
Friedrich List and the Social Question

W. O. Henderson
University of Manchester

I

At the opening of the List archives in Reutlingen in 1934 the Burgomaster complained that List had been unfairly accused of turning a blind eye to the harsh conditions of work in factories and to the wretched lot of domestic craftsmen displaced by new machines.² It has certainly been argued that List was so busy promoting the interests of the capitalists that he had little time to pay much attention to the social consequences of industrialisation. It is indeed surprising that one who was a leading publicist and journalist in Germany should have had so little to say about the widespread poverty and distress that existed in Europe between 1815 and 1848.

In 1834 Villeneuve-Bargemont estimated that there were over 13 million paupers and beggars in Europe. In England and Wales over a million paupers were relieved in 1840 and this figure rose to 1,700,000 in 1847. In France in 1833 it was officially estimated that over a million paupers either received outdoor relief or were admitted to almshouses or hospitals.³ In any society provision must be made for those unable to support themselves — the aged and infirm, orphans, widows, and deserted wives — but what alarmed people in the first half of the nineteenth century was the large number of able-bodied

¹ F. Seidel, *Das Armutsproblem im deutschen Vormärz bei Friedrich List* (1971) and *Die soziale Frage in der deutschen Geschichte* (1964).

² *Mitteilungen der List-Gesellschaft*, No. 29 (May 5, 1835), p. 554.

³ HILDE RIGAUDIAS-WEISS, *Les enquêtes ouvrières en France entre 1830 et 1848* (1936), p. 33. Pierre Leroux argued that the official figures were too low and he estimated there were 1,831,000 paupers in France in 1833.

adults who were either out of work or were unable to earn enough to support themselves and their families.

After 1815 the dislocation caused by the Napoleonic wars was responsible for much distress since the labour market could not quickly absorb all the soldiers who were demobilised. Bad harvests, as in 1817, caused distress on the land, while trade depressions had the same effect upon craftsmen and shopkeepers in towns and villages. The industrial revolution, first in England later in various regions on the Continent, led to unemployment and poverty among these whose skills were becoming obsolete owing to the introduction of new machines. The Luddites in England, the silk weavers in Lyons, and the linen weavers of Silesia were among those whose distress drove them to violence. List of course was well aware of these problems. But while he frequently discussed his doctrines concerning phases of economic growth and productive forces, it was only occasionally that he turned his attention to social questions that many of his contemporaries regarded as matters of vital importance. When List was concerned with running a coalmine in America and in constructing a colliery railway he had little to say in his writings or correspondence about the miners or the labourers who built the railway. And in the years preceding the revolutions of 1848 when governments throughout western Europe faced a rising tide of unrest, List seemed to be much more concerned with tariff policy and railway projects than with the grievances of peasants, artisans, and factory workers.

II

As a young man List was a civil servant in Württemberg for eleven years, starting as a probationer in 1806 and ending as a senior official with the title *Regierungsrat*. One of his last assignments was in Heilbronn where he was sent in 1817 to question a number of peasants and artisans who were on the point of leaving Württemberg for America.⁴ He was instructed to find out why they were emigrating and, if possible, to dissuade them from doing so. The emigrants whom he interviewed left him in no doubt as to why they were going to America. They stated that a harvest failure, rising prices, and high

⁴ The manuscript of List's record of his interviews in Heilbronn, Weinsberg, and Neckarsulm is in the List archives (Fasc. II/4) and part of a draft of his report to the Ministry of the Interior is printed in *Werke*, Vol. VIII, pp. 104-8. See also T. STEIMLE, 'Friedrich List und die Auswanderung aus Württemberg' in *Mitteilungen der Friedrich List Gesellschaft*, 1932, pp. 444-8; M. MILLER 'Ursachen und Ziele der schwäbischen Auswanderung' in *Korrespondenzblatt des Gesamtvereins der deutschen Geschichts- und Altertumsvereins*, Vol. 81 (1933) and G.P. BASSLER, 'Auswanderungsfreiheit und Auswandererfürsorge in Württemberg' in *Zeitschrift für Württembergische Landesgeschichte*, Vol. XXXIII, 1974, pp. 117-60.

