

V

A User Friendly Guide to Karl Marx's "On the Jewish Question" (1844)

Joseph M. Schwartz

If you devote an hour and one-half or so to reading this twenty page selection of "On the Jewish Question" carefully we should have a participatory seminar and you'll understand Marx's critique of liberal democracy and "bourgeois" rights. While the text is not as difficult as it may first appear, if one is not acquainted with the context of the argument and an understanding of the basic conceptual terms of the essay ("political emancipation", "civil emancipation," "human emancipation", "the rights of man", "the rights of citizens") it can be rough going. So please read this guide first. But nothing can substitute for a close encounter with the text.

To comprehend "On the Jewish Question" properly one must understand the context of Marx's debate with the "left Hegelian" Bruno Bauer. Marx and Bauer are arguing about Jewish "emancipation" -- the right of the Jews to vote in the emerging German quasi-democratic states and principalities of the 1840s. Bauer's position is that the Jews should become atheists before they should be allowed to vote. For Bauer, the democratic state must be a secular one -- and he implies that Christians who already have the vote should be forced to give their atheism (though he never advocates this). Contrary to your high school teacher's view of Marx as an atheist who favored state suppression of religion, Marx in this essay defends separation of church and state as integral to liberal democratic capitalism. Marx's argument is that in the secular state of liberal democratic capitalism, human beings' universal identity as citizens (we are all equal as citizens) is integrally related to our rights to our particular identities in civil society (the competitive, economic marketplace) as property-owners and propertyless and as Jews and Christians. That is why Marx says it is not anomalous that the most advanced democratic secular state (the U.S., which has universal white male suffrage by 1844 and a strong tradition of separation of church and state) is also the most religious society in the capitalist world. That is, "rights" in a democratic capitalist society do not free us from religion or from property, but allow us to strive for property (most of us will fail) and choose our own religion. (Marx obviously accepts the stereotype of Jews as a materialist, commercial people. Not to defend his self-hating anti-Semitism; but Marx also believes that Christians have been "Judaized" by capitalism. We are all "Jews" now; that is, people governed by the profane demands of the marketplace.)

Bauer as a "left Hegelian" is in Marx's opinion a "crude materialist"; as a materialist Bauer correctly understands that it is not God who creates human beings but human beings who create God. But the left Hegelians are "one sided materialists" in that they believe that guided by this materialist understanding of the origins of religion they can rationally ask human beings to abandon religion. Marx's counter-argument is that religion can only be abolished when human beings democratically transform the material conditions that give rise to religion. People who are not truly free should not be asked to abandon religion; nor will they freely do so. It is an "idealist" fallacy to believe that religion can be willed away. In fact, in an inhumane society Marx believes that religion is "the sigh of a suffering creature... a haven in a heartless world. It is the opium of the people." (In the mid-19th century opium was used as a pain-killer rather than as a hallucinogen. So most of what you've been taught about Marx's attitude towards religion is dead wrong. One can take issue with Marx's assumptions that religion would wither away in a human

society -- as would the need for institutional guarantees of rights. If we treat each other humanely we will not need the solace of religion or the protections from others that rights provide. But perhaps only in a society of angels could we do away with institutional guarantees of freedom. But we can discuss the possible limitations of Marx's vision of communism in the seminar; right now, focus on the possible validity of his critique of liberal democratic capitalism.)

While Marx believes that in a truly human society human beings will not have to transfer their aspirations for a just world onto an alien superior being (i.e., non-alienated human beings -- persons who control the institutions in which they work and live and are not undemocratically controlled by these institutions -- will no longer have a spiritual need for religion), he only believes that a democratic revolution in civil society (in power relations in daily life) can achieve this emancipation. If religion needs to be forcibly abolished by the state, then human liberation has not been achieved by democratic transformation at the grassroots. Marx explicitly condemns efforts by the state "from above" to achieve liberation or communism (see p. 36 and his critique of the Jacobin terror of the French revolution).

"On the Jewish Question", along with "The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts", is the key text of the young Marx who writes as a radical democratic critic of German society. At this stage, Marx is performing an "internal critique" of liberal democracy -- he criticizes it for failing to fulfill its own ideological claims of liberty and equality. Marx has yet to develop his materialist analysis of capitalism as a mode of production. Nor has he identified the working class as the universal class whose interdependent structural role in modern production will enable them to achieve democratic control over a mode of production that is now undemocratically governed by those who own capital but not by the workers who create that capital.

