Karl Marx's Theses on the Jews and the Necessity of Free Trade: *Zur Judenfrage* (1844)

Matthew Raphael Johnson
2025

The Jews (like the Christians) are fully politically emancipated in various states. Both Jews and Christians are far from being humanly emancipated. Hence there must be a difference between political and human emancipation (Karl Marx, The Holy Family, *1844).*

Marxism has always been a Jewish movement. This makes the present essay on a young Karl Marx writing on the Jews a very difficult work to interpret. His essay was written five years before the *Communist Manifesto* was first published. What he says about the Jews and their relation to capitalism is historically accurate, but some of his statements are today only made by National Socialists and their allies. As Postmodern socialism is vehemently against any antisemitism, "The Jewish Question," sticks out as a huge problem for them, thus it's either ignored or interpreted out of existence.

Karl Marx was Jewish and the grandson of a rabbi. He knew the role of his people in the creation of revolution long before socialism. It is important to recall the role of capitalism and free trade as necessary for any future revolution in that it destroys religion, ethnicity, tradition and the guilds. The Jewish mentality created the mercantile spirit, and its next stage in development was their total domination in socialism. In 1843, Marx wrote "The Jewish Question *(Judenfrage)"* primarily to stress the Jewish role in bringing mercantile life to the apex of society.

A huge portion of the literature on Karl Marx's *Zur Judenfrage* has been written by Jews, and thus, most of the interpretations offered are a laughable parody of scholarship. Their writings on this topic are self-serving and distorted, never once asking if Marx's characterization of the Jews was true, only that it is "antisemitic." After all, Marxism is one of the official ideologies of the western European university and hence, it must be cleansed of any association with "retrograde" ideas.

Marx's aim in this paper was to defend the full civil and political emancipation of Germany's Jews, or so it is said. This is a strange thing to advocate since Jews did not consider themselves Germans, did not speak German and in fact, saw the population around them as *goyim;* cattle to be exploited. Jews were a highly privileged and wealthy minority in pre-unification Germany. Hence, the debate over "emancipation" was contrived and created for an ignorant gentile audience. Emancipation in reality meant that Jews, being far better organized and operating from a different moral playbook, would rule society entirely, creating it into a mass of "animals," as Moses Hess put it.

The target of Marx's critique was the well-known weirdo atheist Bruno Bauer, who was not Jewish. In the previous year Bauer had written an essay also called *The Jewish Question,* in which he argued that Jews had to "give up their Judaism if they were to become worthy of equal rights," or that's how Hal Draper put it. However, all of this turns on what the term "Judaism" means. By itself, it is hardly descriptive, as it can either refer to a culture, an ethnicity or a religion; by itself, it says nothing. Some of the more naive gentile writers still think it's just a "different church" than everyone else, but the religious aspects of the group are certainly secondary to their ethnic cohesion. Judaism is a rejection of *Logos*. Bauer's problem was that he

saw Judaism as a religion.

In Marx's view, Bauer's initial error was his failure to distinguish between "political emancipation" and "human emancipation." Political emancipation in a modern state does not require Jews to renounce anything, it only removes formal restrictions on their behavior. Only a complete and revolutionary "human emancipation" would involve the disappearance of religion (and ethnicity) entirely, but that is not yet possible "within the hitherto existing world order." Lenin would later show what that would mean in practice, as the Jews persecuted the Orthodox church in the most violent and systematic way possible.

Bauer, according to Marx in this essay, confused these two types of emancipation. Political emancipation did not require the abolition of religion any more than it required the abolition of the other conditions of civil society, such as private property or the right to vote. The modern political state liberated those conditions of civil society from political control, thus allowing them to flourish in an unencumbered way in private life (Peled, 471). "Private" is meant as "private sector," that is, outside of the state.

In Hegel's view, the state and civil society were two different worlds, the latter finding its completion in the former. It was only when the state (a term used equivocally), in Marx's early view, would absorb civil society to itself could the start of human emancipation take place. Both Hegel and Marx believed that a state separate from civil society is a form of alienation. The next step in the revolution would dispense with ethnicity and religion altogether. Marx writes in "The Jewish Question:"

> The *decomposition* of man into Jew and citizen, Protestant and citizen, religious man and citizen, is neither a deception directed against citizenship, nor is it a circumvention of political emancipation, it is *political emancipation itself,* the *political* method of emancipating oneself from religion. Of course, in periods when the political state as such is born violently out of civil society, when political liberation is the form in which men strive to achieve their liberation, the state can and must go as far as the *abolition of religion,* the *destruction of religion.* But it can do so only in the same way that it proceeds to the abolition of private property, to the maximum, to confiscation, to progressive taxation, just as it goes as far as the abolition of life, the *guillotine* (italics in the original).

Jews, upon "political emancipation," will dominate the state through money. Taken to its end, there would be no more a Jewish community than there would be a Christian one. There would only be alienated individuals with their own private religious illusions. This also means Jewish economic practices would no longer be restricted.

Marx agreed with his teacher Ludwig Feuerbach that religion is a human construct reflecting human conditions, but analyzed in historical, not abstract terms. He saw religion as both an expression of suffering and a protest against it. In his 1843 essay "Critique of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right,"* Marx sought to distance himself from Young Hegelians like Bauer, whose religion-focused critique could not be a solution to suffering without a transformative critique of society that leads to mass violence. A critique of religion would be ineffective without changing the real social conditions of which religion is only an expression. Infamously, Marx wrote: "Religious suffering is, at one and the same time, the expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people."