taxes had left them virtually destitute. They complained of oppression by their feudal lords and by government officials. A peasant, who submitted his evidence in writing, declared: "The most grievous poverty forces us to emigrate to America. As we have not received the seed that we were promised our fields have not been sown and we can expect nothing but shortage of food. We cannot afford to pay taxes to two masters and no one listens to our complaints. If we take a little straw or brushwood from the woods we are punished by the forest court even though we have done no damage. The records of the forest court substantiate this. The present high prices and shortage of food is so serious that we cannot save our families from starvation. Death by famine is at the door. And so we must seek a new home in another country as no one will help us here."⁵ List urged the government to remedy conditions which forced peasants to emigrate. And he suggested that the state should control emigration by curbing the activities of dishonest agents who gave emigrants a false picture of conditions in America and sometimes robbed them of their savings.

After his mission to Heilbronn List frequently argued that emigration could play an important rôle in solving the problems of unemployment and pauperism. He appreciated the risks run by those who left Europe to settle in America but suggested that these risks could be reduced if the state were to control emigration and protect emigrants. A few years after his visit to Heilbronn List was an emigrant himself. Having been imprisoned for his political activities he was released before completing his sentence on condition that he left Württemberg. He went to the United States in 1825 and remained there until 1832. In Heilbronn he had talked to emigrants when they were leaving for America. Now he saw how immigrants were faring in a new country. He learned by bitter experience that, without previous experience, it was a mistake to try to run a farm. But he was more successful as a journalist, an entrepreneur, and a politician. He played a leading part in establishing a colliery undertaking near Tamaqua and in constructing a railway from Tamaqua to Port Clinton. He edited the *Readinger Adler*, an influential German paper in Pennsylvania. In its columns he argued that more immigrants from Europe were needed to promote the economic expansion of the United States. In 1826 he printed a report which had appeared in the *London Courier* that unemployed English factory workers were being encouraged to migrate to Canada and he expressed the hope that some of them would find their way to Pennsylvania.⁶

During his stay in the United States List was involved in some abortive schemes to settle Germans in the United States. In 1828 he wrote to Dr. Rush (Secretary to the Treasury) that he proposed to establish a German settlement

⁵ F. LIST, *Werke*, Vol. VIII, pp. 867-8.

⁶ *Readinger Adler*, September 26, 1826, in F. LIST, *Werke*, Vol. II, p. 240.

in Lycoming County in Pennsylvania⁷ and subsequently he had 2,000 "hand bills to emigrants" printed in Philadelphia.⁸ In 1830, when making arrangements to return to Europe, List applied for a post in the American consular service and informed Secretary of State van Buren that if he were appointed he would encourage Germans to emigrate to the territory of Michigan.⁹ Back in Europe he corresponded with his business partner Isaac Hisster on the possibility of securing German miners for the colliery in which they both had an interest. He wrote: "In respect of your desire to send coalminers from this country to Pennsylvania I have inserted some articles into the newspapers but I don't think that they will effectuate much, as the miners of this country are too poor to pay the passage to the United States. I will propose to you another plan. Several or all of the coal companies... ought to combine for the purpose of importing miners. The passage might well be effectuated for 35 dollars a head. It therefore would require no greater advance than about 10,000 dollars to import 300 men, which might be recovered by deducting the advances afterwards from their wages".¹⁰

When he held office as American consul in Saxony List received an official enquiry concerning the transport of paupers from Germany to the United States. He replied that it had become "a general practice in the towns and boroughs of Germany to get rid of their paupers and vicious members, by collecting the means for effectuating their passage to the United States among the inhabitants, and supporting them from the public funds. This practice is not only highly injurious to the United States, as it burdens them with a host of paupers and criminals, but it deters also the better and wealthier class of inhabitants of this country from emigrating to the United States".¹¹