In "On the Jewish Question" Marx criticizes the emerging democratic state as being "falsely universal". In the realm of the state (formal political life) each citizen is said to have equal rights (e.g., one person, one vote); yet in civil society (the realm of the economy and community -- the true underpinnings of the supposedly universal state) human beings are unequal in power. They do not share a universal identity, but are defined by their particular identities as rich and poor; property-owners and propertyless; Jews and Christians.

These unequal power relations among groups in civil society constitutes the essence of "the rights of man" or civil emancipation. (The rights of life, liberty and property -- the rights to be egoistic, own property and be religious). We are all equal before the law in a liberal democratic society (as contrasted with feudalism); but this political emancipation (though a gain in human freedom) is devalued by the inequalities of power which are the essence of the "rights of man." Thus, the equal rights of citizens do not eliminate the particular identities that define human beings in civil society; rather "bourgeois rights" defend the rights of some human beings (those with power in civil society) to dominate others.

Marx does not deny that political and civil emancipation are preferable to the feudal tyranny they abolished (where one's civil status was determined by one's status at birth, rather than one's achievements in the market; and where political power was determined by birth rather than by the competition for votes). But only under a system of human emancipation where human beings democratically and consciously control the institutions in which they work and live could the false

claims of political and civil emancipation be fulfilled. Thus, only by transcending ("aufheben") political and civil emancipation through human emancipation can human beings truly emancipate themselves.

Let me conclude this guide with some issues we should discuss in seminar:

I. Marx's theory of the capitalist state

society is divided into civil society and the state -- the two spheres can exist only insofar as the state is an unreal and illusory communal life. The state is an illusory collective interest; in civil society man lives a conflict divided existence. (p. 33-34)

II. The inability of achieving human liberation through political liberation

what does political emancipation leave unresolved (p. 32-33, p. 45) This argument ties in with Marx's critique of Bauer. What is Bauer's answer to "The Jewish Question". (Bauer calls for liberating liberal democracy from religion. But Marx argues religious restrictions are not the cause of secular ones but result from these secular inequalities). (p.31)

III. The democratic theory of revolution

Marx's critique of the state attempting to impose its universality on civil society. See his critique of the French Terror (p.36) Why would Marx be sceptical of the state trying to achieve communism in a society where the forces of production have not been fully developed and where there has not been a mass revolutionary movement in civil society? Did the USSR fulfill Marx's conception of communism?

IV. Marx's Critique of "bourgeois rights"

they protect the egoistic character of private life in civil society (mutual self-limitation). Rights do not unite people or develop them as human beings; rather they serve as an ideological justification for private property. (see p. 40f. on "the rights of man" vs. "the rights of citizens", p. 43 in particular)

But why does Marx believe that political emancipation is a partial gain for humanity. Why does he call it the final step of emancipation within the existing order (of systems of private property)? (p.45)

Finally, consider the following questions -- Marx believes that only human emancipation will achieve true freedom. But what would happen to particular identities in a truly free society. Is Marx's belief in a universal form of identity an Enlightenment conception that denies the value of the particular identities of race, gender, nationality, etc.? That is, what might postmodernism have to say to Marx. Are "particular" identities always oppressive? On the other hand, isn't injustice built on refusing to see others as fellow human beings? (Part of the crisis of American civilization is that white suburbanites do not recognize as fellow citizens residents of the inner cities). Is the Enlightenment project of building a just society which fulfills our common humanity an outmoded project. Perhaps neither Marxism nor postmodernism comprehends the proper dialectic between universal and particular identities that would need to exist in a free and just society.

But we can talk about all this in seminar. Read the text closely and...

