Economic questions: the Jesus of Nazareth question

https://www.taxresearch.org.uk/Blog/2025/11/16/economic-questions-the-jesus-of-nazareth-question
Published: January 12, 2026, 8:00 pm

This is one of a series of posts that will ask what the most pertinent question raised by a prominent influencer of political economy might have been, and what the relevance of that question might be today. There is a list of all posts in the series at the end of each entry. The origin of this series is noted here.

After the first two posts in this series, the topics have been chosen by me, and this is one of those. This series has been produced using what I describe as directed AI searches to establish positions with which I agree, followed by final editing before publication.

As this series has developed, it has become clear to me, and to others, that it is about those economists, political economists, moral philosophers and others who have most influenced the development of my own thought, either positively or negatively, and I do not differentiate, because we need both such influences to develop thoughts of our own.

It is in that context that the subject of this essay – Jesus of Nazareth – became an obvious person for inclusion. I was brought up in an evangelical Christian household, and then rejected that faith in my late teens, before discovering a very different understanding of what faith might mean in my thirties as a Quaker. Quakers were founded in the Christian tradition, but do not demand adherence to that faith now. The teachings of Jesus of Nazareth were, however, fundamental to the development of my moral understanding of life, and remain so. It is for that reason that Jesus of Nazareth – a person who I do not doubt existed, whatever else is claimed about him – makes an appearance here.

Jesus of Nazareth stands at a strange and revealing crossroads in the history of ideas. He was not an economist, nor a philosopher in the academic sense, and yet his teachings contain one of the most radical moral critiques of economic systems ever

articulated. In the world he inhabited — a society marked by imperial domination, crushing debt, dispossession, and stratified hierarchy — he placed the poor, the sick, the excluded, and the burdened at the centre of moral concern. His message directly challenged the idea that wealth signified virtue and that poverty revealed failure. Instead, he insisted that justice began with care, that solidarity outranked status, and that a society should be judged by how it treated its most marginal members.

Hence, the Jesus of Nazareth Question: *if the measure of a good society is how it treats the least of its members, how can any economics that tolerates neglect, exclusion, and inequality claim moral legitimacy?*

A world shaped by empire and debt

The historical Jesus lived in a political economy structured by Roman imperial extraction, elite landholding, and the crushing weight of personal indebtedness. Farmers lost land to creditors. Families were pushed into servitude. Taxation, tithes, and rents hollowed out subsistence. In this world, poverty was not a moral failing; it was the predictable result of political and economic design. Jesus' repeated return to the themes of release, forgiveness, and reversal was therefore not abstract spirituality but a direct commentary on economic injustice. His call to "release the captives" and proclaim a "year of jubilee" drew on an older Hebrew tradition that recognised the corrosive social effects of spiralling debt and extreme inequality. His message was a challenge to a system built on extraction, hierarchy, and fear.

The inversion of moral worth

One of Jesus' most consistent themes is the inversion of status: the last shall be first; the meek inherit the earth; the poor are blessed; the rich are warned. This was not piety but an explicit moral critique of economic order. In a society where wealth conferred honour, and honour conferred power, Jesus insisted that the true test of a community was whether it upheld the dignity of those without property, privilege, or security. His teaching cut directly against the belief that prosperity was a sign of virtue. Instead, he emphasised that compassion and justice mattered more than accumulation. This inversion exposes the moral emptiness of any system that celebrates wealth while ignoring the suffering that often accompanies it.

Community over competition

Jesus' ethic was rooted in community rather than competition. He taught that relationships — not possessions — form the basis of a fulfilling life. His gatherings broke the social boundaries of class, gender, ethnicity, and purity that structured the ancient world, offering instead a vision of mutual responsibility and shared care. In economic terms, this is a rejection of the idea that individuals flourish in isolation. It asserts

instead that human well-being requires solidarity, shared provision, and a willingness to bear one another's burdens. In modern language, he understood that societies disintegrate when competition becomes the ruling principle.