In the 1830s much of List's time and energy was devoted to promoting the construction of a network of railways in Germany. His writings on railways, however, throw little light on his views on the social question. He argued that the railways would create far more jobs than they would destroy and he appealed to railway companies to introduce cheap fares so as to give workers opportunities to travel that they had never enjoyed before. At this time List was involved in launching a new encyclopaedia to which he contributed articles on the workers and on labour-saving machinery. Here he attacked those who criticised the establishment of factories with machinery driven by steampower because they would throw domestic craftsmen out of

⁷ J. RIDGWAY to F. LIST, April 23, 1828: 'Dr. Rush handed to me your letter to him on the subject of a German settlement in Lycoming County' (List archives, Fasc. 41/47 and *Werke*, Vol. II, p. 485).

⁸ F. LIST, *Werke*, Vol. II, p. 485.

⁹ F. LIST to MARTIN VAN BUREN, October 21, 1830 in *Werke*, Vol. II, pp. 302-3.

¹⁰ F. LIST to ISAAC HIESTER (probably 1832) in *Werke*, Vol. II, pp. 486-7.

¹¹ F. LIST to LEVY WOODBURY (secretary to the Treasury), March 8, 1837 in *Werke*, Vol. II, pp. 332-3.

work. List insisted that factories, like railways, eventually increased the number of jobs available. In his view the decline in job opportunities was only a temporary phenomenon.¹²

III

List's attitude towards the social question in the 1840s may be gathered from articles which appeared in the *Zollvereinsblatt* and other journals. In a prospectus List promised that methods of alleviating distress among the workers would be discussed in the *Zollvereinsblatt*.¹³ And in 1844 he printed an article from the *Trier'sche Zeitung* on a Society for the Welfare of the Working Classes which had recently been founded in Berlin.¹⁴ List wrote many of the articles which appeared in the *Zollvereinsblatt*. Others were written by various contributors or were reprinted from German and foreign newspapers and weeklies. The contributors to the *Zollvereinsblatt* cannot always be identified but as List was the editor it may be assumed that he agreed with the opinions expressed in its pages.

List examined the condition of various types of workers — factory workers, smallholders, and domestic craftsmen — whose incomes were so low that they could not provide for themselves and their families. When dealing with the grievances of factory workers List faced a dilemma. He advocated the extension of the factory system and he believed that the establishment of an industrial economy would increase a country's wealth, enhance its power, and raise the standard of living of its people. In 1843 he declared that the factory system, far from impoverishing the workers provided them with higher earnings than they had obtained as peasants or domestic craftsmen. "It is not the factories that have created the poor, but the poor who have created the factories".¹⁵

Dr. Tögel, one of List's closest collaborators, declared that "wherever production by machinery flourishes, more workers are employed than were

¹² ROTTECK and Welcker, *Staatslexikon oder Encyclopädie der Staatswissenschaften* Vol. I (1832) and in F. LIST, *Werke*, Vol. V, pp. 30-5.

¹³ F. LIST to the J.G. COTTA publishing house, November 19, 1842 in F. LIST, *Werke*, Vol. VIII, p. 656.

¹⁴ 'Der Verein für das Wohl der Hand-und Fabrikarbeiter' in *Das Zollvereinsblatt*, No. 47, November 18, 1844, pp. 924-8. The correct name of the of the society was *Verein für das Wohl der arbeitenden Klassen*. See ADOLF SCHMIDT: *Die Zukunft der arbeitenden Klassen und die Vereine für ihr Wohl* (1845), *Der Centralverein für das Wohl der arbeitenden Klassen in fünfzigjähriger Tathigkeit 1844-94* (1894), H.R. SCHMEIDER, *Bürgerliche Vereinsbestrebungen für das Wohl der arbeitenden Klassen* (University of Bonn dissertation, 1967).