In other words, the violent abolition of religion as the "illusory happiness of the people" is the demand for their real happiness, hence giving socialism its "mandate." To call on them to

give up their illusions about their condition is to call on them to give up a condition that requires illusions. This became the justification for the Jewish mass murders in the USSR.

Marx was a devotee of free trade because it destroyed national boundaries and created an alienated proletariat without a country. Marx believed that any German was "backward" who advocated tariffs for the sake of preserving German (or Prussian) sovereignty. The French and British Revolutions abolished the restraints on man's passions instituted in Christianity. This means that the bourgeois revolutions "allowed the rapacious capitalists to gain the upper hand and oppress the poor in a way unknown when Christianity was the source of the social order," as E. Michael Jones wrote in 2014.

By the time *Zur Judenfrage* was written, the evils of capitalism and the factory system were too great to ignore; it was indefensible. Still, Marx was a young man and his ideology had not reached full coherence. Marx exploded onto the scene with Rothschild money to ensure that only the international version of socialism became the only alternative to capitalism. Prior to that, the Christian and idealist socialism was found in ethnonationalism. In 2025, many are dusting off library copies of *Capital* because they've been told that Marx is the only alternative to capitalism, and the two systems are "opposites."

Marx and his followers favored the proletariat because it would bring about "the dissolution of the existing social order," whereas economic nationalism (represented by List, Herder, Mueller and Fichte in Germany and the monarchy and the Slavophiles in Russia) would strive to preserve that order from the inroads of predatory British free trade and the imperialism which necessarily followed from it. The proletariat as a sociological group derives from those leaving the village to find work in the growing cities during and after the industrial revolution. They were often alone, alienated, surrounded by new temptations and cut off from all that made them a human being. He owned nothing, so he had to rent his own body out as a worker. This level of alienation Marx sought for all humanity, since it was necessary for the socialist revolution to take place at all. Men with a strong sense of ethnicity and religion do not fight for socialism.

English Protestant capitalism was itself revolutionary. Marx saw the proletariat as the vanguard of his revolution because it was an abstraction, one on which could be infused with whatever meaning Marx and the Left wanted to project onto it. Their level of alienation made them a perfect candidate, though for the most part, even that failed. This had nothing to do with their well being or status, only that they were vulnerable.

Because of Marx, the reaction against British capitalism – socialism – became Jewish, which meant it possessed a visceral hatred Christianity. Yet it was Christianity that prevented the Darwinian or Hobbesian domination of the rich over the poor. Marx asked in the *Judenfrage:* "What is the worldly cult of the Jew, huckstering. What is his worldly god? Money." Marx then conferred on the proletarian a new identity as rootless cipher with no homeland, while at the same time conferring on the Jew a sense of his ethnic cohesion. Engels was aware that the first and most obvious result of Europe's "emancipation" from the Christian order was the exploitation of the poor by the rich, who now had been "emancipated" from any duty towards labor. Marx (taking from his teacher Moses Hess) was convinced that the destruction of Christianity would lead to a future paradise, the ultimate Jewish fantasy of heaven on earth, via *tikkun olam.*

Marx argues that the "Jewish religion" is merely the spiritual reflection of Jewish economic life. In this he is correct, as the religious elements of Judaism are secondary to its ethnic component, and that has become a part of its mercantile and revolutionary existence. This is the starting point of a complex argument that draws on the historical choice of the Jew as a

financially able huckster and posits a special connection between Judaism as a religion and the economy of contemporary bourgeois society.

Marx openly supported free trade precisely because it would increase the misery of the worker:

> Generally speaking, the Protective system in these days is conservative, while the Free Trade system works destructively. It breaks up old nationalities and carries antagonism of proletarian and bourgeoisie to the uttermost point. In a word, the Free Trade system hastens the Social Revolution. In the revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favor of free trade.

In order to emancipate the working class "as human beings," Marx needed to destroy the tattered remnants of the social order which were still protecting them. That meant destroying private property, the family, religion and, most importantly, ethnicity and race. The same thought is found in Engels, who seems far too optimistic:

> The great mass of proletarians are, by their very nature, free from national prejudices and their whole disposition and movement is essentially humanitarian, anti-nationalist. Only the proletarians can destroy nationality, only the awakening proletariat can bring about fraternization between the different nations (from Jones, Barren Metal).

This is what the "Jewish Question" was arguing. Jews, who monopolize the writing on this issue, cannot see it, but that is because they are blinded by ethnic self-interest. For example, Hal Draper, a Jew who tries to obfuscate the issue, wrote:

> [Bauer's] core argument was this: that as long as Jews remain Jewish, they are too consumed by Jewish self-interest and communalism to be worthy of full citizenship. In effect, Bauer was calling for opposition to the nascent movement for Jewish emancipation in Germany. His long essay was replete with anti-Semitic themes: if Jews were ill-treated in the Christian world, they provoked this mistreatment by their obstinacy; Jews were not hated because they were misunderstood since true understanding ought to lead to hatred; Jews had lost interest in the progress of man and concentrated entirely on personal advantage; Jews had evolved no moral principle from their suffering; and so forth.

Bauer was merely describing the present state of Jews in Germany. "Citizenship" for Marx was still an element of alienation. Draper might have convinced himself this is "antisemitic," but that is not contrary to historical truth. They were poorly treated from time to time in Christian societies due to usury, monopoly, their control over the alcohol trade and underselling in business. This is not a personal opinion, this is an unfortunate fact.