OK...now on to “On the Jewish Question,” Marx reader, pp. 26-46

1. Why does Bruno Bauer believe that if Jews in Germany wish to have the rights of citizens they should have to abandon their Judaism and become atheists? Why does Marx believe this is a hypocritical demand (that is, why does Marx believe that civil and political emancipation is completely compatible with the citizen preserving his or her particular religious, class, cultural and other identities in civil society)?
2. what point (related to the above) is Marx making on p. 31 when he writes that “the country which has attained full political emancipation, that religion not only continues to exist but is fresh and vigorous, this is proof that the existence of religion is not at all opposed to the perfection of the state.” (Hint: Marx is talking about the US – the first society to achieve universal suffrage for white men. By “the perfection of the state” he means the achievement of “political emancipation” or universal suffrage.)
3. What does he mean on p. 33 that the democratic state “abolishes after its fashion, the distinctions established by birth, social rank, education, occupation when it decrees that birth, social rank, education, etc., are non-political distinctions...but the state, none the less allows private property, education, occupation, to act after their own fashion...and to manifest their particular nature?” That is, why does Marx believe that the achievement of universal citizenship does not yield a universal, egalitarian identity in civil society? That is, as he writes on p.34, “He lives in the political community, where he regards himself as a communal being, and in civil society where he acts simply as a private individual, treats other men as means...” In short, why does Marx believe that universal suffrage/political emancipation does not transform power relations of inequality in civil society (the realm of “civil emancipation” or “freedom of contract/freedom of the marketplace)
4. contrary to misreadings of Marx, on p. 36 Marx makes very clear why he thinks that any state which tries to abolish religion will not only engage in repression, but is likely to give rise to a backlash that will restore religion in even a stronger position than before the repression (Note: Marx does believe that in a society of true human emancipation – where human beings democratically control the institutions of civil society – there will be no need for religion. Whether or not he is right about that, Marx certainly did not think the state should use coercion to force people to abandon religion.
5. Why don't the rights of men in civil society abolish egoism and exploitation in civil society? On the other hand, why doesn't the achievement of political emancipation achieve freedom from domination in civil society?
6. put into your own words what Marx means by “human emancipation” on p. 46.?

Questions on the Preface to a Contribution to the Critique..., p. 3-7 of Marx-Engels Reader

Define the terms "mode of production," "forces of production," "relations of production." Why does Marx believe that the social forces of capitalist production are ultimately "fettered" by the private social relations of capitalism?

Read the section on alienated labor The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts

(pp. 70-81 in Marx-Engels reader)

1. What's the parallel Marx draws between the alienation involved in religion and the alienation involved in labor (i.e., what does he mean on p. 72-73 by "the more man puts into God, the less he retains in himself...and the object of his labor becomes a power of its own confronting him." How does religion and capital come to dominate the very human beings that create God and capital?
2. Describe the 4 types of alienation that the worker experiences under capitalism
3. What does Marx mean on p. 80 when he writes a "forcing up of wages would therefore be nothing but better payment for the slave." Also, how could his critique of Proudhon's vision of all laborer's working for the state be read as a prescient (that is, a foreseeing of in the future) critique of authoritarian communism?

Wrapping up “On the Jewish Question...” Marx’s Opposition to the State Forcibly Trying to Abolish Religion

1 contrary to misreadings of Marx, on p. 36 Marx makes very clear why he thinks that any state which tries to abolish religion will not only engage in repression, but is likely to give rise to a backlash that will restore religion in even a stronger position than before the repression) (Note: Marx does believe that in a society of true human emancipation – where human beings democratically control the institutions of civil society – there will be no need for religion. Whether or not he is right about that, Marx certainly did not think the state should use coercion to force people to abandon religion.

To further see why Marx is against a communist society forcibly banning religion, but also why he thinks that in a society with less human suffering, the need for religion would “wither away,” read p. 54, “Religious suffering is at the same time an expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of an oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people.” (p. 54. ...remember that opium was a medicinal pain-killer in Marx’s day and not so much a recreational drug!)

The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts

I. Alienated Labor (pp. 70-81 in Marx-Engels reader)

1. What’s the parallel Marx draws between the alienation involved in religion and the alienation involved in labor (i.e., what does he mean on p. 72-73 by “the more man puts into God, the less he retains in himself...and the object of his labor becomes a power of its own confronting him.” How does religion and capital come to dominate the very human beings that create God and capital?
2. Describe the 4 types of alienation that the worker experiences under capitalism
3. What does Marx mean on p. 80 when he writes a “forcing up of wages would therefore be nothing but better payment for the slave.” Also, how could his critique of Proudhon’s vision of all laborer’s working for the state be read as a prescient (that is, a foreseeing of the future) critique of authoritarian communism?

II. Read the section on alienated labor in The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (pp. 70-81 in Marx-Engels reader)

4. What’s the parallel Marx draws between the alienation involved in religion and the alienation involved in labor (i.e., what does he mean on p. 72-73 by “the more man puts into God, the less he retains in himself...and the object of his labor becomes a power of its own confronting him.” How does religion and capital come to dominate the very human beings that create God and capital?

