friendly's supposed question by asserting that the Soviet Union was still in a transitional stage of socialism and was by no means evidence of what communism could accomplish.

Conclusion

Whatever the exact nature of his political views in his American years, those who knew him best, starting from the unquestionably radical Mary Finley, recognized him as an authentic leftist. Tompkins has documented the work he did over several years for Soviet-supported and pro-Soviet causes. But the desire for change evidently lost all its intensity.

'What was (and is) essential', he still wrote in *Politics* (96), 'is a belief, or at least a hope, that the devices and spectacles were part of a process leading to the achievement of social goals', a statement that I take to have an oblique contemporary reference. My conjecture is that this

[57] Nafissi realizes that Finley never took 'Marx and dialectical materialism as gospel', but for some reason considers that Friendly made an 'understandable' mistake on this point. I also very much doubt that Finley described himself to Friendly as 'marxisant', which in any case was clearly untrue in 1971.

[58] Doctrinaire is another term he applies to some Marxists in the interview. *Science and Society* started in New York in 1936; it was 'Marxian', but apparently in a quite broad-church sense, at least in its first years. Finley never wrote for it, though some of his friends and acquaintances did.

[59] Nafissi, ibid.

[60] Mohammad Nafissi has objected to me that there is no evidence that Finley, who of course read the article (but when?), demanded a retraction; but it would not, I think, have been his style to do so.

was mainly nostalgia, rather like the nostalgia that many Europeans, and some Americans too, still felt in those years for the cause of the Spanish Republic.[61] I suggest that we should see the somewhat idealized Athenian democracy of *Politics in the Ancient World* in a similar way (though we should be careful not to exaggerate the degree of idealization): it was at once an expression of hope in democratic forms of government (in Aristotle's sense) and a reaction to the disappointment of its author's hopes for modern democracy.

Moses in short, having seen the extremely ugly face of the Hooverist state in 1952, chose—not the Ivory Tower, he did not isolate himself from real-world problems[62]—but a secure academic fortress;[63] fortunately he was by then extremely well qualified to do so. We might criticize him if we, most of us, had not made a similar choice without having first been bullied by a sub-committee of the United States Senate. For Moses had to face a type and degree of political persecution from the empowered American Right which we hope will never afflict anyone in this land again.

---

[61] Cf. Jones, this volume p. 126.

[62] See Cartledge this volume. Finley thought his own history professors at Columbia had lived in an ivory tower (Finley 1967a, quoted by Shaw and Saller in their introduction to Finley 1982b at p. x).

[63] But the beginnings of this decision went back to 1946–1947: Tompkins this volume, pp. 24–25, 28.

UN-ATHENIAN AFFAIRS: I. F. STONE, M. I. FINLEY, AND THE TRIAL OF SOCRATES

Thai Jones

In 1983, I. F. Stone, the radical journalist, boarded the *Queen Elizabeth II* to sail for England on his summer holiday.* Izzy, as he was known, had friends everywhere, and his ten-day itinerary was packed. But he looked forward to one appointment in particular: his planned visit with M. I. Finley, the eminent historian of Greece, who was also a longtime friend. For years, Stone had been working on a book about the trial of Socrates, and he was eager to discuss his theories with a trusted—and sympathetic—expert.

These two figures were colossi in their respective fields. And though they are not usually associated with one another, they did share a remarkable set of experiences. Their lives roughly corresponded to what Eric Hobsbawm has called the Short Twentieth Century (Stone was born in 1907 and died in 1989; Finley lived from 1912 to 1986), meaning that the rise of Communism and Fascism, followed by the Cold War, marked the essential political milestones of their careers.[1] Isidor Feinstein and Moses Israel Finkelstein each chose to Anglicize and shorten his Jewish surname for personal and professional reasons. As suspected Communists in McCarthyite America they were outcasts whose careers were threatened by witch-hunt and blacklist. Yet each outlasted his enemies and went on to achieve superlative distinction.

A final significant link was their shared fascination with the ancient world. By the 1960s, Finley was already widely regarded as the leading historian of ancient Greece. He was more than that: In fact, he was in the words of colleague Arnaldo Momigliano 'the most influential ancient historian of our time', whose thinking had lifted his field to the leading

* I would like to thank Logan McBride, Alice Kessler-Harris, Eric Foner, and Don Guttenplan for reading this essay in draft form. I am deeply indebted to Daniel Tompkins for sharing with me the correspondence between Finley and Stone that he discovered in the Cambridge University Archives, as well as for his liberality in sharing materials and discussing with me the relationship between Stone and Finley. Don Guttenplan generously presented me with several books from I. F. Stone's personal collection of Greek and Roman history.

[1] Hobsbawm 1994, 235, 439.

edge of theoretical discourse.[2] His writings challenged old orthodoxies about slavery and economics, while introducing innovative sociological methods to the study of the classical Mediterranean. Prestigious posts at Cambridge University, popular books, and lecture tours had earned him global renown and a knighthood.

Stone's Grecian odyssey had been rather more tortuous. Finding himself unemployable in the newspaper business of the early 1950s, he had spent two decades self-publishing *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, a newsletter that became must-reading for anyone craving an independent voice in conformist America. If his exposures of official lies made him an oracle to young investigative journalists, his steadfast honesty about divisive questions—including Israeli politics, the New Left, and Soviet totalitarianism—made him a truly independent intellectual, a party of one beholden to no faction or shibboleth. Confident in his values, even at the nadir of the Red Scare, he had foreseen his eventual redemption. 'Honey', Izzy had promised his wife, Esther. 'I'm going to graduate from a pariah to a character, and then if I last long enough I'll be regarded as a national institution'.[3]

By the early 1980s, this prophesy had been fulfilled. Yet Stone was not satisfied with accolades and tributes. During his career as a journalist he had cherished a plan for a more academic project: a history of the 'freedom of thought'. And his research had brought him all the way back to ancient Greece—in particular, to the trial and execution of the philosopher Socrates. 'I. F. Stone's retreat into the cloistered precincts of classical scholarship was as unorthodox as anything he'd ever done', his biographer D. D. Guttenplan has noted.[4] And yet there was something apt about the elderly Stone spending his final decades immersed in the original trauma of western political life—to be a radical, after all, means to return to the roots.

To write intelligently about Ancient Athens, Stone first had to learn Greek and immerse himself in the scholarly literature—all at an enormous cost of anxiety and exertion. A combination of 'chutzpah plus zest plus temerity' kept him at it.[5] As foreign as the material was, he still found ways to employ the instincts of a lifetime to interpret ancient texts. His copies of Plato grew ragged from use: he underscored relevant passages with shaky lines, and crowded the margins with notes. 'You re-examine

[2] Nafissi 2005, 191.
[3] Guttenplan 2009, xv.
[4] Guttenplan 2009, 442.
[5] Stone 1978.

all the source material for yourself', he explained. 'It's not so different from digging the real truth out of a Pentagon or State Department document'.[6]

In the end, the stakes justified the travails, particularly once his newspaperman's eye began to hone in on one burning question. 'The more I fell in love with the Greeks', he wrote, 'the more agonizing grew the spectacle of Socrates before his judges. It horrified me as a civil libertarian. It shook my Jeffersonian faith in the common man. It was a black mark for Athens and the freedom it symbolized. How could the trial of Socrates have happened in so free a society? How could Athens have been so untrue to itself?'[7]

Poring over battered Greek dictionaries with a magnifying glass necessitated by cataracts, I. F. Stone began to rewrite a formative episode in Western history. Relying heavily on M. I. Finley's work for background information, he patiently unraveled the secrets behind the mythology in an effort 'to give the Athenian side of the story, to mitigate the city's crime and thereby remove some of the stigma the trial left on democracy and on Athens'.[8] Like 'an old fire horse' attracted once again to the klaxon—as he described himself to Finley—he found himself back on the trail of a breaking story. 'Reporter that I am', he said, 'I am drawn by the hope of one last scoop'.[9]

Ancient history, to these two thinkers, could never be completely disassociated from contemporary commitment. For I. F. Stone, the gadfly and muckraker, the prosecution of Socrates was political from preface to epilogue. A lifelong practitioner of free speech and free thought, who had seen these values severely repressed, he looked to classical Athens as an antithesis to Cold War America. M. I. Finley, the structural historian *par excellence*, transferred his ideological engagements from the chaos of his own times to the cloistered combat of classical scholarship. 'Finley', wrote Arnaldo Momigliano, 'always felt that ancient history derived its relevance from the possibility of direct confrontation with the modern world'.[10]

Peloponnesian War and Cold War, Ancient Sparta and Nazi Germany, the Socrates case and the Rosenberg case, Joseph McCarthy and Emperor Nero—such echoes reverberated throughout their work. To understand

---

6 Stone 1979.
7 Stone 1989, xi.
8 Personal communication with the author, November 14, 2012; Stone 1989, xi.
9 Stone 1979; Letter of August 22, 1983 [Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library].
10 Finley 1987, 3.

Finley and Stone's engagement with the ancient world, therefore, it is first necessary to survey their modern lives.

* * *

With a tabloid sensibility, I. F. Stone wrote that M. I. Finley's life had been a 'wonderful Horatio Alger story' that could serve as a parable of victory over adversity: 'From 5th amendment fugitive to a British baronetcy and an honored place on the formidable peaks of British classical scholarship'.[11] In many ways, the story was even more newsworthy; Stone's friend had been a child genius of national repute. 'As a final achievement in the most remarkable school record ever attained by a Syracuse pupil', the *New York Times* reported in 1923, 'Moses Finkelstein, 10 years old, has won the honor place of valedictorian in the June graduating class of the Central High School'. That September, the *Boston Globe* announced his arrival at Syracuse University with the words: 'College Man of 11 in Short Trousers'. Three years later, the *Los Angeles Times* ran the banner headline, 'Boy Prodigy Enters Columbia', above a photograph of Moses in short pants at his desk. 'He'll study with students twice and thrice his age', the caption read, 'but he is sure that he will be able to keep up with them'.

Having earned his master's degree in public law from Columbia University at 17, he took a job with the legal team for General Motors. This had been his father's dream for him. 'But after six months', he later recalled, 'I walked out. I rebelled', returning to Columbia to pursue a doctorate in history.[12] The timing of his withdrawal from business into academia could not have been better; the global economy was collapsing. The rest of the decade brought continued crisis and inspiration. The Spanish Civil War, and the excitement generated in New York City by the solidarity of the Popular Front, would always be his primary political touchstones. 'I find it very hard to put a label on myself in terms of a tradition', he would recall. 'But I'm a product of the thirties, there's no question about that . . . I came of age in the Depression'.[13]

His professors' teaching rarely touched on these contemporary issues. Department elders had no notion that history could shed light on current affairs. In contrast, Finley wrote, 'we who were growing up in a difficult world . . . sought explanation and understanding of the present in

[11] Letter of August 22, 1983 [Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library]. Finley became a Knight of the British Empire, not a baronet.

[12] Nafissi 2005, 196.