¹⁵ LIST to KING WILHELM, I of Württemberg, April 9, 1843 in F. LIST, *Werke*, Vol. IX, pp. 109-115.

previously to be found in domestic workshops". And he considered that the workers had been relieved by machines of much heavy manual labour. Moreover workers were not only producers of goods. They were also consumers. And, as consumers, they could now buy a wider range of cheap manufactured products than before, because the output of factories was much greater than that of small workshops. Dr. Tögel denied that industrialisation had created "a great new proletariat" or that "despotic masters" were exploiting factory workers.¹⁶

It was not easy for List to reconcile his belief that the rise of modern industry benefited the labour force with the fact that there was serious unrest among many factory workers in the 1840s since men, women, and children worked long hours for low pay. He had to answer those who claimed that the workers were being exploited by the factory owners and were worse off than under the domestic system.

One argument that he put forward was that bad conditions of work were not an inherent characteristic of the factory system. He quoted in the *Zollvereinsblatt* an account by Charles Dickens of conditions in a cotton mill in Lowell (Massachusetts). He had written that the factory girls "were all well dressed", "they had serviceable bonnets, good warm cloaks and shawls; and were not above clogs and patterns". "They were healthy in appearance, many of them remarkably so, and had the manners and deportment of young women; not of degraded brutes of burden". "The rooms in which they worked, were as well ordered as themselves. In the windows of some, there were green plants, which were trained to shade the glass; in all, there was as much fresh air, cleanliness and comfort, as the nature of the occupation would possibly permit of". Dickens added that the girls lived in well conducted boarding houses near the mill.¹⁷

List also printed an article from the *Deutsche Gewerbezeitung* describing conditions in the Hammerstein cotton mill near Elberfeld. The most modern machinery, operating 24,000 spindles, had been installed in nine large work-rooms which were well ventilated and spotlessly clean. Fire precautions included the construction of an outside fire escape built of stone. The labour force consisted of 400 operatives and some ancillary workers such as mechanics and carpenters. Power was supplied by a "gigantic iron waterwheel" and by a steam engine. Among the welfare services provided for the workers were houses, an elementary school, a sewing class, a savings bank, and a health insurance scheme. The millowner had built 18 blocks of flats for 75 families

¹⁶ 'Die Organisation der Arbeiter und die heutige Industrie' in *Das Zollvereinsblatt*, No. 6, February 11, 1845 (signed 'T').

¹⁷ 'Die Factorybill' (second article) in *Das Zollvereinsblatt*, No. 17, April 22, 1844, pp. 313-22. See Charles Dickens, *American Notes and Pictures from Italy* (reprint of the first edition, 1893), pp. 57-9.

for which the workers paid much lower rents than those charged in neighbouring towns. Each flat had its own vegetable garden. Factory children received an hour's schooling a day, as well as religious instruction, while a sewing class for young women was held after working hours in the summer. The health insurance scheme was subsidised by the management, though the workers had to pay a small weekly contribution. The local medical officer had reported favourably on the health of the operatives. The article attacked critics of industrialisation who painted a gloomy picture of factory workers being treated like slaves by heartless employers. A visit to the Hammerstein mill would cause them to take a more favourable view of the social consequences of industrialisation.¹⁸

Although there were modern factories run by enlightened employers it was obvious that widespread distress existed in many factory towns. The passing of a Factory Act in Britain in 1833¹⁹ gave List an opportunity to explain his attitude towards the evils of the factory system. He argued that the situation in Britain was an exceptional one which need not be repeated when other countries became industrialised. During the industrial revolution large numbers of workers had left the land for centres of industry. Manufacturers had made large profits. The great landowners had also enjoyed high incomes because they had been able to use their political influence to secure the maintenance of high import duties on cereals. The policy of protection raised the cost of living for the workers. List thought that the workers had earned high wages in the early phase of the industrial revolution — certainly more than they had earned as farm workers or domestic craftsmen. But circumstances were changing. Since 1815 the output of British industry had greatly expanded with the erection of new and bigger factories and the introduction of more efficient machines and processes. Competition among manufacturers coupled with a fall in the level of prices had reduced profits. The factory owners had reacted by reducing wages. But there had been no corresponding fall in the prices charged for food or consumer goods. A great tariff wall — particularly the Corn Laws — kept prices high. So in List's view it was a decline in the standard of living that had caused unrest in England in the 1840s.