- (rationality of capitalism). Contrast this with Marx's different view of the veiled nature of capitalist ideology (ideology of freedom of exchange and political equality hides domination in production)

b. constant revolution of production yields material prerequisites of freedom (p. 476-477, Tucker)

c. capitalism as "sorcerer's apprentice" (capitalism as digger of own grave)

1. creates proletariat and social conditions for political organization

2. centralization and concentration of capital

3. crises of overproduction, underconsumption, creation of mass unemployment and economic insecurity

4. despotic planning in capitalist firm versus the anarchy of the capitalist market; communism as rational planning of economy

III. Centrality of Political Organization of Working Class (480-481)

a. liberation as self-emancipation

b. need for working class to go through long period of struggle to develop its capacity for self-government

c. rejection of capitalism as wage-slavery (483). No matter how good wages may be, workers still do not control production.

IV. What Communism is Not

1. not abolition of personal property (484). Capital is already socially produced property. Communism will not expropriate privately owned goods such as personal effects; rather it will socialize control over already socially produced capital.

2. not universal laziness (486). Under capitalism the lazy often make much money

3. not cultural barbarism (487)

4. not community of women (488). Capitalism causes prostitution.

5. not abolition of national identity; capitalism already destroys natural boundaries

V. Moderate Nature of Revolutionary Program (490)

a. progressive taxation

b. free education

c. nationalize banks, transport and communications

d. gradual transition

VI. Critique of Other "Socialisms" as Elitist or Reactionary (section on utopian socialism)

II. Outline of Argument of On the Jewish Question

a. Bauer's argument -- why Bauer believes Jews should give up religion if they wish to become citizens

b. why Marx disagrees -- why capitalist democracy is compatible with citizens keeping their particular identities in civil society

c. political emancipation (one person/one vote) vs. civil emancipation (freedom to

compete in the market)

d. state as realm of false universality (we are not really equal in power in civil society)

e. human emancipation -- human control over their production

analysis of religion and state as false realms of universality (we don't really control our destiny democratically in the "real world" of economic production) leads to his broader analysis of alienation

III. Key Issues in The Manuscripts

a. parallels between alienated labor and alienation in the state and in religion (human beings create institutions which come to control them)

b. political economy ignores the sordid origins of capitalism -- not through virtuous entrepreneurs but through slavery, theft and alienation--that's where capital comes from

c. four forms of alienated labor

1. from product

2. from production

3. from self as creative, species-being

4. from fellow humans who are seen only as competitors

d. view of communism as truly human production. Opposes "primitive communism". If not on universal scale of economic abundance will get state as a universal capitalist exploiting a society of workers to achieve economic development

e. critique of money as a falsely universal commodity which can buy attributes that human beings don't truly have. In good society only love can be exchanged for love, trust for trust -- that is money will no longer be a universal "pimp" able to buy things that humans do not merit

IV. Key Issues in The German Ideology

a. critique of "German Ideology"--the "crude empiricism" of Feurbach -- recognizes humans create ideas, but doesn't try to change human material circumstances that give rise to these ideas; critique of "crude idealism" (Max Stirner) -- believes ideas drive history and fails to see that it is historical material circumstances that give rise to ideas.

b. ideology -- a surface view of world which a material system of production produces which obfuscates the true material causes of that belief system (i.e., feudalism produces ideology of honor and obligation, but hides how that obligation is created by enforced dependence of feudal hierarchy; capitalism creates ideology of freedom of choice, equality in politics, but obfuscates how such "freedom" arises from domination in production).

c. life produces consciousness, not consciousness produces life

d. study individuals as they really are in production rather than as they appear to themselves (154)

e. why the state develops -- to mediate class conflicts in society.

f. Origin of division of labor

1. individual vs. community

VIII. Guide to reading

On The Jewish Question

The German Ideology - Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's

Karl Marx (1818-1883)
Friedrich Engels (1820-1895)

Philosophy of Right

This handout provides some hints, suggestions, and questions to help guide your reading of Marx's early works (through The German Ideology). You will receive similar guides to some of the subsequent assignments, but they're unlikely to be this detailed or extensive. These writings are difficult and sometimes obscure, and many of them employ the style and terminology of the Young Hegelian movement, with which you're likely to be unfamiliar. Nevertheless, these writings shouldn't be at all impossible to crack (some of the most difficult, like the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, have been omitted), and they're important for several reasons. First, they allow you to grasp the way in which Marx develops his fundamental approach to social theory--including his basic intellectual and moral commitments--which will continue to guide his later work. Second, they contain some of the most illuminating discussions of Marx's overarching conceptions of society, of human nature, of freedom and heteronomy. Third, The German Ideology contains Marx's most comprehensive and detailed discussion of his general theory of history and of his method for studying it, "historical materialism." By the time he and Engels write the Communist Manifesto (1848), Marx has already worked out his fundamental theoretical project.