[13] Nafissi 2005, 195.

our study of the past'. Frustrated by his coursework, he turned to other scholars for guidance, immersing himself in the writings of Marc Bloch, Thorstein Veblen, Max Weber, Sigmund Freud, and Karl Marx.[14]

Not content with merely studying provocative ideas, Finkelstein engaged in political activism as well. He would later deny having been a communist (and *a fortiori* a member of the party),[15] but he worked closely with known radicals and was well known to be on the radical left. His greatest political achievement came in 1938, when he organized an expansive coalition of more than a thousand scientists to petition against racist theories emerging from Nazi Germany.[16]

Finley's successful coup drew praiseful national attention, but a second manifesto was dramatically less effective. A group of well-known intellectuals, calling themselves the 'Committee of 400', signed an open letter asserting Stalin's long-term trustworthiness as a safeguard against Hitler.[17] It was published on August 26, 1939—three days *after* Molotov and Ribbentrop had signed their infamous nonaggression pact. The document immediately became notorious as one of the great political miscalculations of all time.

The entente between Germany and the Soviet Union had surprised everyone, but the people who had signed the letter were especially exposed. The suddenly discomfited signatories included scientists, artists, writers, and intellectuals. Among them was I. F. Stone.

Izzy had been torn between journalism and classics since his youth. He took four years of Latin in high school—Catullus and Lucretius were his favorites—and then studied Greek for a semester at the University of Pennsylvania, where he majored in philosophy. Though he dropped out during his junior year to work as a reporter, his early immersion in classical literature confirmed in him a dedicated civic humanism, a confidence that political and intellectual questions could be answered with the wisdom of the Western canon. 'We simply find our selves', he would write in the *Trial of Socrates*, 'coming back century after century . . . to the same half dozen basic answers worked out by the ancient Greek philosophers'.[18]

---

[14] Finley 1967a.

[15] 'I have never been a Communist', Finley to Dean Herbert P. Woodward, 5 September 1951: Rutgers University Archives, Lewis Webster Jones Papers, Series II: Academic Freedom Cases, 1942–1958. See further Tompkins this volume, pp. 27–28.

[16] Tompkins 2006, 112–3.

[17] Watson 2004.

[18] Stone 1989, ix, xi, 70.

By the 1930s, he had become one of the leading radical journalists in America. As an editorial writer for the *New York Post* and a frequent contributor to *The Nation* and *The New Republic*, he was an influential opinion-maker with access to power at the highest levels. What he saw did not comfort him. Fearful of the rising prominence of fascist forces at home, in 1937 he changed his name from Feinstein to Stone, and predicted a dark future if reactionaries seized power in Washington. 'They'd like to turn all America into a Pennsylvania company town', he wrote in the *Post*, 'where everything and everybody are controlled by the company and no one dare protest or speak'.[19]

Stone was less critical of the Soviet Union, straining at times to defend the nation he considered to be 'the scene of the greatest social experiment of our time'. As a fellow traveler, he downplayed the gravity of Stalin's purge trials, and rationalized the undeniable excesses of the regime. 'Revolutions do not take place according to Emily Post', he wrote. 'The birth of a new social order, like the birth of a human being, is a painful process'. But the revelations of the Nazi-Soviet agreement struck like a personal betrayal, and forced him to reconsider his entire political stance. 'I'm off the Moscow Axis', he confided to a friend in late 1939, 'no more fellow traveling'.[20]

For both men the 1930s had proven decisive. Henceforward, each would eschew group affiliations in favor of projecting their own individual voices. This position as independent intellectuals would come to define the remainder of their public lives. And it would draw them both to Socrates.

* * *

The Great Depression had been a forward-facing time for radicals. Political and economic crisis had fostered a foment that made social transformation seem possible. Stone and Finkelstein had committed themselves to struggling for those goals, but by the end of the Second World War, their progress had stalled, and both men found themselves vulnerable. No longer members of a broad-based movement, they had become lonely defenders of an increasingly marginal position. The early 1950s marked their crisis. Red Scare terror in the United States threatened their professional lives.

---

[19] Guttenplan 2009, 123.
[20] Guttenplan 2009, 128, 109, 150, 148.

Internationally, the repressions of Stalinism further darkened the visions of socialism that had guided their youthful organizing.

'I feel for the moment like a ghost', I. F. Stone wrote in 1952. He had lost his latest position, as a reporter at *PM*, and was unable to find steady work. Though he didn't realize it, he was also being followed relentlessly by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; they tapped his phones, interrogated his neighbors, opened his mail, and sorted through his garbage.[21]

By founding his own journal, he succeeded in maintaining a voice of opposition in a time of silence. The first issue of *I.F. Stone's Weekly* appeared in January 1953. From the start it offered a different type of journalism. Excluded from press conferences and ostracized by his former sources, Izzy found other forms of information. A product of necessity in the Red Scare, this was a research strategy with eminent precedents. 'A lot of [Marx's] works were based on the parliamentary investigations in the press', Stone noted. 'I'm not comparing myself—but he used the same raw material I used in the *Weekly*: the bourgeois parliamentarians and the bourgeois press'.[22]

The newsletter's contents reflected the idiosyncrasies of its one-man editorial team. Izzy cherished a melting-pot identity, combining strains of civic humanism with Marxian radicalism and yiddishkeit. He saw himself in the tradition of the Founding Fathers, Milton and Montesquieu. Yet, at the same time, he was all too aware that the loftiest values often masked the severest forms of social control. He was a classic nudzh, a 'pious Jewish atheist' who wept over Passover readings of the exodus story and took pride in Jewish traditions of resistance and radicalism. He was also confident in the righteousness of his own work. 'Well, I may be just a Red Jew son-of-a-bitch to them', he proclaimed defiantly, 'but I'm keeping Thomas Jefferson alive'. Circulation for the *Weekly* soon rose above 10,000 and Stone found himself once again earning his living as a reporter.[23]

Stone's humanist values deeply informed his work. On issue after issue, he took a hard look at the facts and reported what he believed, no matter how painful. The best example of this appeared in 1956, after he had spent a week in the Soviet Union. 'The way home from Moscow has been agony for me', his dispatch began.

---

21 Guttenplan 2009, x, 275.
22 Patner 1988, 43–44.
23 Patner 1988, 13; MacPherson 2006, 3; Guttenplan 2009, xvii, 328.

> I feel like a swimmer under water who must rise to the surface or his lungs will burst. Whatever the consequences, I have to say what I really feel after seeing the Soviet Union and carefully studying the statements of its leading officials. *This is not a good society and it is not led by honest men*.[24]

By this time, Stone had long since distanced himself from party communists and had become a frequent critic of Russian policies. Soviet premier Khrushchev's 'secret speech' in February had removed the last vestiges of romanticism from Stalin's legacy. Nevertheless, the pervasive disillusionment in his writings from Russia revealed how heartfelt his socialist ideals remained. The column lost him hundreds of subscriptions to the *Weekly*, but it also demonstrated the honesty-at-all-costs reporting that hallmarked his work.[25]

* * *

Moses Finkelstein had taught at City College during the 1940s, while completing his dissertation. He changed his last name to Finley in 1946. By the start of the next decade, he was a rising young professor at Rutgers University's Newark campus. His survey courses in ancient history were so popular that students were routinely turned away.[26] Though he had yet to produce a major book, he was already considered by the administration to be 'an outstanding teacher and scholar … likely to develop into the University's most distinguished historian'.[27]

That summer, however, a colleague who had known him during the 1930s named him to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, one of several congressional witch-hunting instruments, as a Communist Party organizer. In the atmosphere of the Red Scare all such accusations were taken seriously. Called to testify before the senators in March 1952, Finley denied having ever been a member of the Party. He then invoked the Fifth Amendment, refusing to identify others, or answer any further questions.

At first the university administration assured him his job was secure. But Rutgers received significant funding from the state, and the governor of New Jersey soon called for Finley's termination. A faculty committee ruled in his favor, finding 'no evidence that … Mr. Finley … has ever misused his position as a teacher to propagandize his students'.[28] But

---

[24] Stone 1969, 145.
[25] Stone 2006, 130.
[26] Letter of August 22, 1983 [Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library].
[27] Schrecker 1986, 172.
[28] Schrecker 1986, 177.

the Board of Trustees, fearing controversy, overruled the committee and decided to fire him anyway.

At midnight on January 1, 1953, M. I. Finley's termination became official. Within a matter of months, he moved to England, and after a year or so he had found a new position at Cambridge University. He almost never talked or wrote about this experience. And because his career had recovered so quickly, it was sometimes assumed that he was not a victim. But there is no doubt about his trauma, or his enduring sense of solidarity with the group of 'teachers who were dismissed, denied employment or promotion, socially ostracized, even driven to suicide' by the paranoid attacks of McCarthyism.[29]

From the security of Cambridge, Finley began to fulfill the potential the Rutgers administration had seen in him. His second book, *The World of Odysseus*, was a sensation, which he followed up with a string of articles and essays in such widely read journals as *The New Statesman, The Listener, The Observer, The Times Literary Supplement* and *The New York Review of Books*. In a field where most of the scholarly accouterments seemed designed to keep non-specialists away, his essays were eclectic, engaging, and remarkably popular.

Finley was just as comfortable quoting John Stuart Mill or Herbert Marcuse as Aristotle or Diocletian, but two formative influences loomed above the rest.[30] An enduring engagement with Max Weber led him to introduce the concept of models and ideal types into the historiography. 'I have the reputation', he once acknowledged, choosing a metaphor from the 1930s, 'of being a sociological fifth columnist among the historians'.[31] The second influence, of course, was the historical materialism of Karl Marx. 'Properly understood, Marxism is not a dogma', wrote Finley. 'For an ancient historian, it is a way of looking at men and events which helps to pose fruitful and significant questions. It also helps to test the answers'.[32]

'Was Socrates Guilty as Charged?' one of Finley's best-known essays, appeared in the July 1960 issue of *Horizon* magazine. Socrates, Finley writes, was 70 years old in 399 B.C., when three fellow-citizens charged him with corrupting the youth and showing impiety against the city's gods. Considering the stakes, this prosecution was a serious matter. But Socrates seems to have taken it philosophically. After watching him

[29] Finley 1969.
[30] Finley 1975b, 191.
[31] Finley 1966.
[32] Finley 1967a.

stumble through a halfhearted defense, the 501 members of the jury decreed him guilty by a count of 281 to 220. Still treating the affair as a farce, Socrates then sarcastically suggested that as punishment Athens should award him its highest honors for the rest of his life. Insulted by his attitude, the jurors voted for his execution, by a margin of 361 to 140, an even larger majority than before. A month or so later, Socrates took hemlock and died.

Finley characteristically framed the Socrates trial within the larger context of a century of Athenian political and social history. For the defendant—as for his accusers—the defining experience of life had been the generation-long war against rival Sparta. The conflict, which had only ended five years earlier, had brought plagues, military disasters, and two elite usurpations against Athenian democracy. Socrates had fought bravely as a soldier, but as a tutor he was also known to have educated several of the rich men's sons who had gone on to overthrow the state.