List thought that the Factory Act of 1844, which reduced the hours worked by women in textile mills, failed to deal with the real cause of labour unrest. In his opinion workers in England were more concerned with the

¹⁸ 'Die Spinnerei zu Hammerstein bei Elberfeld' in *Das Zollvereinsblatt*, No. 12, March 25, 1845.

¹⁹ The Factory Act of 1844 gave women of all ages the same protection as that granted to young persons (aged 13 to 18) in 1833. Their hours of work were reduced to 12 a day and they were not allowed to work at night. Children under 13 were to attend school for 3 hours a day and their daily hours of labour were reduced to 6½. Dangerous moving machinery had to be fenced. The Act applied to textile factories.

high price of food than with long hours. He proposed that landowners and manufacturers should make financial sacrifices to solve the problem — the former by agreeing to free trade (including the repeal of the Corn Laws) and the latter by increasing wages even if this meant lower profits. Only such a policy would reduce the cost of living for the workers and bring about industrial peace. He thought that Peel had been right to introduce an income tax since this would, to some extent, shift the burden of taxation to the shoulders of the wealthier classes. At the same time a reduction in the tariff would bring down the cost of food and consumer goods.

It has been seen that List regarded emigration as a cure for pauperism. In the early 1840s he wrote articles in the *Zollvereinsblatt* and the *Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung* on this subject.²⁰ He advocated the establishment of a joint stock company to buy land in North America and to be responsible for settling Germans there. He praised a suggestion by Gladstone that the British government should make loans available to enable 20,000 persons a year to emigrate. But List thought that this scheme was far too modest to make a substantial impact on the problem that it was designed to solve.²¹

List had less difficulty in dealing with distress among domestic workers who could not compete with new factories and among peasants who could not make ends meet because their farms were very small. He considered that both groups belonged to a phase of economic development that was passing away. In his view the future lay with large factories and large farms which would be much more efficient than domestic workshops and tiny smallholdings. The creation of an industrial economy involved the transformation of rural craftsmen into urban factory workers and the establishment of large farms to feed the growing factory towns. List admitted that the transition from one type of economy to another might lead to temporary unemployment but eventually the workers would be better off in the new urban industrial society than they had been in the old rural society.

Since small workshops could not compete with factories, the fortunes of domestic craftsmen declined in the first half of the nineteenth century, particularly in the textile industries. In England the handloom weavers sank into a condition of abject poverty and by 1850 only 50,000 of them survived. In Germany the handloom weavers of Silesia were in a similar plight. By the 1840s piecework rates were so low that many weavers could not make

²⁰ F. LIST, 'Über die Auswanderung nach Nordamerika' in the *Zollvereinsblatt*, 1843, pp. 603-6 and 622-3. A book on emigration to Texas (by G.A. Scherpf) was advertised in the *Zollvereinsblatt*, October 23, 1843. On March 15, 1843 W.L.I. Kiderlin wrote to List: 'I see from several articles in the (Augsburg) *Allgemeine Zeitung* that you are at present concerned with a plan to promote emigration' (List archives, Fasc. 41/2 and F. LIST *Werke*, Vol. II, p. 487).

²¹ F. LIST, 'Die Factorybill' (first article) in *Das Zollvereinsblatt*, No. 15, April 8, 1844, pp. 281-9. A second article appeared on April 22, 1844 (pp. 313-22).

ends meet, even though they often had smallholdings on which to grow their own vegetables. To make matters worse, feudal dues survived in Silesia, the weavers paying a special tax instead of working on their lord's farm. Yet there were those who argued that to some extent the weavers had only themselves to blame for their misfortunes. One contemporary writer accused them of "idleness, obstinacy, and conservatism" ²² because they refused to move with the times and rejected opportunities to enter a factory as full time-machine weavers, since that would involve giving up their smallholdings.