A few general comments which may help clarify the overall thrust of the readings. (If any of these points don't seem entirely clear to you now, you might want to come back to them again after you've read through Marx.) Marx's sociology is always a critical sociology. He intends to produce not only an understanding but a critique of modern society. However, according to Marx, this criticism can't be based on some set of abstract, timeless, or utopian moral ideals. It has to be based on a thorough and concrete analysis of modern (what he will later call capitalist) society which will reveal its inner dynamics and the way in which it creates the objective possibilities for its own transcendence (through revolution). Marx is always scornful of mere moralizing, or of socialists who, as he says somewhere, know nothing about capitalism except that it's bad. He sees modern society as a stage in a process of historical development, one whose emergence had a certain inner logic and even necessity, but which will just as necessarily give way to a different (and higher) social formation.

Try to move with Marx as he develops this position, and try to get a sense of what he means by "criticism." In particular, try to see how, in Marx's view, the dynamic of criticism forces one to ask deeper and more fundamental questions--to move from the critique of religion to the critique of the state, of "civil society," of the division of labor, and eventually (later on) of the capitalist mode of production.

Much of the impulse behind Marx's criticism of existing (and previous) societies comes from his image of the possibilities for human fulfillment and his sense of the way in which this fulfillment is frustrated by social conditions. Marx has a powerful conception of human nature, but this conception is not a static one that involves some fixed set of drives or instincts; rather, Marx conceives of human nature primarily in terms of development and potentiality. Human beings have the capacity to freely and consciously shape their lives in cooperation with others. As long as they are not able to do so, as long as they are the helpless pawns of other men or of impersonal forces--natural or social--beyond their control, they are not fully human. It is important to see that, for Marx, freedom, fulfillment, and rational community go together, and this unity is eventually expressed in the notion of communism.

As opposed to this image of freedom and community, Marx sees modern society as marked by mutual isolation, oppression, and heteronomy. A key idea running through this analysis is the idea of alienation. While Marx doesn't use the term "alienation" very frequently after The German Ideology, the concept remains a crucial one throughout his work. (For a more detailed and explicit discussion by Marx of his notions of alienation and human nature, you might someday want to look at the 1844 Manuscripts.) It's impossible to give an adequate summary of this highly complex concept here. However, one crucial element of it is the idea that, in all societies up to and including the present, human beings come to be dominated by their own creations--including their systems of social relationships. This notion may seem a little abstract to you now, but try to make sense of it as it's fleshed out by the readings. It ties together, for example, Marx's analysis of religion, of the state, of the division of labor--and, later on, of the capitalist mode of production. "As, in religion, man is governed by the products of his own brain, so in capitalist production, he is governed by the products of his own hand." (Capital: Tucker, p. 422) Much of Marx's work involves an attempt to analyze the specific ways in which human beings are dominated by social forces which confront them as irresistible alien powers (and of which they are frequently not fully aware). But alienation is not inherent in the human condition; it is the product of certain forms of social organization, and it can be replaced by conscious cooperation and self-determination. Thus, the main thrust of Marx's social theory consists of a theory of heteronomy embedded within a philosophy of freedom.

(In the following notes, page numbers--in the 1978 Tucker reader--are given on the left. Please don't assume that anything not mentioned here isn't important.)

"Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right"

(Marx begins with the analysis of religion developed by Feuerbach, a Young Hegelian philosopher. According to Feuerbach, religion involves the projection--i.e., alienation--of man's own powers onto an imaginary entity, God. Marx agrees, but argues that religion is in turn a symptom of a deeper problem; it is a reflection of man's very real alienation).

53-54 Why is the criticism of religion important? What are its limitations?

How does Marx characterize religious consciousness? What causes it?
What functions does it serve?

Once the "criticism" of religion is complete, what should we do?

(In the rest of the essay, Marx goes on to argue that the process of criticism poses "tasks which can only be solved by means of practical activity." Criticism by itself is not enough to change society. The solution--as they used to say in the '60s--is revolution; at the end of the essay he sees the mass base for revolution in the proletariat.)