Draper mutilates Marx's meaning by saying

> While Bauer echoed the generally prejudicial *[sic]* representation of the Jew as "merchant" and "money-man," Marx's riposte was that in the modern world "money has become a world power and the practical spirit of the Jews has become the practical spirit of the Christian peoples." In other words, why pick on the Jews? If the practical spirit of Judaism is moneymaking, as Bauer suggests,

> this hardly distinguishes Jews from the great array of non-Jewish entrepreneurs, merchants and bankers who have risen to ascendancy in contemporary society. The idea that the Jew is fundamentally more rooted in money making than the Christian is as wrong-headed as the idea that the Jew is less eligible for civil and political rights. Historically, it is true that many Jews played a significant role as middlemen – between landowners and tenants, state and tax payers, capital and consumers – and that a few Jews (like the Rothschild family) played a significant role as international bankers; but Marx insisted that this progressive role played by Jews in the development of capitalism was coming to an end and the practical spirit of money-making was as general as the growth of nation states, national banks and national capital.

It's unclear whether Draper (and he speaks for much of the literature on the topic) just doesn't know, or is deliberately distorting the issue. Jews *created* the modern commercial state. No matter what city or region is analyzed, Jews came to control a huge share of its mercantile trade, using debt to take large chunks of property to themselves. For him to call this "prejudicial" is laughable, since this has been the direct experience of millions from Spain to Russia. International banking was controlled by the Rothschild family. Pretending they were just one of many is also dishonest. It also means that any Marxist would have to look very closely at Jewish capital, since so much of it was concentrated and under their control. Yet, given socialism's heavily Jewish makeup, that was impossible.

Thus, the "Jewish religion" does not need to disappear in society, as Bauer argues, because it is actually a "natural" part of it. This makes sense only if by "religion," he means the economic and ethnic existence of predatory Talmudists. Marx equated "practical Judaism" with "huckstering and money," he then concludes, that "the Christians have become Jews," and, ultimately, it is mankind (both Christians and Jews) that needs to emancipate itself from this "practical Judaism." Marx too was reflecting reality.

This is just another way of saying that the Jews leveraged their financial power to alter the basic moral code of the societies in which they lived. They were the revolutionary core whether capitalist or socialist. Their dishonest business tactics (see below) forced gentiles to respond in kind until the society became a commercial one, not a moral one. This is not a "prejudice," it is historical fact. Jews have been removed from 109 cities, nations and empires since the fall of Rome. Their dishonest huckstering, without exception, was a key reason.

The specific Jewish occupations, hence the specific Jewish spirit as well, have been generalized throughout the Christian world. Draper says "there is no longer any economic basis for distinguishing between Jew and Gentile, hence no room for legal discrimination between them." Indeed, the Judaization of society has enabled the Jews to emancipate themselves in a Jewish way, that is, practically; all that remains is to put the official stamp of legality on this situation. The key element is that the influence of the Jews created the present situation.

Furthermore, any persecution – invariably from Jewish behavior – would also benefit them, since it would give an even greater impetus to their cohesion, their ultimate weapon. Hence, some persecution is absolutely necessary for modern Judaism. All the restrictions on Jews in Europe came from their own behavior. First it was dishonest business, then it was violent revolutionary action.

The differential treatment of non-Jews in Jewish commercial law resulted in the complete transformation of the idea of commerce generally towards free trade. Jews could charge interest to strangers (that is, the *goyim*), but not to each other. This means that the modern profit-seeking egoism derives in part from the Jewish conception of their law concerning non-Jews. Clearly,

intercourse with strangers could not but loosen the bonds of personal duties and replace them by economic freedom. Such a mentality was entirely foreign to Christian Europe in the Middle Ages (see below).Yet, this has escaped these Jewish writers.

Hyam Maccoby, another Jew, argued that "On the Jewish Question" is an example of Marx's "early antisemitism." According to him, Marx argues that the modern commercialized world is the triumph of Judaism, a pseudo-religion whose god is money. Maccoby suggested that Marx was "embarrassed" by his Jewish background and used Jews as a "yardstick of evil," though he offers no evidence of this, nor does he say if it was true or false. His paper is mostly an emotional rejection of any historical description of the Jews as powerful capitalists. It is emotional since facts are nowhere to be found.

If Marx was anti-capitalist, then it would be difficult to be philosemitic, again, since Jews controlled so much wealth. After all, the wealthiest Jews tended to be Talmudic scholars, or at least financed them. Werner Sombart wrote in (1911) *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*:

> The most learned Talmudists were also the cleverest financiers, medical men, jewelers, merchants. We are told, for example, of some of the Spanish Ministers of Finance, bankers and court physicians that they devoted to the study of the Holy Writ not only the Sabbath day but also two nights of each week (Sombart, 133).

The intellectual alchemy which transformed Karl Marx into an antisemite as well as a Jewish revolutionary is strange at first, but it makes sense given the intellectual context of western Europe. The same Enlightenment – which dissolved all customs and religious beliefs – when applied to Christianity, reduced Judaism to its essence as rejection of *Logos* culminating in revolution. The German Enlightenment, in other words, gave birth to the Jewish revolutionary spirit in an especially virulent form when it made contact with Jews who felt that their own religious tradition had been discredited. From then on, Judaism was ethnicity.

During the 1830s and 1840s Marx succumbed to the same intellectual process which created the *Maskilim* (the activists of the Jewish enlightenment) of his father's generation in Prussia. Then the Jewish settlements to the east would eventually transform the *shtetls* of west Russia into a hotbed of Jewish revolutionary activity which would bring about the first Marxist state; one that immediately persecuted Orthodoxy. When the German Enlightenment made contact with Jews, it led to assimilation in the first generation and socialism in the second (cf. Jones, *Barren Metal,* 2014).