In June 1844 there were serious disturbances in the mountain villages of Silesia and mobs attacked the warehouses and homes of unpopular employers. The authorities called in troops to restore order. These events came as a shock to the public and many articles and pamphlets discussed the cause of poverty and suggested ways in which the situation might be remedied. An article by List on the Silesian weavers appeared in the *Zollvereinblatt* in July 1844.²³ He contrasted the disturbances in Silesia with those in the English factory districts. He observed that the unrest in England had been due to the grievances of factory workers while in Silesia it was due to the grievances of handloom weavers. He argued that in England machinery had been adopted too quickly, while in Silesia it had not been adopted quickly enough. In England the recent slump had been caused by over-production and the inability of foreign markets to absorb all the goods that English manufacturers wished to sell. The Silesian economy, on the other hand, was depressed because markets had been lost owing to the imposition of hostile tariffs by foreign countries and to the greater efficiency of foreign manufacturers. The British tariff gave industrialists protection in the home market: the Zollverein tariff did not.

List declared that it had long been recognised that the manufacture of linen — once Germany's greatest export industry — would continue to decline unless more machinery was introduced. The Overseas Trading Corporation (*Seehandlung*), a Prussian state institution, had established some mechanised mills in Silesia ²⁴ but List considered that they provided no answer to the problem. He argued that nationalised factories controlled by bureaucrats were never as successful as those run by private entrepreneurs. An official Prussian report had stated that in the past six months the *Seehandlung* had provided work for 1,200 weavers and their families and had paid them 6,722 thalers in

²² ALEXANDER SCHNEER, *Über die Not der Leinen-Arbeiter in Schlesien und die Mittel ihr abzuhelfen* (1844).

²³ F. LIST, 'Die Noth in Schlesien und die Handelspolitik des Zollvereins' in the *Zollvereinsblatt*, No. 28, July 8, 1844, pp. 537-47 and in F. LIST, *Werke*, Vol VIII, pp. 397-403. At the end of this article List printed an extract from the *Weser-Zeitung*, June 26, 1844 (pp. 544-7) which is not reproduced in *Werke*.

²⁴ For the industrial enterprises of the Overseas Trading Corporation see CHRISTIAN VON ROTHER, *Die Verhältnisse des Königlichen Seehandlungs-Institut und dessen Geschäftsführung und industrielle Unternehmungen* (1845).

wages.²⁵ List declared that this was an admission of failure. On the other hand he praised the Württemberg government which had granted a loan to enable a mechanical flax spinning mill to be established in Urach.²⁶ He thought that it was right for the state to assist private enterprise in this way but wrong for the state to set up its own nationalised enterprises.

The situation in Silesia could be remedied in two ways. The first was that the Zollverein should levy a high import duty on foreign linen yarn and cloth so as to give German manufacturers and workers an assured market at home. The second was that the Prussian government should grant subsidies and loans to entrepreneurs to enable them to establish factories with modern machines driven by steam power. As a temporary measure List advocated the introduction into Silesia of an improved handloom constructed by Claussen, a Belgian inventor.²⁷

List also discussed the fate of peasants who practised what he called a "dwarf economy" and were condemned to a life of poverty because their holdings were too small to support a family. He argued that one cause of poverty in Ireland was early marriages and large families which were encouraged by the ease with which tiny plots of land could be rented. No wonder that the population of the country had doubled in 50 years.²⁸ List also discussed the causes of poverty among the peasants in the valleys of the Main and the Neckar. Like the Irish they cultivated minute smallholdings but while the Irish peasants were tenants, many of the peasants in south west Germany were freeholders. Their plots of land were continually being reduced in size because in that part of the country an estate was divided equally among the heirs when a peasant died. List argued that where a "dwarf economy" existed, the smallholdings should be combined to form larger farms and that displaced peasants should be encouraged to emigrate or to look for work in factories.²⁹

²⁵ Article in the *Vossische Zeitung* quoted in F. LIST, 'Die Noth in Schlesien ...' in the *Zollvereinsblatt*, No. 28, July 8, 1844, p. 540 (note).