"On the Jewish Question"

(This essay moves from the critique of religion to the critique of the state, and offers a statement of Marx's position on the nature of human emancipation. It is important to recognize that Marx isn't criticizing the whole set of existing states but, so to speak, the best possible state--what Americans would call the democratic state. He sees it as a genuine historical advance, but rejects it as inadequate.

Marx takes as his starting point Hegel's theory of the modern state, which he subjects to criticism. A few words about this. Hegel distinguishes between two spheres of social life in modern society, the state and "civil society." The historical significance of this latter term will be dealt with in lecture. Basically, "civil society" refers to the modern world of egoism, self-interest, and competition. The "state," however, is a political community in which individuals participate as citizens in pursuit of the common good. Thus, individuals in modern society lead two kinds of life, which provide them with complementary sorts of satisfactions. As members of civil society, they can pursue their particular interests in conflict with others; as citizens of the state, they can participate in a self-governing community of rational beings.

Marx agrees with Hegel that we need the satisfactions of community. But he denies that we get them. Our real life is in civil society, which is a world of egoism and heteronomy. As long as this is the case, the notion of political community is an illusory one.

Incidentally, part of what is going on in this essay--and in the other two as well--is Marx's reflection on the meaning of the French revolution. (Please, by the way, try to ignore Marx's use of the anti-semitic language and imagery current at the time.)

- 27 (Note that when Marx speaks of giving up "religious prejudice" he means giving up religion.)
- 28 How can "religious opposition" be overcome? What will take the place of religion?
- 29-30 Note the distinction between merely "political emancipation" and "human emancipation." Follow this distinction through the rest of the essay and see what Marx means by it.
- 30-31 Where does "the state" exist in "fully developed form"? What does this mean? What is "the relation between complete political emancipation and religion?" What conclusions does Marx draw?
- Why is Bauer's approach inadequate, so that "Bauer's criticism ceases to be critical"?
- 32 Note first and second full paragraphs.
- 32-35 What constitutes "political emancipation"? What are its limitations? What is "civil society"? Why does Marx criticize it? Why does political emancipation involve splitting social life into two realms?
- *Read the paragraph that runs from pp. 33-34 several times. Read this set of pages closely.
- 36 (Note that the first paragraph, pp. 35-36, is a critique of the Jacobin dictatorship.)
- 39 Note second paragraph. How is the political state analogous to religion?
- 41-43 How are the "rights of man" different from the "rights of the citizen"? What image of "man" is implicit in declarations of the "rights of man"? What image of society?

- 44 Note that this passage gives an assessment of the meaning of the French revolution (and of the broader movement of which it was a part). It represented the simultaneous triumph of (real) egoism and (illusory) community. How, and in what way?
- 46 What is the problem with this state of affairs? What is the solution? (Read the last two paragraphs of this section quite closely, and see p. 34 again.)

"Theses on Feuerbach"

(Note that the "old materialism" which Marx attacks is basically that of the Enlightenment. He argues that it's one-sided and inadequate. What does he offer in its place? Pay particular attention to theses III, VI, VII, X, XI.)

The German Ideology

(This is a joint work by Marx and Engels, although Marx seems to have had a greater hand in its composition. I will refer to them as "Marx".)

- 148-9 What is Marx's criticism of the Young Hegelians ("German criticism")? Why does he reject their approach? What does he suggest in its place?
- 149-50 If we want to understand human history, what are the crucial things to grasp? What are the distinctive characteristics of human beings?
- 150 Note: "production," "reproduction," "mode of life," "intercourse," "division of labor."
- This is a crucial page. Marx argues that the key to understanding a society is to grasp the way it is organized to produce the necessities of life.
- 150-54 Here Marx offers a (highly compressed) sketch of human history in terms of a sequence of different modes of production. What are these stages of development, and how are they related to the division of labor?
- 154-55 Marx summarizes what he takes to be the proper approach to understanding history, and suggests he will now build on it.
- 155-57 Marx starts over again. What do humans produce?
- 157-59 What is the relationship between consciousness and social life?
- 159-63 A very important section, in which Marx spells out why the division of labor implies inequality and heteronomy and suggests how these can be overcome.
- 160 First full paragraph: What is the relationship between the division of labor and alienation?

(Last paragraph: note argument from "The Jewish Question.")

- 160-61 What is the real significance of political struggles?