Christianity did not dissolve, as Bauer had anticipated, into a "universal human consciousness," but it dissolved into the mercantile spirit of Judaism. In that context, Christians were, therefore equally capable of becoming "emancipated." Both were entitled, as egoistic, alienated individuals, to the negative freedom of civil society; both would attain true freedom only in a society liberated from Judaism, that is, from "the preconditions of huckstering." This is a nice way of saying that the Jews took over the morals of society and perverted it in their direction.

Marx continues in "The Jewish Question:"

> The Christian state can behave towards the Jew only in the way characteristic of the Christian state – that is, by granting privileges, by permitting the separation of the Jew from the other subjects, but making him feel the pressure of all the other separate spheres of society, and feel it all the more intensely because he is in

> religious opposition to the dominant religion. But the Jew, too, can behave towards the state only in a Jewish way – that is, by treating it as something alien to him, by counterposing his imaginary nationality to the real nationality, by counterposing his illusory law to the real law, by deeming himself justified in separating himself from mankind, by abstaining on principle from taking part in the historical movement, by putting his trust in a future which has nothing in common with the future of mankind in general, and by seeing himself as a member of the Jewish people, and the Jewish people as the chosen people.

This is only when Judaism was a religious doctrine, but there is much truth here. The "Jewish way" is to see the *goyim* as themselves aliens that, at best, need to be led to true Enlightenment by the nose, or at worst, destroyed. The state in Germany was a Lutheran one, so the Jews, seeing themselves as both separate and superior, can only be granted privileges, not abstract "rights." Since they functioned in civil society, it was also irrelevant.

Marx asks "What constitutes liberty?" He then quotes the French Revolutionary "Rights of Man," specifically article VI: "Liberty is the power which man has to do everything that does not harm the rights of others," or, according to the Declaration of the Rights of Man of 1791: "Liberty consists in being able to do everything which does not harm others." The revolutionaries had a defective conception of freedom that today is taken for granted; they merely defined it as an absence of restraint. Marx and other revolutionaries refused to countenance the notion that it was the removal of Christian principles (the restraint) that permitted the explosion of greed that empowered a new class of capitalist oligarchs.

Then Marx writes:

> The political revolution which overthrew this *[feudal]* sovereign power and raised state affairs to become affairs of the people, which constituted the political state as a matter of general concern, that is, as a real state, necessarily smashed all estates, corporations, guilds and privileges, since they were all manifestations of the separation of the people from the community. The political *[French]* revolution thereby *abolished the political character of civil society.* It broke up civil society into its simple component parts; on the one hand, the *individuals*; on the other hand, the *material* and *spiritual* elements constituting the content of the life and social position of these individuals. It set free the political spirit, which had been, as it were, split up, partitioned, and dispersed in the various blind alleys of feudal society. . . But, the completion of the idealism of the state was at the same time the completion of the materialism of civil society. Throwing off the political yoke meant at the same time throwing off the bonds which restrained the egoistic spirit of civil society.

There, Marx comes close to the truth. "Political emancipation" really means the overthrow of the French monarchy and the church that went with it. Marx states that this destruction of the estates and guilds also set free man's ego, which led to materialism, which was a needed step on the road to revolution. These "rights of man" were mere abstractions, but still, a necessity for their time. He puts it this way: "Hence, man was not freed from religion, he received religious freedom. He was not freed from property, he received freedom to own property. He was not freed from the egoism of business, he received freedom to engage in business."

Socialism requires the active destruction of religion, not just its banishing to the private arena of civil society. “Human emancipation” doesn't have a state at all, and certainly doesn't refer to abstractions such as “rights.” Everything else is just one step closer to the revolution.

The removal of all barriers to free trade in commodities also applies to labor. Total freedom in the labor market leads to general competition among the workers by necessity. The highest degree of general competition must with the same necessity drive the workers' wages down to the lowest possible level. This is the goal of free trade. It leads to pure misery and according to Marx, revolution.

Since the proletarian owns nothing but his body, he must rent it out for a wage. Freedom here then is just a hoax, because he lacks the resources which capital provides to the upper classes, and deprived of the protection for labor that unions provide by the ongoing campaign of demonization in the press, the worker stands entirely alone against the forces which capitalism has unleashed to destroy him. Marx writes in what is probably the most infamous passage of this essay:

> Let us consider the actual, worldly Jew – not the *Sabbath* [religious] Jew, as Bauer does, but the *everyday Jew.* Let us not look for the secret of the Jew in his religion, but let us look for the secret of his religion in the real Jew. What is the secular basis of Judaism? *Practical* need, *self-interest.* What is the worldly religion of the Jew? *Huckstering*. What is his worldly God? *Money*. . . An organization of society which would abolish the preconditions for huckstering, and therefore the possibility of huckstering, would make the Jew impossible. . . We recognize in Judaism, therefore, a general anti-social element of the present time, an element which through historical development – to which in this harmful respect the Jews have zealously contributed – has been brought to its present high level, at which it must necessarily begin to disintegrate. In the final analysis, the *emancipation of the Jews* is the emancipation of mankind from *Judaism*. The Jew has emancipated himself in a Jewish manner, not only because he has acquired financial power, but also because, through him and also apart from him, money has become a world power and the practical Jewish spirit has become the practical spirit of the Christian nations. The Jews have emancipated themselves insofar as the Christians have become Jews (from Part II, italics in the original).