Such political and religious tensions, stemming from the traumas of the Peloponnesian War, render the trial intelligible for Finley. 'It was this chance combination of history and personal factors', he wrote, 'that produced the great tragedy in 399'. But the actual human-scale events of the trial, and its outcome, were mere vagaries of circumstance—the votes of 31 jurors, after all, would have changed the verdict to not guilty—and as such they were not of especial interest.[33]

When he discussed Socrates in his lectures, therefore, Finley stressed this notion of contingency. 'Why was Socrates put on trial in 399?' he would ask his audience, with a rhetorical flourish. 'My answer is as unsensational as it could be . . . Socrates was indicted by some chance'. This was his final verdict: *By some chance*. 'Those three words were pronounced at the end of a lecture with enormous emphasis', a colleague recalled, 'as if it had cost him something to accept that momentous events do not necessarily occur in response to universal laws'.[34]

In effect, Finley had unearthed the political and social context necessary to explain why Socrates had been prosecuted. By emphasizing the disasters the Peloponnesian War had inflicted on Athens, he had shown that the atmosphere was rife in 399 B.C. for a witch-hunt. That was a question suitable for a historian of deep structures. With it

---

[33] Finley 1968a, 70.
[34] Watson 2004.

accomplished, the results were a mere matter of chance—and, as such, uninteresting.

But Finley was not always so blasé about history's witch hunts. In a 1967 review of Ramsay MacMullen's *Enemies of the Roman Order*, he provided a clear comment concerning his beliefs on the nature of persecution. The incitement came in MacMullen's use of the expression, 'Un-Roman Activities Committee', to describe Emperor Nero's retaliations against advocates of freedom of thought. 'It took me a time', Finley commented acerbically, 'to decide that this was not just a joke in poor taste'. But it was no jest. Exhibiting 'a total failure of definition or sophistication', MacMullen had indeed approached the Roman evidence with the mind-set of a McCarthy Era prosecutor, making no distinction between actual threats and harmless nonconformities. His 'own categories are in fact those of the Un-*** Activities Committee', Finley continued. 'He really does treat philosophical speculation, graffiti in latrines, the great Jewish revolts, big-city crime, hunger riots, popular astrologers and quacks . . . all on a par'.[35]

Finley's use of the asterisks here suggested his sense of the interchangeable nature of—and the common modes of thinking employed by—witch-hunters. Whether in America or Athens, Russia or Rome, a witch-hunt's victims never actually embodied the evils attributed to them. They were sacrificed to a prevailing mood, they distracted attention from pressing crises; whatever the case, they were inherently innocent of the charges pressed against them. In this case, Finley argued, the author's indiscriminate lumping of true perils with guiltless infractions resulted in flawed conclusions. 'A small distinction has been overlooked', he wrote. 'Nero feared assassination, not social revolution, because, as [the] . . . evidence displays amply, there were neither revolutionary forces nor ideas nor threats'. Once true dangers and harmless distractions were conceived as one and the same, Finley concluded, 'The Un-*** Activities Committee mentality has indeed triumphed'.

By the early 1970s, Finley and Stone must have felt that their enemies' mentalities stood ascendant. The Soviet Union, once the locus for progress, was decaying toward a depressed stupefaction. America offered scant relief as an alternative. Finley had taken British citizenship in 1962, in large part because of the political narrow-mindedness that ruled in the

---

35 Finley 1967b.

country of his birth. 'In the United States', he commented around this time, 'socialism is a moral, if not a legal, offence'.[36]

Although he did not often participate in political affairs, his Short Twentieth Century engagements manifested themselves in his work—especially in his writings on the ancient economy. Mohammad Nafissi and Ian Morris have suggested the ways in which Finley transferred his youthful struggles against the capitalist system from contemporary politics back to his analysis of the Greco-Roman world. Finley may not have found any proto-socialists in the ancient past, but he did demonstrate forcefully that classical economic practices diverged from modern, profit-driven capitalism. In doing so, he critically undermined his colleagues' ability to shift twentieth-century understandings of a capitalist free market system to the Mediterranean scene.

His political writings in these years appeared, at first glance, to take on a nostalgic, even fatalistic quality. 'All major movements for social reform and of course all revolutions ... have been animated by a spirit of Utopianism', he wrote in 1967. 'They then turn out not to have attained Utopia, even at their best, and there is an inevitable let-down. Voices are raised against both the social changes and the underlying Utopianism, against the possibility of human progress, against man's potentiality for good'.[37] Though the context for this passage was a discussion of the idealistic projects of antiquity, Finley was clearly thinking of his own era, which had been defined by the disastrous consequences of utopias gone wrong.

Though Finley was intensely cynical about the present, he had not given up on the future. He concluded the same 1967 essay with an optimistic, if somewhat wistful, quote from Oscar Wilde's *The Soul of Man under Socialism*: 'A map of the world that does not include Utopia is not worth even glancing at ...'.[38] Though so much had soured since his youth, Finley—and Stone, as well—still adhered to the 1930s dream. Even in the midst of the Cold War, they refused to denounce Marxism as an evil in and of itself and kept on the lookout for the arrival of a truly democratic alternative to capitalism.

The quote from Oscar Wilde perhaps expressed the state of Finley's desire: a world without utopia was not worth inhabiting. If socialism could not be a principle of liberation, then something else must be found.

[36] Finley 1969.
[37] Finley 1975a, 191.
[38] Finley 1975a, 192.

The same held true in his personal travels. According to a *Washington Post* reporter, Finley had turned down many opportunities to visit the Soviet Union. In the newspaper reporter's interpretation, at least, Finley's hesitation to travel to Moscow was rooted in a fear of what he might find there.[39]

While Finley harbored illusions in the present, I. F. Stone transshipped his own to antiquity. Through all his years chasing deadlines, he had always cherished the plan of writing a book about the history of 'freedom of thought'. After heart disease forced his retirement from the *Weekly* in 1971, he commenced research in earnest. Beginning with the age of Milton, he found himself continually going further back in time. 'I felt I could not understand the English 17th century without understanding the Reformation, nor the Reformation without the Middle Ages', he would later recall, 'and, finally, I landed back in the Athens of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., the first extended period of free thought and free speech known to us. There I fell in love with the Athenians and . . . I have been there ever since'.[40]

With his humanist ethos it is certain that Stone, at first, approached the Socrates story with a very different outlook from the perspective that would eventually appear in his book. How could Izzy, after all, not have seen himself in Socrates, 'the self-appointed gadfly' whom so many had 'revered as a nonconformist', the personification of unblinking honesty in the face of state opposition?[41] Even critics would note Stone's clear identification with his subject's 'position as the lonely critic of a flawed society'.[42] But he did not side with Socrates for long. Digging into the evidence, he gradually uncovered an elitist, anti-democratic nuisance for whom he had scant affinity. In the end, Stone—who had spent his entire career asserting the universal untrustworthiness of governments—would choose to make the Athenian state his hero, while Socrates, the individualist, would become the villain of his story.

I. F. Stone had been featured in a successful documentary in the early 1970s. As Izzy pursued his Greek studies the filmmaker Jerry Bruck, Jr., sensed an opportunity to make a sequel. Filming was underway; footage had already been captured showing Stone giving lectures on Athenian free speech to large, appreciative audiences in Washington, D.C.,

[39] Friendly 1971.
[40] Stone 1978.
[41] Stone 1989, 104, 121.
[42] Kagan 1988.

Montreal, and at Harvard. With Izzy scheduled to visit England in the summer of 1983, Bruck saw an opportunity to capture another crucial scene. 'There's no occasion where Izzy has been filmed discussing and testing his ideas with a classicist of your stature', Bruck wrote to Moses Finley, in a letter seeking permission to bring cameras to their meeting, 'and his long-standing friendship and admiration for you suggests the potential of such warmth, ease and humor in conversation that I greatly hope that you'll say "yes".'[43]

According to Bruck, the two men had been acquainted since before Finley's departure for England in the early 1950s. Stone, who was concerned about the responses his book would receive from professional historians, felt that Finley—an old friend—would offer a sympathetic audience. As the book progressed, Stone had taken to sending paragraphs to Cambridge for confirmation or critique. The film crew visited the Finley home for an interview that lasted several hours. Although notoriously impatient with anything that smacked of dilettantism, Finley appreciated Stone's efforts. 'He was very respectful of Izzy', recalled Bruck, 'and said his work represented more than just amateur dabbling'.[44] That August, Stone corresponded with his old friend once more. 'It was a great pleasure to see you and Lady Finley again', he wrote, 'and I wish we did not live so far apart, and I am sorry we didn't have a chance for friendly conversation without a camera's eye upon us'.[45]

* * *

'No other trial, except that of Jesus, has left so vivid an impression on the imagination of Western man as that of Socrates'. With these stirring words, Stone opened his long-awaited book, *The Trial of Socrates*—which was published, at last, in 1988.

The Short Twentieth Century never receded far from the pages, which were rife with anachronisms. The Spartans were a 'master race', while 'the recent careers of Stalin and Mao Tse-tung' were cited as parallels to ancient tyrannies, and Grecian elites became the 'Athenian jet set'.[46] The use of such anachronisms was a matter of style, meant to appeal to a popular readership. But in a crucial way the entire project was an attempt by Stone to contrast the ancient world against his own.

---

43 Letter of July 9, 1983 [Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library].
44 Personal Communication with the author, November 14, 2012.
45 Letter of August 22, 1983 [Finley Papers, Cambridge University Library].
46 Stone 1989, 216, 96, 161.

The central arguments in the *Trial of Socrates* all revolved around a single question, which—significantly—the author chose as the title for the book's epilogue: 'Was There a Witch-hunt in Ancient Athens?' By reexamining the ancient texts, Stone hoped to prove that Athenian democracy had been qualitatively superior to the flawed America of recent memory. To do so, he had to demonstrate conclusively that the Athenian prosecution of Socrates had not been a witch-hunt.

As M. I. Finley had explained two decades earlier, a witch-hunt was a particular type of repression. The 'Un-*** Activities Committee', by definition, targeted activists and ideas that did not pose a true hazard to society. It persecuted the innocent and executed the harmless. Stone used this same reasoning. Thus, to him, the murder of the Rosenbergs had been 'barbaric, savage, and way out of line with justice', even though he had long guessed that Julius Rosenberg had been guilty of some form of espionage.[47] Stone's defense of Athenian democracy, therefore, rested on proving that the teachings of Socrates had, in fact, been intolerably menacing to the health of the polis. Thus, the muckraker who considered freedom of thought the centerpiece of liberty, and had famously declared that 'every government is run by liars', now found himself in the unfamiliar position of apologist for the state-ordered execution of one of history's most revered free-thinkers.[48]

The extent of Izzy's apologia is clear from the almost willful lack of interest he showed in questions of Athenian social and structural history. His narrative existed entirely on a literary and philological plane. Though he had carefully read Finley's *Ancient Economy*, Stone still casually described the Greek economy as a 'free market' (the questioning of this concept had been one of Finley's major arguments in these books). And, though Izzy had written about Athenian slavery years earlier in the *Weekly*, the subject hardly appeared in *The Trial of Socrates.* Another telling instance was Stone's casual treatment of Athenian imperialism. '*Empire* is perhaps too strong a word', he wrote of the city-state's Aegean hegemony, 'if it conjures up images of the Persian empire or the Roman'.[49]

Unconcerned with such niceties, Stone constructed his case against Socrates on philosophical, political, and historical grounds. He first argued

---

[47] Guttenplan 2009, 278.
[48] Guttenplan 2009, 443.
[49] Stone 1989, 102.

that the 'negative dialectic', otherwise known as the Socratic method, was inherently elitist. Next, he demonstrated the antidemocratic nature of Socratic political science. Finally, he examined late fifth-century Athenian history to show that Socrates' disciples had actively sought to overthrow the city's popular government, while the philosopher had done nothing to stop them.