The critique of wealth without responsibility

Jesus' strongest language is directed not at ordinary wrongdoing but at those who accumulate wealth without regard to justice. The parable of the rich fool, the warnings to the rich young ruler, and the denunciations of those who "devour widows' houses" all confront the moral hazards of wealth in a system where poverty is widespread. This is not an attack on wealth per se but on unaccountable wealth: wealth insulated from the obligations of care. In modern terms, it is a critique of rentierism, financial extraction, and the hoarding of resources while others lack the means to live with dignity. His moral stance exposes the contradiction at the heart of neoliberalism: the idea that private gain automatically produces public good.

The politics of compassion

Jesus' focus on healing, feeding, and inclusion was not mere charity. It was a declaration that the structures of society must be arranged so that no one is left outside the circle of care. His teachings imply that compassion is not a private virtue but a public responsibility. In this sense, his vision aligns with the idea that public services — health, housing, education, and support — are expressions of collective moral purpose, not optional extras. To treat people as disposable is, in this framework, to betray the essence of community.

Economics as moral practice

The picture that emerges from Jesus' teaching is that economics cannot be morally neutral. Decisions about taxation, debt, labour, land, and care are always decisions about justice. They shape who is safe and who is vulnerable, who flourishes and who is left behind. Jesus' message confronts the idea that economics is a technical science operating outside moral judgment. Instead, it insists that society is accountable for the conditions it creates. If the pursuit of wealth harms the poor, corrodes community, or entrenches fear, then it is morally indefensible, whatever its efficiency.

What answering the Jesus of Nazareth Question would require

To take Jesus' teaching seriously as a political-economic critique would require:

*
Re-centring the vulnerable in public policy, requiring that institutions be judged by how they treat those with the least power, not the greatest wealth.

*

Confronting the ethics of wealth accumulation by imposing obligations on wealth, closing off rent-seeking, and ensuring that those who benefit most from society contribute proportionately most to its maintenance.

*
Relieving the burdens of debt and insecurity as a consequence of recognising that chronic indebtedness, poverty, and precarity destroy lives and undermine community.

*
Embedding compassion into the design of public systems meaning that healthcare, education, housing, and care are not treated as commodities but as expressions of shared responsibility.

*
Reasserting that the purpose of economic life is human flourishing and not profit, or wealth accumulation, requiring the restoration of dignity, security, and hope.

These are not theological positions. They are the practical implications of a moral vision rooted in justice rather than accumulation.

Inference

The Jesus of Nazareth Question confronts us with a moral reversal. If the well-being of the poor is the true measure of a society, then much of what passes for economic success today is exposed as failure. Jesus' teaching demands a political economy built on compassion, solidarity, and responsibility — not because these are charitable virtues, but because they are the conditions of a just society. His challenge is contemporary: an economy that sacrifices the least for the comfort of the wealthy cannot claim moral legitimacy. The task he sets is therefore political and not devotional. It is to build a society in which the dignity of every person is upheld, and in which freedom is measured not by wealth but by the security, belonging, and hope shared among all.

Previous posts in this series

* ***The economic questions***
* ***Economic questions: The Henry Ford Question***
* ***Economic questions: The Mark Carney Question***

* ***Economics questions: The Keynes question***
* ***Economics questions: The Karl Marx question***
* ***Economics questions: the Milton Friedman question***
* ***Economic questions: The Hayek question***
* ***Economic questions: The James Buchanan question***
* ***Economic questions: The J K Galbraith question***
* ***Economic questions: the Hyman Minsky question***
* ***Economic questions: the Joseph Schumpeter question***
* ***Economic questions: The E F Schumacher question***
* ***Economics questions: the John Rawls question***
* ***Economic questions: the Thomas Piketty question***
* ***Economic questions: the Gary Becker question***
* ***Economics questions: The Greg Mankiw question***
* ***Economic questions: The Paul Krugman***
* ***Economic question: the Tony Judt question***
* ***Economic questions: The Nancy MacLean question***
* ***Economic questions: The David Graeber question***
* ***The economic questions: the Amartya Sen question***

Comments

When commenting, please take note of this blog's comment policy, ***which is available here. Contravening this policy will result in comments being deleted before or after initial publication at the editor's sole discretion and without explanation being required or offered.***