For Marx, Judaism is inherently in the service of Mammon, and a Christian is any non-Jewish member of a Christian state. Because Jews have poisoned the Christian well, Christians are also materialists, hence, “Christians have become Jews.” “Emancipation,” because it is based on an abstraction, would unleash pure huckstering on a society. Rights are abstract, the “real Jew” is not. Marx continues:

> The monotheism of the Jew, therefore, is in reality the polytheism of the many [physical] needs, a polytheism which makes even the lavatory an object of divine law [the Talmud]. Practical need, egoism, is the principle of civil society, and as such appears in pure form as soon as civil society has fully given birth to the political state. The god of practical need and self-interest is money. Money is the jealous god of Israel, in face of which no other god may exist. Money degrades all the gods of man – and turns them into commodities. Money is the universal self-established value of all things. It has, therefore, robbed the whole world – both the world of men and nature – of its specific value. Money is the estranged essence of

> man's work and man's existence, and this alien essence dominates [the Jew], and he worships it. The god of the Jews has become secularized and has become the god of the world. The bill of exchange is the real god of the Jew. His god is only an illusory bill of exchange. The view of nature attained under the domination of private property and money is a real contempt for, and practical debasement of, nature; in the Jewish religion, nature exists, it is true, but it exists only in imagination.

These are the two quotations that are cited by Nationalists and conservatives in the few times *Zur Judenfrage* is ever mentioned. Marx has shown here that, Judaism is not a theological relic of the past, Jews as revolutionaries were actually the carriers of the most "dynamic spirit of the present," the spirit of practical rationality and private gain. In other words, British free trade, oligarchy and imperialism.

Yet, Jewish behavior, "huckstering," was alien to the Christian Europe of the Middle Ages. Part of the point here is that the Jews introduced practices that today are taken for granted, but in years past were unheard of. Dishonest competition and underselling were largely foreign to the cities of northern Europe. Sombart says, summarizing the mentality of the non-capitalist economics of the Medieval world:

> To take away your neighbor's customers was contemptible, unchristian, and immoral. A rule for *Merchants Who Trade in Commodities* was: "Turn no man's customers away from him, either by word of mouth or by letter, and do not to another what you would not have another do to you." It was, however, more than a rule; it became an ordinance, and is met with over and over again. In Mayence its wording was as follows: "No one shall prevent another from buying, or by offering a higher price make a commodity dearer, on pain of losing his purchase; no one shall interfere in another's business undertaking, or carry on his own on so large a scale as to ruin other traders." In Saxony it was much. the same. "No shopkeeper shall call away the customers from another's shop, nor shall he by signs or motions keep them from buying" (Sombart, 88).

Stability, not profit, was the goal. This was the ideal in European commerce. Not even advertising was permitted less one producer was granted an unfair advantage. He cites a huge number of local laws and statutes in his book, but, as Jews became wealthier, more numerous and more powerful, they were able to uproot this system by example. This was Marx's response to Bauer. For Marx, the feudal must give way to the mercantile, or the capitalist. It was a necessary step in the revolution before socialism could even be considered. Jews were a central element to both transitions.

It is important to understand how the Jews revolutionized Europe. While not exclusively a Jewish concern, they were the core of the new society of "private gain." Werner Sombart describes the mercantile world before Jewish domination:

> Producer and trader should receive sufficient for their need. One outstanding result of this principle was strictly to circumscribe each man's activity in his locality. Competition was therefore quite out of the question. In his own sphere a man might work as he willed — when, how, where — in accordance with tradition and custom. But to cast a look at his neighbor's sphere — that he was forbidden to

> do. Just as the peasant received his holding — so much field, with pasture and woodland, as would keep him and his family, just as he never even dreamed of adding to his possessions, so, too, the craftsman and the merchant were to rest content with their portions and never covet their neighbor's. The peasant had his land, the town-dweller his customers: in either case they were the source whence sprang his livelihood; in either case they were of a size sufficient for the purpose. Hence, the trader had to be assured of his custom, and many were the ordinances which guarded him against competition. Besides, it was commercial etiquette (Sombart, 87-88).

It was a non-acquisitive society at its root. A foreign and alien element added the revolutionary views that would destroy that, the Jews and their radical Protestant creation.

Showing some of his Hegelian influence, Marx writes near the end of Part II of *Zur Judenfrage:*

> Christianity is the sublime thought of Judaism, Judaism is the common practical application of Christianity, but this application could only become general after Christianity as a developed religion had completed theoretically the estrangement of man from himself and from nature. Only then could Judaism achieve universal dominance and make alienated man and alienated nature into alienable, vendible objects subjected to the slavery of egoistic need and to trading. Selling is the practical aspect of alienation. Just as man, as long as he is in the grip of religion, is able to objectify his essential nature only by turning it into something alien, something fantastic, so under the domination of egoistic need he can be active practically, and produce objects in practice, only by putting his products, and his activity, under the domination of an alien being, and bestowing the significance of an alien entity – money – on them.