The idealist philosophy, which Plato's dialogues attributed to Socrates, was predicated on reducing knowledge to absolute definitions. A person who could not define an object or concept in its ideal form could not truly claim to understand it. In practice, of course, such definitions were impossible. And thus Socrates could famously claim—as he did at his trial—that he was the wisest of mankind insofar as he was most aware of his own ignorance.

The nature of knowledge is inevitably political, and Stone argued that the clever wordplay of Socrates, which always ended with the mortification of his interlocutor, was a grimly effective attack on democracy. Athenian democracy rested on the assumption that each constituent citizen was qualified to govern. By reducing everyday concepts to abstract types, Socrates and Plato countered with a drastic retrenchment of political capacity. 'If occupations as humble as shoemaking or horse-trading could not be carried on successfully without unattainable definitions', Stone asked, 'how could ordinary men be trusted to practice the far more complex art of governing their cities?'[50]

Thus the idealist philosophy, taken to its logical ends, would have spelled the end for an open Athenian society. If common citizens could never succeed in understanding their world, then there would be no purpose in educating them, admitting their presence on juries, or granting them the franchise. 'The negative dialectic of Socrates', Stone concluded, 'would have made equity and democracy impossible. His identification of virtue with an unattainable knowledge stripped common men of hope and denied their capacity to govern themselves'.[51]

Still in the realm of ideas, though closer to practical affairs, Stone then proceeded to analyze the political science delineated by Plato in the *Republic* and the *Laws*. These works—organized around fictional Socratic dialogues—revealed the 'blueprints for an ideal state'.[52] But these imagined

[50] Stone 1989, 73.
[51] Stone 1989, 97.
[52] Stone 1989, 172.

utopias were characterized by censorship, eugenics, restrictions on travel, the execution of dissidents, and the use of cultural indoctrination to ensure the obedience of the poor. 'These Platonic innovations in thought-control', Stone noted, 'went beyond any kingship the Greeks had ever known. They were in fact the first sketches of what we now call totalitarian societies'.[53]

'It was fortunate for Socrates', he continued, 'that at the time of his trial the *Republic* had not yet been written and could not be read to the judges. If this was indeed Socratic teaching . . . it would have been even harder to convince the court that Socrates had not turned some of its most gifted youth into dangerous revolutionaries'.[54]

Thus far, Stone had accused the defendant of nonconformist ideas. On these grounds, conviction by a jury, though understandable, would have nevertheless qualified as a witch-hunt, placing Athens on the same moral plane as the flawed nation-states of the twentieth century. But the prosecutor's most damaging evidence was still to come. Though Socrates himself had taken no direct actions to topple the democracy, Stone conceded, neither had he actively worked to uphold it. Furthermore, his disciples had taken leading roles in a horrific series of usurpations that had roiled Athens in the dozen years before the trial.

These coups, which Stone referred to as the 'three political earthquakes', occurred in 411, 404, and 401 B.C., exhibiting the all-too-familiar features of secret plots, assassinations, paid informants, and terror. First came the reign of the Four Hundred oligarchs, which lasted four months. Then, the Thirty Tyrants, backed by Sparta, held power for eight months, during which time they oversaw the execution of 1,500 citizens, and the banishment of thousands more.

'In 411 and in 404', Stone wrote, 'the conduct of the aristocratic dictators proved cruel, rapacious, and bloody. Never in the history of Athens were basic rights and property as insecure as in those two interludes'.[55] Many of the rich men's sons who served as the most enthusiastic protagonists of these regimes had been students of the philosopher. 'The "Socratified" youth', wrote Stone, who had formerly seemed harmless, were now associated with extreme violence. 'They had become the storm troopers

[53] Stone 1989, 15.
[54] Stone 1989, 173.
[55] Stone 1989, 146.

with which the Four Hundred in 411 and the Thirty in 404 terrorized the city'.[56]

A remarkably generous amnesty after 404 B.C., which shielded the rebels from prosecution, should have ended the period of strife. But the oligarchic ultras would not accept the terms of peace. The final antagonism came in 401, when a rejuvenated democracy forcibly put down its last opponents. This was the last pang of the civil war. If ever the philosopher of virtue and piety should have contributed his wisdom to his fellow citizens, this would have been the moment. 'But Socrates', Stone wrote, 'during those fateful conflicts and their humane resolution, did not take his stand with the aristocrats, or his own middle class, or the poor. The most talkative man in Athens fell silent when his voice was most needed'.[57]

Rather than participating in some process of truth and reunion, Stone theorized, the philosopher hewed to his constant course. 'I believe there never would have been a trial had he, too, demonstrated his own reconciliation with the democracy', Stone wrote:

> Had any such change in his attitude taken place, he would have allayed fear that a new crop of 'Socratified' and alienated youth might emerge from his following to unleash civil war again within the city. But there is no evidence . . . of any such change in Socrates after the overthrow of the Thirty. Socrates resumed his antidemocratic and antipolitical teachings. His tone had been more offensive than his doctrine. Neither was altered. The sneer barely below the surface of his irony was still there. He remained unreconciled. He seems to have learned nothing from the events of 411, 404, and 401.[58]

'Athens never had an un-Athenian Activities Investigating Committee', Stone concluded. In this way, it was superior to the America of the 1950s; faith in democracy was restored. But this by no means suggested that Stone condoned the verdict. 'In prosecuting Socrates', he wrote, 'Athens was un-Athenian, frightened by the three political earthquakes . . . These events help to explain the prosecution of Socrates, but they do not justify it. The trial of Socrates was a prosecution of ideas. He was the first martyr of free speech and free thought'.[59]

* * *

[56] Stone 1989, 141.
[57] Stone 1989, 146.
[58] Stone 1989, 156.
[59] Stone 1989, 197.

Moses Finley had died in 1986, two years before the publication of *The Trial of Socrates.* As he feared, Stone did indeed receive some of the severe treatment from reviewers and historians that he had long feared. But these detractors had little impact on the book's success. A surprise sensation, for months it was a fixture on bestseller lists around the country. Izzy plunged immediately into a new project—this one to be a history of freedom of thought through time, beginning with the Hebrew prophets—but heart failure cut his labors short. Amidst news of student protests in Beijing, he died in June 1989.

The lives of M. I. Finley and I. F. Stone had traced parallel courses almost from the beginning. And at the end of crisis-rich decades, the same beliefs that had always guided them remained. Both continued to insist that western democracies in the period of the Cold War did not retain a monopoly on virtue in world affairs.

A desire for some alternative had carried them both to ancient Greece. 'I landed back in the Athens of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., the first extended period of free thought and free speech known to us'. Izzy had explained to the *New York Times*. 'There I fell in love with the Athenians . . . and I have been there ever since'.[60] Finley experienced a similar attraction. 'He felt . . . a natural affinity with the Greeks and more precisely with the democratic Greeks', Arnaldo Momigliano recalled.[61] Another colleague once asked Finley what place and time in history he would have most liked to live. After a pause, Moses had replied, 'I'd have to say Athens in the fifth century B.C.', and then he had added the caveat 'provided, of course, you were not a slave'.[62]

The similarities in these outlooks are striking, but the differences are crucial. Finley and Stone both cherished hopes for a truly democratic socialism. But Finley had refused even to visit the Soviet Union, fearing that his illusions might crumble. Stone had traveled to Moscow. What he saw there left him in despair, yet he had courageously proceeded to confess his findings. Finley and Stone both saw ancient Athens as an uplifting counterpoint to twentieth-century liberal capitalism. But Stone romanticized the past almost beyond recognition. Finley grappled with its contradictions to discover the relationships between slavery and freedom, economic thought and cultural practice.

---

[60] Stone 1978.
[61] Finley 1987, 3.
[62] Watson 2004.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources

American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia). Franz Boas Papers.
American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia). Oral History Files (Leslie Dunn).
Cambridge, University Library. Finley Papers.
Columbia University Libraries, Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Finley's MA thesis, Robert Merton Papers, Benjamin Nelson Papers, Meyer Schapiro Papers, W.L. Westermann Papers.
Federal Bureau of Investigation (Washington, DC). Moses Finley file.
Hampshire College (Amherst, Massachusetts). Archives of *The International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences.*
National Anthropological Archives (Suitland, Maryland). E.S. Goldfrank Papers.
New York University. Tamiment Library. Files of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.
Rutgers University Libraries (New Brunswick, NJ). University Archives; Lewis Webster Jones Papers.
Sarah Lawrence College Library (Bronxville, NY), Archives. Charles Trinkaus Papers.
Stanford University, Hoover Institution. Sidney Hook Papers.
University of Vermont Library (Burlington, VT). Edward Carter Papers.

Works Referred to

Abraham, H. J. 1955. "John Marshall Harlan: A Justice Neglected", *Virginia Law Review* 41: 871–91.
American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. 1939. *Can You Name Them?* New York.
Applebaum, L. 1988. "Edwin R. A. Seligman", in J. D. Buenker and E. R. Kantowicz (eds.), *Historical Dictionary of the Progressive Era, 1890–1920*. 425–6. Westport, CT.
Baker, L. D. 1998. *From Savage to Negro. Anthropology and the Construction of Race, 1896–1954*. Durham, NC.
—— 2010. *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture*. Durham, NC.
Balkin, J. M. (ed.). 2001. *What "Brown v. Board of Education" Should Have Said: The Nation's Top Legal Experts Rewrite America' s Landmark Civil Rights Decision*. New York.
Banaji, J. 2001. *Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity: Gold, Labour, and Aristocratic Dominance.* Oxford.
Barrett, W. 1982. *The Truants: Adventures among the Intellectuals*. Garden City, NY.
Baumgarten, A. 2010. *Elias Bickerman as a Historian of the Jews: A Twentieth Century Tale*. Tübingen.
Beizer, M. n.d. "Yevreiskaya Aristokratiya: Rabbin Sankt-Peterburgskoi Khoralnoi Sinagogi i yevo Rodoslovnaya", published electronically at http://jeps.ru/userimages/katsenellen bogen.htm
—— 1989. *The Jews of Saint Petersburg.* Philadelphia.
Berent, M. 2004. "In Search of the Greek State: a Rejoinder to M. H. Hansen", *Polis: the Journal of the Society for Greek Political Thought* 21: 107–46.
Berve, H. 1937. Review of V. Ehrenberg, *Ost und West*, in *Philologische Wochenschrift* 23/24 (June 12): 650–5.
Birkner, M. J. 2001. *McCormick of Rutgers: Scholar, Teacher, Public Historian*. Westport, CT.