²⁶ Escher Wyss of Zürich received a loan of 150,000 florins to build a flax spinning mill at Urach and to instal 20 spinning machines. See P. BORSCHIED, *Textilarbeiterschaft in der Industrialisierung* (1978), p. 113.

²⁷ For Claussen's handloom see 'Der neue Handwestuhl' in the *Zollvereinsblatt*, 1846, p. 577.

²⁸ F. LIST, 'Das Eisenbahnsystem in Irland' in the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 169 and No. 170, 1839 and *Werke*, Vol. III, pp. 289-93. See also 'Brief über den grossen Fragen des Tages' in the *Zollvereinsblatt*, 1843 (Letter 13) and in *Werke*, Vol. VII, p. 374.

²⁹ F. LIST, 'Die Ackerverfassung, die Zwergwirtschaft, und die Auswanderung', in the *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift*, 1842, Heft IV, pp. 106-191 and in *Werke*, Vol. V, pp. 418-547 and comments by the editors, pp. 640-91. See also GERTRUD MAYER, *Friedrich List als Agrarpolitiker* (1938).

IV

It has been seen that List did not put forward a doctrine of social development to supplement his theories of productive forces and phases of economic growth. His critics suggested that he was too preoccupied with his advocacy of industrialisation to concern himself with the social question and that he was more interested in the rôle of the middle classes in promoting economic expansion in Germany than in the fate of the workers in the new factories. List admired Defoe's "honest projector" and believed that the middle classes would provide the dynamic drive towards industrialisation. From their ranks would come the architects of the new economy — the scientists, the inventors, the entrepreneurs, and the managers. The factory workers no doubt had a part to play in the process of industrialisation but their rôle would be a subordinate one. And as for peasants, smallholders, and domestic craftsmen, List considered that they belonged to an age of economic development that was soon destined to give way to a predominantly industrial economy. It has been suggested that List's attitude towards the social question explains his failure to examine in any detail the doctrine of the early socialists. He showed some interest in the communities established by Robert Owen and the Rappists in America but he does not seem to have taken the socialist doctrines of Fourier, Weitling and Marx very seriously.

It has been observed that List and Marx were the leading exponents of two diametrically opposed views on the future development of society.³⁰ They agreed that the old feudal agrarian society was giving way to a new industrial society in which the middle classes would play a dominant role. But while List apparently assumed that the triumph of the middle classes would last for ever, Marx was confident that it would be shortlived. Before long the workers would overthrow the bourgeoisie to become the dominant class in society. Another fundamental difference between List and Marx was that List was a nationalist who devoted his energies to promoting the economic expansion and political unification of Germany while Marx believed that his doctrines were of universal application and he appealed to the workers of the

³⁰ J. PLENGE, *Die Stammformen der vergleichenden Wirtschaftstheorie* (1919), A. MEUSEL *List und Marx* (1928), and F. LENZ, *Friedrich List die 'Vulgarökonomie', und Karl Marx* (1930). Marx criticised List's *National System of Political Economy* in an essay probably written in 1845. The essay was not published in Marx's lifetime but 39 pages of the manuscript have survived. Pages 10 to 21, however, are missing. The manuscript was published under the title 'Über Friedrich Lists Buch *Das nationale System der politischen Ökonomie*' in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung*, June 1972, Heft iii. See CARL-ERICH VOLLGRAF, 'Karl Marx über die ökonomische Theorie von Friedrich List' in *Wirtschafts Wissenschaft*, 1977, Vol VII, pp. 991-1010.

world to unite to destroy the capitalist system and to replace it by a dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the twentieth century the leaders of communist states paid homage to Marx whose doctrines had inspired the revolutions that had brought them to power. The capitalist world, however, largely forgot List's powerful advocacy of industrialisation and free enterprise. One reason for this may be his failure to place a greater emphasis on the rôle of the vast mass of the workers in the industrial society that he wished to promote.