Marx is suggesting that profit seeking at the expense of another was a Jewish practice that quickly spread to the rest of society, as Sombart has shown above. Religion is inherently alienating since it involves the “transferring” of man's essence elsewhere, an idea taken from Feuerbach. For the Jews, that essence was money, and this was the god of Judaism then and now. Once their dominance reached a critical mass, suddenly, Protestantism (especially Calvinism), made money making almost a commandment. The scientific revolution, coming from alchemy and the Kabbalah, posited man as ruling nature, not as a part of it. The Jews took control of Christianity, to a great extent, through the revolution of Calvin and the Puritans. Marx wrote:

> In its perfected practice, Christian egoism of heavenly bliss is necessarily transformed into the corporal egoism of the Jew, heavenly need is turned into world need, subjectivism into self-interest. We explain the tenacity of the Jew not by his religion, but, on the contrary, by the human basis of his religion – practical need, egoism. Since in civil society the real nature of the Jew has been universally realized and secularized, civil society could not convince the Jew of the unreality of his religious nature, which is indeed only the ideal aspect of practical need.

At the time, Judaism was still seen as a theology. Marx came to realize that once that was jettisoned, the Jew can come out of his separation and dominate the society, creating the

conditions for the "immiseration" of the workers. Marx correctly realized that the Jewish religion had no resemblance to the Old Testament (which banned usury and mercantilism), but only the later Babylonian Talmud and a few other sources. The Talmud, more or less, came from the Jew's economic position and needs. It should remain in spirit, but the endless traditions and rules should be jettisoned.

The reason why many Jews condemn *Zur Judenfrage* as an "antisemitic" document is because it is an accurate portrayal of the Machiavellian economic thought and action of the Jews among gentiles. The overwhelmingly Jewish authors who deal with his paper often cannot contain their emotion, so their evidence, as mentioned above, is quite scarce.

Yet, the history remains. The Jew challenged the moral economy of Christian Europe, introducing the competitive element taken for granted today. These things were the origin (but not the entirety) of the endless complains raised against him. Sombart writes:

> Now in a community where quality was regulated, the only effective means of achieving this end *[economic dominance]* was price-cutting. We shall therefore not be surprised to find the Jews availing themselves of this weapon, and we shall see that it was just this that made them so disliked among Christian traders, whose economic outlook was all for maintaining prices. The Jew undersells; the Jew spoils prices; the Jew tries to attract customers by low prices — that was the burden of the complaints heard in the 17th and 18th centuries wherever Jews did business (ibid, 101).

One of the most common complaints against the Jews economically was underselling, something totally unknown among Christian merchants within the guild system. The very notion that a seller or manufacturer should try to destroy the business of others was outrageous, and not a normal part of European economic practice. Christian men, by natural law, had the right and duty to earn a living by honest labor. By the time Charles Darwin justified the "survival of the fittest," it became the norm. Sombart writes:

> The Swedish Parliament in 1815 debated the question whether the Jews should be allowed entire liberty of trade, and one of the chief reasons which prevailed against the motion was that Jews lowered prices. From Poland the same strains reach us. Jews tell Christian traders that if they (the latter) sold their goods as cheaply as the Jews, they too would attract customers. It is no different in Germany. From Brandenburg (1672), from Frankfort (17th century), from Madgeburg (1710) the old story is repeated. A Wallachian traveler in Germany about the same time reports the ubiquity of this accusation. The General Prussian Edict of 1750 takes cognizance of it. "The merchants of our towns. . . complain that the Jewish traders who sell the same goods do them great harm, because they sell at a lower price." Right up to the 19th century it is still met with. In the Supplication of the Augsburg wholesale merchants against the admission of the Jews (1803) we may read that "the Jews understand how to derive advantages from the general depression of trade. They obtain goods from people who need money badly at shameful prices, and then spoil the market by selling them at a cheaper rate." In many branches of industry Christian manufacturers and merchants even to-day regard the cutting of prices by Jews as a serious endangering of their trade. That this is an open secret and often enough discussed,

is well known (Sombart, 102).

As is so often the case, the evil drove out the good because the good was difficult, and the evil was well organized. The moral economy gave way to capitalism and free trade, two necessary stages before the Jewish Left can take over entirely, because the ego was set free. Passions were given free rein and called “freedom.”

The problem in 2025 is that, while academics continue to claim that any complaints against Jews were for “no reason ”or because the *goyim* were “jealous,” when someone of Marx's stature shows that Jewish economic dishonesty was the norm, Jews need to either dismiss it as “antisemitic raving,” or try to reinterpret it beyond reason.

On the practical level, how could the Jews afford underselling? First, these goods were taken by dishonest means. In Russia, the Jews were expert smugglers and functioned as a mafia organization. Second, from the “fire sales” which occurred after a debtor had been liquidated. In addition, another complaint stated that the goods peddled by these Jews were of inferior quality, using advertising and PR to manipulate the buyer. The Jews acted as a criminal mafia in every society in which they've been found. The only thing that keeps that from being known is their control over the press and the legal profession, all brought about by “political emancipation.”

Bakunin is an interesting case in point, as he, along with Proudhon and Kropotkin, was the father of anarchism. In his *Study on the German Jews* he wrote:

> The Jewish sect constitutes a veritable power in Europe. It reigns despotically in commerce and banking, and it has invaded three-quarters of German journalism and a very considerable part of the journalism of other countries. Then woe to him who makes the mistake of displeasing it! (quoted disapprovingly in Draper, 1977: 293).