Blauner, B. 2009. *Resisting McCarthyism: To Sign or Not to Sign California's Loyalty Oath*. Stanford.
Boas, F. 1910. "The Real Race Problem", *The Crisis* (edited by W. E. B. DuBois), 1.2: 22–25.
—— 1919. "Colonies and the Peace Conference", *The Nation* 108: 247–9.
Bransbourg, G. 2012. "Rome and the Economic Integration of Empire", *ISAW Papers* 3 (Preprint): http://dlib.nyu.edu/awdl/isaw/isaw-papers/3/preprint/.
Briggs, W. 2006. "Meyer Reinhold in Scoundrel Time", *Classical Bulletin* 82: 81–90.
Brunt, P. A. 1953. "The Hellenic League against Persia", *Historia* 2: 135–63.
—— 1977. "Josephus on Social Conflicts in Judaea", *Klio* 59: 149–53.
Bücher, K. 1912. *Industrial Evolution*. New York.
Carruthers, B. G., and W. N. Espeland. 1991. "Accounting for Rationality: Double-entry Bookkeeping and the Rhetoric of Economic Rationality", *American Journal of Sociology* 97: 31–69.
Cartledge, P. 2009. *Ancient Greek Political Thought in Practice.* Cambridge.
Chipkin, I. 1936. "Twenty Five Years of Jewish Education in the United States", *American Jewish Year Book* 38: 48–50.
Christ, K. 1990. *Neue Profile der alten Geschichte.* Darmstadt.
—— 1995. "HOMO NOVUS. Zum 100. Geburtstag von Joseph Vogt", *Historia* 44: 504–7.
Ciccotti, E. 1937. *Civiltà del mondo antico.* Udine.
Cohen, E. E. 2000. *The Athenian Nation.* Princeton.
Cohen, M. 2012. *The Birth of Conservative Judaism: Solomon Schechter's Disciples and the Birth of an American Religious Movement*. New York.
Cook, B. Wiesen. 2004. "Up Against the Red Scare: Owen Lattimore Remembered", in Owen Lattimore, *Ordeal by Slander* (new ed.), vii–xxiv. New York.
Cooney, T. A. 1986. *The Rise of the New York Intellectuals:* Partisan Review *and its Circle*. Madison, WI.
Countryman, V. 1951. *Un-American Activities in the State of Washington*. Ithaca, NY.
Deissler, J. 2010. "Cold Case? Die Finley-Vogt Kontroverse aus deutscher Sicht", in H. Heinen (ed.), *Antike Sklaverei: Rückblick und Ausblick. Neue Beiträge zur Forschungsgeschichte und zur Erschliessung der archäologischen Zeugnisse*, 77–93. Stuttgart.
Dekel, E., and D. Gantt Gurley. 2013. "How the Golem Came to Prague", *Jewish Quarterly Review* 103: 241–58.
De Ste Croix, G. E. M. 1985. "Karl Marx and the Interpretation of Ancient and Modern History", in B. Chavance (ed.), *Marx en Perspective*, 159–87. Paris.
Dunn, J. 1993. *Western Political Theory in the Face of the Future* (2nd ed.). Cambridge.
Duranty, W. 1930. "Peasants Rejoice over Stalin Order", *New York Times*, Mar. 8.
Ellenson, D., and L. Bycel. 1997. "A Seminary of Sacred Learning: The JTS Rabbinical Curriculum in Historical Perspective", in J. Wertheimer (ed.),*Tradition Renewed: A History of the Jewish Theological Seminary* 2: 527–91. New York.
Elliott, J. E. 1983. "Introduction", in Schumpeter 1983, vii–lix.
Elliott, M. 2001. "Race, Color Blindness, and the Democratic Public: Albion W. Tourgée's Radical Principles in Plessy v. Ferguson", *Journal of Southern History* 67: 287–330.
Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences. 1930–1935. Edited by E. R. A. Seligman and A. Johnson. New York.
Farmer, W. R. 1956. *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period.* New York.
Farrar, C. 1988. *The Origins of Democratic Thinking. The Invention of Politics in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
Fast, H. 1954. "Why the Fifth Amendment?", *Masses & Mainstream* 7.2 (Feb.): 44–50.
Fears, J. R. 1973. Review of Finley 1973a, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 410: 197–8.
Fetter, F. 1930. "Capital", in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* 3: 187–90.
Finkelstein [Finley], M. I. 1935. "Emporos, Naukleros and Kapelos: Prolegomena to the Study of Athenian Trade", *Classical Philology* 30: 320–36.

—— 1935. "Julius Wellhausen", In *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* 15: 400–1. New York.
—— 1936. Review of V. Ehrenberg, *Ost und West*, *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* 5: 439–40.
—— 1937. Review of E. Ciccotti, *Civiltà del mondo antico*, *American Historical Review* 42: 277–9.
—— 1939. Review of *Cambridge Ancient History* XI, *Political Science Quarterly* 54: 609–11.
Finley, M. I. 1952. *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500–200 B.C.* New Brunswick, NJ.
—— 1953. "Land, Debt and the Man of Property in Classical Athens", *Political Science Quarterly* 68: 249–68.
—— 1954. *The World of Odysseus.* New York.
—— (ed.) 1960. *Slavery in Classical Antiquity: Views and Controversies* Cambridge.
—— 1962. "Athenian Demagogues", *Past and Present* 21: 3–24.
—— 1964a. "The Crisis in the Classics", in Plumb 1964: 11–23.
—— 1964b. "Christian Beginnings", *New York Review of Books* 2.2 (Mar. 5): 14–15 (repr. in Finley 1968a, Chapter 14).
—— 1965a. *The Jewish War and other Selections from Flavius Josephus*. New York.
—— 1965b. "Ancient History in the Senior Forms—I", *Didaskalos* 1.3: 66–74 (repr. in J. Mingay and J. Sharwood Smith [eds.], *From "Didaskalos": An Anthology from the Journal of the Joint Association of Classical Teachers*, Bristol, 1982, 69–77).
—— 1966. Reply to A. Gouldner, "Name Calling", *New York Review of Books* 7.4 (Sept. 22): 28–9.
—— 1967a. "Class Struggles", *The Listener* 78.1: 201–2.
—— 1967b. "UnRoman Activities", *New York Review of Books* 8.9 (May 18): 37–9.
—— 1968a. *Aspects of Antiquity: Discoveries and Controversies*. New York.
—— 1968b. Review of A. Momigliano, *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico, History and Theory* 7: 355–67.
—— 1969. "Un-American Activities", *New Statesman.* Feb. 28: 296–7.
—— 1970. "Aristotle and Economic Analysis", *Past and Present* 47: 3–25 (repr. in Finley 1974).
—— 1971. *The Ancestral Constitution*. Cambridge. (Finley's Cambridge Inaugural Lecture, printed separately, then repr. in Finley 1975b).
—— 1973a. *Democracy Ancient and Modern.* New Brunswick, NJ (revised ed., 1985).
—— 1973b. *The Ancient Economy.* Berkeley and Los Angeles.
—— (ed.). 1974. *Studies in Ancient Society*. London.
—— 1975a. Review of P. Anderson, *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism* and *Lineages of the Absolutist State, The Guardian*, Feb. 6: 14.
—— 1975b. *The Use and Abuse of History: From the Myths of the Greeks to Levi-Strauss, the Past Alive and the Present Illumined.* London.
—— 1976a. 'In lieblicher Bläue', *Arion* 3: 79-95.
—— 1976b. "The Freedom of the Citizen in the Greek World", *Talanta* 7: 1–23 (repr. in Finley 1982: 77–94).
—— 1977. " 'Progress' in Historiography", *Daedalus* 106.3: 125–42.
—— 1978. "The Athenian Empire: a Balance Sheet", in P. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker (eds.), *Imperialism in the Ancient World,* 103–26 and 306–310. Cambridge (repr. in Finley 1982: 41–61).
—— 1980. *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*. London (expanded ed., Princeton, 1998).
—— 1981. "Politics", in Finley (ed.), *The Legacy of Greece. A New Appraisal*, 22–36. Oxford.
—— 1982a. *Authority and Legitimacy in the Classical City-State*. *Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser* [Copenhagen] 50:3.
—— 1982b. *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* (ed. with an introduction by B. D. Shaw and R. P. Saller). New York.
—— 1982c. "Problems of Slave Society: some Reflections on the Debate", *Opus* 1: 201–11.
—— 1983. *Politics in the Ancient World.* Cambridge.

—— 1985a. *Ancient History: Evidence and Models.* New York.
—— 1985b. *The Ancient Economy* (2nd ed.). Berkeley and Los Angeles.
—— 1985c. "Foreword", in P. E. Easterling and J. V. Muir (eds.), *Greek Religion and Society*, xiii–xx. Cambridge.
—— (ed.). 1987. *Classical Slavery.* London.
Florath, B. 2005. "Zur Diskussion um die asiatische Produktionsweise", in I. Stark (ed.), *Elisabeth Charlotte Welskopf und die Alte Geschichte in der DDR: Beiträge der Konferenz vom 21. bis 23. November 2002 in Halle/Saale*, 184–200. Stuttgart.
Foner, E. 2012. "The Supreme Court and the History of Reconstruction—and Vice Versa", *Columbia Law Review* 112: 1585–1606.
Foucault, M. 1980. "Truth and Power", in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, ed. by C. Gordon, 109–33. New York (the original appeared in Foucault, *Microfisica del potere*, Turin, 1977).
Frankel, J. 1981. *Prophecy and Politics: Socialism, Nationalism, and the Russian Jews*. Cambridge.
Frederiksen, M. W. 1967. Review of Kelly, *Roman Litigation, Journal of Roman Studies* 57: 254–6.
—— 1975. Review of Finley 1973b, *Journal of Roman Studies* 65: 164–71.
Freeze, C. 2002. *Jewish Marriage and Divorce in Imperial Russia*. Hanover.
Friendly, A. 1971. "Making the Break With America", *Washington Post.* Apr. 7.
Ginzberg, E. 1989. *My Brother's Keeper*. New Brunswick, NJ.
Goodman, M. 1987. *The Ruling Class of Judaea*. Cambridge.
Goodman, W. 2000. "Studies Thaw the Exploits of Undercover Cold Warriors", *New York Times*, June 10.
Goodwin, J. 1993. *Eisenstein, Cinema, and History.* Urbana, IL.
Graber, M. A. 2005. Review of Klarman 2004, *American Historical Review* 110: 804–5.
Grimes, W. 2013. "Gerda Lerner, A Feminist and Historian, Dies at 92", *New York Times*, January 4.
Guttenplan, D. D. 2009. *American Radical: The Life and Times of I. F. Stone.* New York.
Hansen, M. H. 1982. "The Athenian ecclesia and the Assembly-place on the Pnyx", *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 23: 241–9.
—— 1999. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes* (2nd ed.). Bristol.
—— 2002. "Was the *Polis* a State or a Stateless Society?", in T. H. Nielsen (ed.), *Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, 17–47. Copenhagen.
Hardy, C. O. 1933. "Market", In *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* 10: 131–3.
Harris, W. V. 1999. "William Linn Westermann", in *American National Biography* 23: 80–81.
—— 2011. *Rome's Imperial Economy: Twelve Essays.* Oxford.
Hellman, L. 1976. *Scoundrel Time.* Boston.
Hicks, G. 1965. *Part of the Truth. An Autobiography.* New York.
Hirschman, A. O. 1991. *The Rhetoric of Reaction: Perversity, Futility, Jeopardy*. Cambridge, MA.
Hobsbawm, E. 1994. *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991.* London.
Hook, S. 1987. *Out of Step*. New York.
—— 1995. *Letters of Sidney Hook: Democracy, Communism, and the Cold War*, ed. by E. S. Shapiro. Armonk, NY.
Hopkins, M. K. 2000. *A World Full of Gods*. London.
Horkheimer, M. 1936. "Egoismus und die Freiheitsbewegung", *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* 5: 161–233.
Hornblower, S. 1992. "Creation and Development of Democratic Institutions in Ancient Athens", in J. Dunn (ed.), *Democracy: the Unfinished Journey, 508 BC to AD 1993*, 1–16. Oxford.
Iversen, R. 1959. *The Communists and the Schools.* New York.
James, H. 1907. *The American Scene*. London.