This is also a correct assessment. Once Bakunin realized Marx and Engels were on the Rothschild payroll, so to speak, he realized why Marxism was synonymous with “socialism” in the world. Marx was financed by elite outside sources in Britain, making a mockery of his theory that stated such cooperation was impossible. If an activist truly believes in equality or socialism, he cannot ignore the Jews. Neither Proudhon or Bakunin avoided the Jewish question, despite their pristine Leftist credentials. Bakunin wrote:

> Himself a Jew, Marx has around him, in London and France, but especially in Germany, a multitude of more or less clever, intriguing, mobile, speculating Jews, such as Jews are everywhere: commercial or banking agents, writers, politicians, correspondents for newspapers of all types, with one foot in the bank, the other in the socialist movement, and with their behinds sitting on the German daily press — they have taken possession of all the newspapers — and you can imagine what kind of sickening literature they produce. Now, this entire Jewish world, which forms a single profiteering sect, a people of bloodsuckers, a single gluttonous parasite, closely and intimately united not only across national borders but across all differences of political opinion — this Jewish world today stands for the most part at the disposal of Marx and at the same time at the disposal of Rothschild. . . This may seem strange. What can there be in common between Communism and the large banks? The Communism of Marx seeks enormous centralization in the state, and where such exists, there must inevitably be a central state bank, and

> where such a bank exists, the parasitic Jewish nation, which. speculates on the work of the people, will always find a way to prevail (Bakunin, 1871: 204-216).

This sort of language terrifies Jewish intellectuals, since no one can deny that these men were founders and leaders of radical Leftist movements. Leftist antisemitism is a Jew's nightmare. The problem was that, if someone were opposed to significant concentrations of capital in the name of equality, and left out the huge role of the Jews in such concentrations, he'd be lying. In the USSR, oligarchs such as the Ginzburg family which controlled the infamous Lena gold mines, were granted high positions in the "worker's paradise." They became "proletarians," but they kept their millions, showing how meaningless those terms were to the USSR and to Marx himself; showing what Marxism really was.

Anarchism, also mostly a Jewish ideology, is absurd, like determinism or materialism. It is nothing but a negation of what exists (or what the present is constructed to be). It has nothing upon which to build a "new society." It is largely a handful of Jewish intellectuals with edgy teens in the street, burning cars due to "racism." The truth is that any weakening of central power anywhere means that oligarchs and local strongmen take over, not the abstraction of "the people." This is an iron law. The collapse of the state leads to a far worse form of domination in oligarchy. This has been seen all over the globe under many differing circumstances. Marxism has the same problem, which explains why National Socialism actually produced a labor-based society while the international socialist states did not. It actually did what the Left only promised.

Moses Hess, who synthesized Jewish nationalism and internationalist socialism, wrote in his (1845) "Essence of Money," one year after Marx's essay was published:

> The Jews had the world-historic mission in the natural history of the social animal world of *developing the beast of prey out of man;* they have finally fulfilled their mission. The mystery of Judaism and Christianity has been made public in the modern Jewish-Christian world of shopkeepers. The mystery of the blood of Christ, like the mystery of the *old Jewish blood cult,* appears here finally completely unveiled as the mystery of the *beast of prey*. . . In the modern Jewish-Christian world of shopkeepers this bent and drive of the social animal world no longer comes out either symbolic or mystic but as wholly prosaic. . . In face of money kings are no longer entitled to conquer as the lions of the animal-men. . . Rather have they only the right, like the other *animal-men,* arising from common natural right, from their common quality of beasts of prey, bloodsuckers, Jews, *money-wolves* (italics mine).

Hess, in a twisted way, equates the Eucharist with its negation, the sacrifice of workers to the industrial machine. He is more than aware, however, that Christianity had nothing to do with this transformation; it was in fact, transformed by his people. Like Marx, he only refers to "Christians" as a group that had already been made over by Jewish power. These are not theological terms for either of them. This competitive and Darwinian spirit is the creation of the Jews, and their role is to reduce all men to the animal level, since animals can be trained, from this, socialism can be built. A "mass" of animalistic, bloodthirsty men is what they mean by the "masses of the people." Labor has nothing to do with any of this except as a cheap prop to justify the takeover of society by "hucksters."

The founder of anarchism, PJ Proudhon (the first to utter the phrase "property is theft" and coined the term "anarchist"), said this about the Jews, though this was only in a note to

himself:

> Write an article against this race that poisons everything by sticking its nose into everything without ever mixing with any other people. Demand its expulsion from France with the exception of those individuals married to French women. Abolish synagogues and not admit them to any employment. Demand its expulsion. Finally, pursue the abolition of this religion. It's not without cause that the Christians called them deicides. The Jew is the enemy of mankind. They must be sent back to Asia or be exterminated. Heine, Weill and others are nothing but secret spies; Rothschild, Crémieux, Marx, Fould, wicked, bilious, envious, bitter, etc. etc. beings who hate us. The Jew must disappear by steel or by fusion or by expulsion. Tolerate the elderly who no longer have children.
> Work to be done: What the peoples of the Middle Ages hated instinctively I hate upon reflection and irrevocably. The hatred of the Jew like the hatred of the English should be our first article of political faith. Moreover, the abolition of Judaism will come with the abolition of other religions. Begin by not allocating funds to the clergy and leaving this to religious offerings. And then, a short while later, abolish the religion (Proudhon, December 26, 1847).

This means that the four most important leaders and founders of the socialist Left in the 19th century by far: Proudhon, Marx, Hess and Bakunin, all have come to the same conclusions regarding the role of Jews in capitalism and their takeover of public morals. The royalists were correct in essentially repeating their statements. For Hess and Marx, the way ahead was to increase the power of the "money-wolves," reduce the proletariat to hopeless poverty, and then take advantage of their alienation to take over the "mass" of "animals" entirely.