von Jhering, R. 1885. *Scherz und Ernst in der Jurisprudenz: eine Weihnachtsgabe für das juristische Publikum*. Leipzig.
Johnson, A. 1952. *Pioneer's Progress.* New York.
Johnson, O. C. 1970. "Campus Battles for Freedom in the Thirties", *Centennial Review* 14.3: 350–1.
Jones, A. H. M. 1938. *The Herods of Judaea.* Oxford.
Jones, N. F. 1987. Review of Finley 1983, *Ancient Philosophy* 7: 232–5.
Joselit, J. 1994. *The Wonders of America: Reinventing Jewish Culture 1880–1950*. New York.
Kagan, D. 1988. Review of I. F. Stone, *The Trial of Socrates, Commentary* 85.3 (March): 72–6.
Katzenstein, P. J. 2012. *Anglo-America and its Discontents: Civilizational Identities beyond West and East.* New York.
Katzoff, L. 1949. *Issues in Jewish Education: A Study of the Philosophy of the Conservative Congregational School*. New York.
Kaufmann, Y. 1937. *Toldot Ha-Emunah Ha-Yisre'elit* (*History of the Israelite Religion*), 4 vols. Tel Aviv.
Kazakevich, V. D. 1944. "Social Sciences in the Soviet Union", *American Sociological Review* 9.3: 312–18.
Kazin, A. 1978. *New York Jew*. New York.
Kelly, J. M. 1966. *Roman Litigation.* Oxford.
Kessler, D., and P. Temin. 2008. "Money and Prices in the Early Roman Empire", in W. V. Harris (ed.), *The Monetary Systems of the Greeks and Romans*, 137–59. Oxford.
Kessler-Harris, A. 2012. *A Difficult Woman: the Challenging Life and Times of Lillian Hellman.* New York.
Keynes, J. M. 1936. *General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*. London.
Kirkendall, R. S. 1966. *Social Scientists and Farm Politics in the Age of Roosevelt*. Columbia, MO.
Klarman, M. J. 2004. *From Jim Crow to Civil Rights: The Supreme Court and the Struggle for Racial Equality*. New York.
Konstan, D. 1988. Review of Finley 1985a, *History and Theory* 27: 178–87.
Koppes, C. R. 1978. "Public Water, Private Land: Origins of the Acreage Limitation Controversy, 1933-1953", *Pacific Historical Review* 47: 607–36.
Kotkin, S. 1995. *Magnetic Mountain. Stalinism as a Civilization*. Berkeley.
Kreissig, H. 1970. *Die Sozialen Zusammenhänge des Judäischen Krieges*. Berlin.
Kutler, S. 1982. *The American Inquisition: Justice and Injustice in the Cold War*. New York.
Kuznick, P. S. 1987. *Beyond the Laboratory: Scientists as Political Activists in 1930s America.* Chicago.
Lakoff, S. 1998. *Max Lerner: Pilgrim in the Promised Land.* Chicago.
Lardner, Jr., R. 2000. *I'd Hate Myself in the Morning: A Memoir*. New York.
Laslett, P. 1956. "The Face to Face Society", in P. Laslett (ed.), *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, 157–84. Oxford.
Lattimore, O. 1950. *Ordeal by Slander*. Boston.
Leiman, S. 2002. "The Adventure of the Maharal of Prague in London: Rabbi Yudl Rosenberg and the Golem of Prague", *Tradition* 36: 26–58.
Liu, G. 2008. "The First Justice Harlan", *California Law Review* 96: 1383–93.
Locke, A., and B. Stern (eds.). 1942. *When Peoples Meet: a Study in Race and Culture Contacts.* New York.
Loomis, W. T. 1998. *Wages, Welfare Costs, and Inflation in Classical Athens.* Ann Arbor.
Losemann, V. 1977. *Nationalsozialismus und Antike. Studien zur Entwicklung des Faches Alte Geschichte 1933–1945.* Hamburg.
Lowenthal, L. 1989. *Critical Theory and Frankfurt Theorists. Lectures—Correspondence—Conversations.* New Brunswick, NJ.
MacPherson, M. 2006. *'All Governments Lie': The Life and Times of Rebel Journalist I.F. Stone.* New York.

Macve, R. H. 1985. "Some Glosses on de Ste. Croix's 'Greek and Roman Accounting'", in *Crux: Essays in Greek History Presented to G.E.M. de Ste. Croix on his 75th Birthday*, 233–64. London.
Maimon, S. 1792–3. *Salomon Maimons Lebensgeschichte, von ihm selbst erzählt und herausgegeben von Karl Philipp Moritz*. Berlin.
Mann, M. 1985. Review of Finley 1983, *British Journal of Sociology* 36: 297.
Margolick, D., and H. Als. 2001. *Strange Fruit. The Biography of a Song*. New York.
Marshall, A. 1961. *Principles of Economics* (9th ed.). London. (First published 1890).
Mayer, E. 2012. *The Ancient Middle Classes: Urban Life and Aesthetics in the Roman Empire, 100 BCE–250 CE.* Cambridge, MA.
Meier, C. 1980. *Die Entstehung des Politischen bei den Griechen*. Frankfurt am Main. (Translated by D. McLintock as *The Greek Discovery of Politics*, Cambridge, MA, 1990).
Meier, C. 1986. Review of Finley 1983, *Gnomon* 58: 496–509.
Meyer, K. E. 1990. "The Editorial Notebook; Trenchcoats, Then and Now", *New York Times*, June 24.
Mickwitz, G. 1937. "Economic Rationalism in Graeco-Roman Agriculture", *English Historical Review* 52: 577–89.
Miller, A. 1987. *Timebends: A Life*. New York.
Miyazaki, M. 2007. "Public Coercive Power of the Greek Polis—on a Recent Debate", http://www.waseda.jp/prj-med_inst/bulletin/bull05/05_13miy.pdf.
Momigliano, A. 1934. "The Roman Government of Palestine", in *Cambridge Ancient History* 10: 850–5.
—— 1975. "The Use of the Greeks", *New York Review of Books*, 16 October, 36–38 (repr. in *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Rome, 1980, I: 313–22).
—— 1994. *Essays on Ancient and Modern Judaism*. Chicago.
Morley, N. (ed.). 2000. *Ancient History: Key Themes and Approaches*. London and New York.
Morris, I. 1994. "The Athenian Economy Twenty Years after The Ancient Economy", *Classical Philology* 89: 351–66.
—— 1999. "Foreword" to a reprinted edition of Finley 1973b, ix–xxxvi.
Moyers, B., and M. Winship. 2012. "The Ghost of Joe McCarthy Slithers Again", *On Democracy* series on billmoyers.com April 26, 2012. <billmoyers.com/2012/04/26/the-ghost-of-joe-mccarthy-slithers-again/>
Nafissi, M. 2005. *Ancient Athens & Modern Ideology. Value, Theory & Evidence in Historical Sciences: Max Weber, Karl Polanyi & Moses Finley* (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies. Supplement 80). London.
Naiden, F. Forthcoming 2014. "Finley's War Years", *American Journal of Philology* 135.
Naiden, F., and R. Talbert (eds.). Forthcoming 2014. A transcript of the Institute of Historical Research Finley-Hopkins interview [see above, p. 117], *American Journal of Philology* 135.
Nathans, B. 2002. *Beyond the Pale: The Jewish Encounter with Late Imperial Russia*. Berkeley.
Navasky, V. S. 1980. *Naming Names*. New York.
Osborne, R. 1996. "Pots, Trade and the Archaic Greek Economy", *Antiquity* 70: 31–44.
——, M. Scott, and D. Jew (eds.). Forthcoming. *The Impact of Moses Finley.* Cambridge.
Patner, A. 1988. *I. F. Stone: A Portrait.* New York.
Petr, J. 1998. "The Social Conscience of an American Economist: Alvin S. Johnson as advocate/reformer", in M. Rutherford (ed.). *The Economic Mind in America: Essays in the History of American Economics*, 258–71. New York.
Phillips, W. 1983. *A Partisan View: Five Decades of the Literary Life*. New York.
Plumb, J. H. (ed.). 1964. *Crisis in the Humanities*. Baltimore.
Pritchard, D. (ed.). 2010. *War, Democracy and Culture in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
Rathbone, D. 1991. *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third-century A.D. Egypt: the Heroninos Archive and the Appianus Estate.* Cambridge.