Proudhon understood what the Jewish mind truly was and refused to sanction any kind of "emancipation." Proudhon came very close to defining anarchism as "freedom from usury." Bakunin wasn't too far off this, but was also concerned with its control over the International. Marx had both Proudhon and Bakunin thrown out of the First International in a fit of rage described well by Paul Johnson in his *Intellectuals*.

In other words, Marx's "The Jewish Question" comes down to the destruction of Christianity that is required for the socialist revolution to take place. Free Trade and capitalism – Jewish "huckstering" – is essential for the later proletarian revolution. This, for Marx, is "emancipation."

Around a century later, the Postmodern Left – the dominant ideology of today's western world – abandoned the working class altogether. They finally dropped the facade of labor equality, proving it was all smoke and mirrors. Oligarchy was perfectly acceptable, since the wealthy were promoting their sexual and racial policies. Non-whites, tranny freaks and homosexuals took the place of the "proletariat" in Leftist thinking, driven by both the universities and the media.

The Left will not tolerate even the slightest mention of the huge number of Jews that control finance capital and speculation in the US, though they're not entirely sure why other than "racism." Their entire stance on this issue is special pleading. They occasionally mention inequality, but only in the abstract.

Today's Jews (and Leftist professors in general) have become intellectually soft because they never have to ever answer question as to whether or not all this is true. "Antisemitism" is an argument in and of itself. In the EU, the law is clear: one goes to prison for even mentioning

these issues. In the mainstream economic world, Jewish academics and “public intellectuals” never have to worry about refuting these or any other charges, since they never hear them and know them only by caricature. This means they are not only intellectually lazy, hiding behind walls of law enforcement and censorship, but also have an extremely narrow view of the world around them. They assume their ideology is “incontrovertible fact” since they have access to no other. Unfortunately, historical reality doesn't bend that easily.

Bibliography

Bakunin, Mikhail 1871 [1924]. *Personliche Beziehungen zu Marx.* In: Gesammelte Werke. Band 3. Berlin

Avineri, Shlomo 1964. Marx and Jewish Emancipation. Journal of the History of Ideas 25(3): 445–50

Avineri, Shlomo 2019. Karl Marx: Philosophy and Revolution. Yale University Press

Bauer, Bruno 1863. On The Jewish Question. The Marxist Archive https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/On%20The%20Jewish%20Question.pdf

Carlebach, Julius 1978. Karl Marx and the Radical Critique of Judaism. Oxford University Press

Draper, Hal 1977. Marx's Theory of Revolution, Volume I: State and Bureaucracy. Monthly Review
http://www.marxists.de/religion/draper/marxjewq.htm

Engels, Frederick 1990 [1890] On Antisemitism. in Marx Engels Collected Works Volume 27, International Publishers

Feuerbach, Ludwig 1957 [1841], The Essence of Christianity, translated by George Eliot, New York: Harper

Fischman, Dennis 1991, Political Discourse in Exile: Karl Marx and the Jewish Question, Boston: University of Massachusetts Press

Israel, Jonathan 2021, Revolutionary Jews from Spinoza to Marx: The Fight for a Secular World of Universal and Equal Rights, Seattle: University of Washington Press

Leon, Abram 2020, The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation. Pathfinder

Marx, Karl 1967 [1867] Capital Volume I. International Publishers

Marx, Karl 1978a [1844]. On the Jewish Question. in The Marx-Engels Reader, edited by Robert Tucker. Norton

Marx, Karl 1978c [1845]. Theses on Feuerbach. in The Marx-Engels Reader, edited by Robert

Tucker. Norton

Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels 1975 [1845]. The Holy Family. in Marx/Engels Collected Works Volume IV. International Publishers

McGeever, Brendan 2020. Antisemitism and the Russian Revolution. Cambridge University Press

McLellan, David 1973. Karl Marx: His Life and Thought. Macmillan

Mills, Charles 1997. The Racial Contract. Cornell University Press

Musto, Marcello (ed.) 2020. The Marx Revival: Key Concepts and New Interpretations. Cambridge University Press

Peled, Yoav 1992. From Theology to Sociology: Bruno Bauer and Karl Marx on the Question of Jewish Emancipation. History of Political Thought,13, 3: 463–85

Rotenstreich, Nathan 1959. For and against Emancipation: The Bruno Bauer Controversy. Leo Baeck Institute Year Book,4, 1: 3–36

Ruben, David-Hillel 1982. Marxism and the Jewish Question. Socialist Register,19: 205-237

Traverso, Enzo 2019, The Jewish Question: History of a Marxist Debate. Haymarket

Traverso, Enzo 2021, Revolution: An Intellectual History.Verso

Johnson, Paul (April 1, 1984). Marxism vs. the Jews. Commentary Magazine

Hyam Maccoby. 2006. Antisemitism and Modernity: Innovation and Continuity. Routledge

Stephen J. Greenblatt. 1978. Marlowe, Marx, and Anti-Semitism, in: Critical Inquiry, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 291–307

Fine, Robert Karl Marx and the Radical Critique of Anti-Semitism - Robert Fine. Engage https://web.archive.org/web/20120205162327/http://www.engageonline.org.uk/journal/index.php?journal_id=10&article_id=33

Hess, Moses. 1845. The Essence of Money. *Rheinische Jarhrbücher zur gesellschaftlichen* Reform. Translated by Adam Buick. Darmstadt https://www.marxists.org/archive/hess/1845/essence-money.htm

Proudhon, PJ. 1847. On the Jews. Marxist Internet Archive https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/economics/proudhon/1847/jews.htm

Jones, E. Michael. 2014. Barren Metal. Fidelity Press