Reinhold, M. 1946. "Historian of the Classic World: a Critique of Rostovtzeff", *Science and Society* 10: 361–91 (repr. in *Studies in Classical History and Society*, New York, 2002: 82–100).
Rhodes, P. J. 1972. *The Athenian Boule*. Oxford. (2nd ed., 1985).
—— 1981. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian* Athenaion politeia. Oxford.
—— (ed.). 2004. *Athenian Democracy*. Edinburgh.
Rose, P. W. 2012. *Class in Archaic Greece*. Oxford.
Rosenfeld, S. 2012. *Subversives: the FBI's War on Student Radicals, and Reagan's Rise to Power.* New York.
Rudolph, B. 1970. *From a Minyan to a Community: A History of the Jews of Syracuse*. Syracuse, NY.
Scheidel, W. 2013. "The Shape of the Roman World". Available at Social Science Research Network: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2242325 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2242325.
Scheidel, W., I. Morris, and R. Saller (eds.). 2007. *Cambridge Economic History of the Graeco-Roman World.* Cambridge.
Schrecker, E. 1986. *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities*. Oxford and New York.
Schumpeter, J. 1939. *Business Cycles: a Theoretical, Historical and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process.* New York.
—— 1954. *History of Economic Analysis*. Oxford.
—— 1983. *The Theory of Economic Development* (trans. R. Opie) (trans. originally publ. 1934; original ed.: *Die Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*, Leipzig, 1912). New Brunswick, NJ.
Schwartz, S. 2010. *Were the Jews a Mediterranean Society? Reciprocity and Solidarity in Ancient Judaism.* Princeton.
Seligman, E. R. A. 1909. *Principles of Economics* (4th ed.). New York.
Shaw, B. 1993. "The Early Development of M. I. Finley's Thought: The Heichelheim Dossier", *Athenaeum* 81: 177–99.
Sinclair, R. K. 1988. *Democracy and Participation in Athens*. Cambridge.
Smith, M. 1971. "Zealots and Sicarii, their Origins and Relation", *Harvard Theological Review* 44: 1–19.
Socher, A. 2006. *The Radical Enlightenment of Solomon* (sic) *Maimon: Judaism, Heresy, and Philosophy*. Stanford.
Sombart, W. 1930. "Capitalism", in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* 3: 195–208.
Stanislawski, M. 1988. *For Whom do I Toil? Judah Leib Gordon and the Crisis of Russian Jewry.* Oxford.
Stanton, G. R. 1996. "The Shape and Size of the Athenian Assembly Place in its Second Phase", in B. Forsén and G. R. Stanton (eds.), *The Pnyx in the History of Athens*, 7–21. Helsinki.
Stark, J. 1938. "The Pragmatic and the Dogmatic Spirit in Physics", *Nature*, April 30: 770–2.
Stern, B. 1943. Review of *Leninism: Selected Writings by Joseph Stalin, American Economic Review* 33: 395–7.
—— 1944. "Recent Social Trends in the Soviet Union", *American Sociological Review* 9: 229–35.
—— 1948. "Engels on the Family", *Science and Society* 12: 42–64.
—— 1949. "Genetics Teaching and Lysenko", *Science and Society* 13: 136–49.
—— 1959. *Historical Sociology. The Selected Papers of Bernhard J. Stern*. New York.
Stern, M. 1973. "Zealots", *Encyclopaedia Judaica Yearbook*, 135–52. Jerusalem.
Stolberg, B. 1939. "'Innocent Front', Catspaws of Communism", *Washington Post*, December 2.
Stone, I. F. 1969. *The Haunted Fifties.* New York.
—— 1978. "I. F. Stone Interviews I. F. Stone at Seventy", *New York Times.* Jan. 22. p. SM4.
—— 1979. "I. F. Stone Breaks the Socrates Story", *New York Times.* Apr. 8. p. SM6.
—— 1989. *The Trial of Socrates.* New York.

—— 2006. *The Best of I. F. Stone.* New York.
Storrs, L. R. Y. 2003. "Red Scare Politics and the Suppression of Popular Front Feminism: The Loyalty Investigation of Mary Dublin Keyserling", *Journal of American History* 90: 491–524.
Syme, R. 1971. *Emperors and Biography*. Oxford.
—— 1988. "Journeys of Hadrian", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 73: 159–70.
Taylor, G. 2009. *The History of the North Carolina Communist Party*. New York.
Taylor, S. J. 1990. *Stalin's Apologist. Walter Duranty: The New York Times's Man in Moscow.* New York.
Temin, P. 2013. "Statistics in Ancient History", http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/77609.
Thompson, W. E. 1982. "The Athenian Entrepreneur", *L'Antiquité Classique* 51: 53–85.
Tompkins, D. 2006. "The World of Moses Finkelstein: the Year 1939 in M.I. Finley's Development as a Historian", in M. Meckler (ed.), *Classical Antiquity and the Politics of America: from George Washington to George W. Bush*, 95–125. Waco, TX.
—— 2007. "Moses Finley: from the American Archives", *The Darwinian*, 1–2.
—— 2008. Review of Nafissi 2005, *History and Theory* 47: 123–36.
Trevor-Roper, H. 2007. *Letters from Oxford*. London.
Tribe, K. 2003. "Historical Schools of Economics: German and English", in W. J. Samuels, J. E. Biddle, and J. B. Davis (eds.), *A Companion to the History of Economic Thought*, 215–30. Oxford.
Turner, Jr., H. A. 2005. *General Motors and the Nazis: The Struggle for Control of Opel, Europe's Biggest Carmaker*. New Haven, CT.
Vidal-Naquet, P. 1977. "Flavius Josèphe ou du bon usage de la trahison", Introduction to *La Guerre des Juifs*, tr. P. Savinel. Paris.
—— 1982. *Il Buon Uso del Tradimento: Flavio Giuseppe e la guerra giudaica.* Rome.
—— 1998. *Mémoires*, vol. 2. Paris.
Vlassopoulos, K. 2007. *Unthinking the Greek Polis: Ancient Greek History beyond Eurocentrism.* Cambridge.
Wald, A. M. 1987. *The New York Intellectuals: The Rise and Decline of the Anti-Stalinist Left From the 1930s to the 1980s*. Raleigh, NC.
Watson, G. 2004. "The Man from Syracuse: Moses Finley 1912–1986", *Sewanee Review* 112: 131–7.
Weber, M. 1921. *Das antike Judentum*. Tübingen. (Translated by H. Gerth and D. Martindale as *Ancient Judaism*, New York, 1952).
Westermann, W. L. 1935. "Sklaverei", In A. F. Pauly and G. Wissowa (eds.), *Realencyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband VI: 894–1068.
—— 1955. *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia.
Westin, A. 1957. "John Marshall Harlan and the Constitutional Rights of Negroes: The Transformation of a Southerner", *Yale Law Journal* 66: 637–710.
Whittaker, C. R. 1986. "Qui êtes-vous, Sir Moses", *London Review of Books*, 6 March: 10–11.
—— 1997. "Moses Finley 1912–1986", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 94: 459–72.
Wiener, J. R. 1989. "Radical Historians and the Crisis in American History, 1959–1980", *Journal of American History* 76.2: 399–434.
Wiseman, T. P. 1983. Review of Finley 1983, *History of Political Thought* 4: 396–400.

INDEX

Individuals in this index who are not identified by role are/were scholars or known public figures.

Agol, Israel (Soviet scientist) 14
agriculture
  American 18
  ancient 24
  Soviet 14
Alito, Samuel 11
Allen, Raymond (President, University of Washington) 66–7, 71
American Association of University Professors (AAUP) 53, 62, 66, 70, 72, 76–8
American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) 6 n.
American Committee for Cultural Freedom 30
American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom 6 n., 7, 13–14, 19–22, 95, 127
American Council of Learned Societies 51
American Economics Association 53
American Russian Institute 7, 27–8
American Society for Russian War Relief 7
Americans for Democratic Action 84–5
Ancient Near East 44–5, 46
Andrewes, Antony 96–7
anthropologists: *see* Boas, Stern
anti-semitism 19–20, 22, 34
Association of American Universities 74
Athens 99–101, 108–18, 124–5, 132, 135–41; Pnyx 111

Baldwin, Roger (founder of the ACLU) 6 n.
bar-mitzvah ritual 40–1
Baron, Salo W. 2
Barrett, William (editor of *Partisan Review*) 85
Beard, Mary 114
Beizer, Mikhail (Michael) 37, 39-40
Bell, Daniel 17 n., 35
Bickerman, Elias 35, 47
Bloch, Marc 127
Boas, Franz 6 n., 7, 13, 17, 19–22, 30, 95
Boudin, Leonard (civil liberties lawyer) 70
Bowra, Sir Maurice 97
Braudel, Fernand 44
Brooklyn College 25, 65
Brown v. Board of Education 9, 13
Bruck Jr., Jerry (film-maker) 135–6
Brunt, Peter 97, 108, 114
Bücher, Karl 50, 53, 60

California, University of 67
Cambridge 1, 16, 30, 35, 96, 97, 101–5, 131
Canada 74, 78, 91
Canning, William (Finley accuser) 63, 65
Canwell, Albert (Washington State politician) 66
Canwell Committee: *see* Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities
capital, capitalism 50, 54-5
Carr, E. H. 18
Cartledge, P. 4
Chafee, Zechariah (law professor) 73–4
Chervonnaya, Svetlana 26
Christianity, Christians 33–4
Ciccotti, Ettore 50, 119
Cicero 109
Cimon 111
City College of New York 6 n., 7, 63, 65, 130
civil liberties 79–92
civil rights cases 8–11, 11–12; and *see* racism
class, social 4, 6, 10, 12, 24, 32, 110, 116–18
Cohen, D. 4
Cohen, E. E. 4
Cold War 3, 65, 68, 69–70, 81, 91, 92, 107, 125, 134
Columbia University 1–2, 7–8, 23–6, 39, 43–4, 50, 52, 60, 76, 87, 94–5, 104, 126
Committee of 400 127
Committee on the Present Danger 69–70
Communist Party (CPUSA) 17, 62–8, 71–4, 77, 79, 81–5, 88, 91, 127, 130
Communists, real or alleged, dismissed from academic jobs in the 1930s 64
  1940s 65–7
  1950s 61–78 *passim*, 88

Cook, B. Wiesen 87
Corey, Lewis (radical activist) 15
Cornell University 76
corporations 59–60
Cromwell, William Nelson (lawyer) 26

Dahl, Robert 98
De Ste. Croix, G. E. M. 96–7
democracy 80, 83–4, 86, 90, 92, 93–105, 108, 138
Dewey, John 20, 30
discrimination, ethnic 12–13, 22–3
District of Columbia v. Heller 11
Dubois, W. E. B. 13, 83
due process 11
Dulles, John Foster 26
Dunn, Leslie 14, 20
Duranty, Walter (journalist) 14–15

economics, academic discipline of 49–60
Egypt 44–5
Ehrenberg, Victor 25–6
Einstein, Albert 19, 26
Eisenstein, Sergei 13
Elliott, John 56
Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences 7–8, 13–15, 17, 52, 54–5, 57, 60
entrepreneurs 58–9
Euripides 118

face-to-face society 98, 110, 113
Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities (Washington State) 66–7
Fanelli, Joseph (Finley lawyer) 13, 70
FBI 6, 29, 70, 89, 91, 129, 143; *and see* Hoover
fear of the Soviet Union, American 80
Fetter, Frank 55
Fifth Amendment 74–5, 77, 89, 96
Finley, Mary (wife of Moses) 24, 94, 121
Finley [Finkelstein], Sir Moses
  and academic politics 102
  American citizenship, gives up 82
  ancestors of, including grandparents 37–9, 40
  books by: *see below*
  British citizen 133
  dismissed by Rutgers University 62–4, 70–1, 79, 82, 130–1
  early and high-school education of 40–1, 43–4, 126
  and educational policy in Britain 102–3
  emigration to Britain of 82
  employment of, non-academic 7, 126
  family members 15, 39–40; *and see* ancestors, parents
  friends of 95-6: *and see* Andrewes, Bowra, Brunt, Garnsey, Hacker, Hopkins, Jones (A. H. M.), Lowenthal, Marcuse, Momigliano, Reinhold, Schiller, Stone, Thorner, Trevor-Roper, Trinkaus, Vidal-Naquet, Whittaker
  higher education of 7, 8, 49–60, 94, 126–7
  historical methods of 52, 115, 131
  idealizes Athenian democracy 109, 122, 141
  intellectual formation of 8–13, 18–19, 40–4, 49–60, 114–15
  Jewishness of 2, 31–48
  journalism of 114, 120; *and see New York Review of Books*
  and material culture 60, 114
  papers of 143 and *passim*
  parents of 8, 15 n., 39
  persecution of 3, 6, 61–78, 79, 82–3, 122
  as polemicist 50, 98, 109–10, 133
  political activities of 5–30, 94, 127–8
  political convictions of 6, 17–18, 101–2, 120–2, 134–5
  The Ancient Economy 31, 44–9, 51, 54, 57, 60, 115–16, 137
  Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology 29, 42, 107
  Democracy Ancient and Modern 4, 93–105, 107, 109, 117, 119
  Politics in the Ancient World 4, 46, 107–22
  Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens 24 n., 51–2, 60, 95
  and see the various groups and institutions with which he was associated (cf. p. 7)
Fogel, Robert 49
Foucault 113
Frankfurt School: *see* Institut für Sozialforschung
freedom 135, 141
  academic 62, 72, 78
  alleged lack of Hebrew word for 45
  essential to the United States 86
Freud 127
Friendly, Alfred (journalist) 120, 135

Garnsey, Peter 102
Geiger, Ted (fellow-student of Finley) 23
General Motors 15

Genovese, Eugene 78, 91
Gingrich, Newt 91
Ginzberg, Eli 42–3
Ginzberg, Louis 42–3
Ginzburg, Baron David (son of the following) 38–9
Ginzburg, Baron Horace (financier and philanthropist) 38–9
Goldschmidt, Walter 18
Gross, Mason (Provost of Rutgers when Finley was dismissed) 78, 96
growth, economic 56, 57
Guthrie, Woody 91
Guttenplan, D. D. 124

Hacker, Louis 15–16
Hammett, Dashiell 88–9
Hansen, Mogens Herman 98, 111
Hardy, Charles 55
Harlan, John Marshall 8–13
Harlan II, John Marshall 13
Harvard University 67, 73–4
Hasebroek, Johannes 1–2, 50
Hebrew School curricula 41
Heichelheim, Fritz 17, 51, 54
Heimlich, Simon (dismissed from Rutgers with Finley) 64, 69–73, 75
Hellman, Lillian 84, 88–92
Hicks, Granville 16–17
Hildesheimerseminar, Berlin 39
Hirschman, Albert O. 80
Hirschman, Ira (member of the NY Board of Higher Education) 6
Hobsbawm, E. 123
Hollywood Ten 68
Holmes, Oliver Wendell 8–9, 12
Hook, Sidney 20, 30, 67, 85
Hoover, J. Edgar 3, 6, 20
Hopkins, Keith 3, 33, 35, 117, 121
Horkheimer, Max 18–19, 29
House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) 67, 75, 89–90
Howe, Irving 35, 84
Hurtado v. California 11

I.F. Stone's Weekly 124, 129, 135
imperialism (ancient) 99–100, 111, 137
Institut für Sozialforschung (Frankfurt School) 7, 18–19, 94
Institute for Social Research: *see* Institut für Sozialforschung
Institute of Historical Research interview 117, 119, 121
Institute of Pacific Relations 95
Internal Security Act (1950) 83
International Congress for Cultural Freedom 30
Ioffe, Berta (aunt of Finley) 39–40
Israel, ancient, social structure of 45–6
Israeli Ministry of Education 39

James, Henry 5 n.
Jewish Theological Seminary (New York) 40, 42–3
von Jhering, Rudolph 115
Johns Hopkins University 87
Joint Association of Classical Teachers (JACT) 103–104
Jones, A. H. M. 32, 35, 97
Jones, Lewis Webster (President of Rutgers when Finley was dismissed) 64, 69, 71–5
Josephus 31–3
Judaea 32

Kazin, Alfred 35
Kessler, David 57–8
Kessler-Harris, A. 3
Keynes, John Maynard 55–6
Konstan, David 115
Kreissig, Heinz 32 n.
Kroeber, A. L. 18
Khrushchev, N. 130

labor law 8–9, 12–13
labor market in antiquity 115–16
land tenure 17–18
Lardner, Ring 84
Laslett, Peter 98
Lattimore, Owen 86–7
Laughlin, Harry ('eugenicist') 22
Leningrad 37, 39
Lerner, Gerda 92
Lerner, Max (journalist) 15–16
Lewis, Naphtali 2
Lipset, Seymour Martin 98
Liva ben Bezalel, Rabbi (Maharal of Prague) 37
Lochner v. New York 9, 12
Locke, Alain 16
Lovejoy, Arthur O. 67
Lovestone-ites 88
Lowenthal (Löwenthal), Leo 18
loyalty oaths 85
Lysenko, Trofim 14

MacMullen, Ramsay 133
Maimon, Salomon (Talmudist and philosopher) 36
Malott, Deane (President of Cornell) 76

Mann, Michael 116
Marcuse, Herbert 18
markets 55, 57–8
Marshall, Alfred 50, 53–4, 57
Marx 5, 15, 23, 42, 50, 51, 127, 129
Marxism 2, 13, 18, 19, 23, 25, 29, 52, 63, 77, 79, 91, 94, 107, 116, 118–21, 129, 131
McCarran Committee: *see* Senate Internal Security Subcommittee
McCarthy, Joseph 16, 68, 81
McCarthyism 3, 23, 61–78, 79–92, 129, 131
McCormick, R. 6 n.
McDonald v. Chicago 11
Meier, Christian 108, 112
Meir of Padua, Rabbi 37
Merton, Robert 16
Meyer, Eduard 51
Mickwitz, Gunnar 24–5, 58
Millar, Sir F. G. B. 35
Miller, Arthur 84
Momigliano, Arnaldo 3, 31–2, 34–5, 37, 40, 42, 47, 108, 114, 123–5, 141
Montgomery, David 91–2
Morris, Ian 134
Morris, Robert (counsel for the McCarran Committee) 62–3
Morrison, Philip 76
Moscow 128, 141
Myers, Fred (Russian War Relief official) 27

Nafissi, Mohammad 51, 118–19, 121, 134
naming names 67–8, 87
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship 27
Navasky, V. 81
Nelson, Benjamin 23, 28
New York Board of Higher Education 65
New York Chamber of Commerce 22
New York City 41–4, 63, 69, 75
New York Review of Books 33, 131
Nicolet, Claude 108
Nixon, Richard 78

Old and New (Soviet film) 13–14
Osborne, R. 57
ostracism 115
Oxford 96

Page, Sir Denys 30
Palmer Raids 3
Partisan Review 85
passports, denial of, to American citizens 83–4
Pecirka, Jan 19 n., 29
Peloponnesian War 99, 132
Pericles 111
Pharisees 32
Plato 138–9
Plessy v. Ferguson 9–11
Plumb, Sir Jack 103
Polanyi, Karl 50–51, 56, 60, 116
politics defined 108–9
poor, the 109–10, 118
popular front 84, 126
Powell v. Pennsylvania 9
progress in historiography 1
psychology, social 19, 110, 112–13

rabbinic ancestry 37, 43
Rabbinic Commission (Russia 1910) 39
racism, the struggle against 16, 29; *and see* civil rights cases
Rahner, Hugo (theologian) 34
Rahv, Philip (co-founder of *Partisan Review*) 35
Rapp-Coudert Committee 65, 69, 75
rationality 58
Rauh, Joseph (lawyer) 85, 89–90
reactionaries 80-1
Reagan, Ronald 3
Reinhold, Meyer 2, 24–5
Robeson, Paul 84
Rockefeller Foundation 74
Roman history 44–7, 108–118, 133
Roman law 13, 114–15
Rosenberg, Ethel and Julius 96, 137
Rostovtzeff, M. I. 1–2, 24, 119
Russia, Russians 29, 38–40, 43; *and see* Soviet Union
Russian War Relief 26–7
Rutgers University 6, 7, 61–4, 69–78, 82, 91, 95–6, 130–1

St. Petersburg 37–9
Saller, Richard 2
Schapiro, Meyer 16
Schechter, Amy (union organizer) 42
Schechter, Frank (law professor) 42–3
Schechter, Solomon 43
Schiller, A. Arthur 7, 114
Schlesinger Jr., Arthur 3 n., 30, 83, 85
Schrecker, Ellen 3–4, 5–6, 82
Schumpeter, Joseph 55–60

Schwartz, Seth 2
Science and Society 25, 121
Seeger, Pete 91
Seligman, E. R. A. 8, 13–14, 52–4, 57, 59–60
Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (SISS) 62–4, 69–71, 73, 75–6, 79, 86–7, 89, 92, 95, 130
Senate Judiciary Committee 62
Seymour, Charles (President of Yale) 67
Sharwood Smith, John (British educator) 103–4
Shaw, Brent 49, 51
Shipley, Ruth (State Department functionary) 84
Shklar, Judith 120
Shlakman, Vera 82
Simon, Herbert 58
Skinner, Quentin 18–19
Smith College 75
Social Sciences Research Council 51–2, 59
Socrates 96, 100–1, 123–5, 128, 131–2, 135–41
Solow, Herbert (journalist) 15
Sombart, Werner 54–5, 58–60
Soviet Union 14, 26–8, 65, 80, 88, 128–30, 135, 141
Stalin 16, 19, 128
Stalinism 16, 81, 84, 88, 91, 129
state, the 113
State Department 83–4
Stern, Bernhard 15–17, 20, 25
Stone, I. F. 5–6, 123–30, 133, 135–41
Struve, Peter (Russian political economist) 14–15
Stuart, John (CPUSA functionary) 28
Supreme Court of the United States 67–8
Sutherland, Arthur (law professor) 73–4
Suwalki (Poland) 38
Syme, Sir Ronald 35, 114
Syracuse University 40, 52, 94

Temin, Peter 57–8
Thompson, W. E. 59
Thorner, Daniel 23
Tompkins, Daniel 3–4, 36, 40, 55, 60, 121
Trevor-Roper, Hugh 30, 97
Trilling, Lionel 16, 84, 87–8
Trinkaus, Charles 23–4
Trotskyists 84, 88
Truman, Harry 84

United States v. Morrison 11 n.

Vatican, Second Council 33
Vavilov, Nikolai (Soviet scientist) 14
Veblen, Thorstein 127
Vidal-Naquet, Pierre 3, 31, 37, 40, 47
Vogt, Joseph 120
Voorhees, Tracy (trustee of Rutgers University) 69–70, 73
Voorhees Committee 69–70

Wald, Alan 82
war 99, 111
Warren, Earl 9, 11
Washington, State and University of 66–7, 71, 75
Weber, Max 25, 45–6, 50, 53, 59, 60, 117, 127, 131
Wellhausen, Julius 17, 31 n., 33 n., 46
West, Allen (Florida politician) 91
Westermann, William 24, 28–9, 94
Whittaker, C. R. 3
Wilde, Oscar 134
Winkler, Richard (journalist) 101
Wise, Rabbi Stephen (political activist) 26
witch-hunts 133
Wittfogel, Karl 63, 95
Wood, John (chair of HUAC) 89
World War II 26, 64–5, 94

Yale University 67
Yates v. United States 13

Zealots 32–3
Zionism 38