

CYCLOPÆDIA
OF
POLITICAL SCIENCE,
POLITICAL ECONOMY,
AND OF THE
POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES,

BY THE BEST AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN WRITERS.

EDITED BY
JOHN J. LALOR.

VOL. I.
ABDICATION—DUTY.

NEW YORK:
MAYNARD, MERRILL, & CO.
1899.

tions only can any influence be wielded. Some governments, indeed, make use of brutal means, such as threats and abuse of the authority they hold under the law. But this method is fraught with more than one danger. Less dangerous, though not without peril, is the influence directed through the channel of subtle or secret corruption.—In countries governed absolutely divisions are sometimes excited among the population belonging to different nationalities or of different religions, sometimes between the different classes of society. Here, the clergy are depended upon; there, the nobility; again the peasants, the laborers or artisans; and these are sought at different crises as allies. Thus the government provides itself with masters whom it is obliged to flatter, and therein lies its well-merited punishment.—The best thing a government can do is to satisfy the just demands of reasonable people. It will by this means keep the mass of the people from union with one of the extreme parties which are found in all countries, at least dormant, and which are not to be feared so long as the aggregate of citizens have no real grievances to complain of. When disaffection takes root among a people, division becomes a method of very little efficacy. We repeat: only by serious reforms can a sovereign regain the popularity necessary to a peaceful reign.—We would say, in closing, that those among whom it is sought to sow the germs of disunion should have ever in mind the axiom which Belgium has inscribed upon her coat of arms—"Union is strength." MAURICE BLOCK.

DIVINE RIGHT. In religion some minds accept the principle of authority, and others the principle of free investigation. In politics the same difference is found. Some advocate the principle of divine right, others that of national sovereignty. Must it be admitted that reason was given to man that he might not use it, and that he must blindly submit his opinions to those of a man clothed with ecclesiastical authority? Or may he freely use his intellect and reject what seems to him inadmissible? It is not our business to decide this question here.—We enjoy more liberty relatively to divine right. We may affirm that all men are equal before God, and that the nation was not created in the interest of a prince, but that the prince exists, at least in principle, only for the good of the nation. We say in principle, for, in reality, more than one monarch proved the scourge of his people. Moreover, nations have prospered under a republican form of government. But under the monarchical form, as well as the republican, sovereignty belongs naturally to the nation, which may delegate its powers, if it thinks best to do so. To believe that there exists any one family having rights directly emanating from God, is to ignore history and close one's eyes to evidence. M. B.

DIVISION OF LABOR. The division of employments is a natural consequence of the life of

man in society. It is, moreover, an element of productive power and of intellectual development. In the infancy of society each individual, each family, manufactures with difficulty and in an imperfect manner the objects it needs; the wisest, the old man of the tribe, preserves in his head the treasure, as yet very meagre, of acquired knowledge, which he endeavors to transmit by word of mouth to those who are to survive him. But as tribes grow larger, and improve, they come to sanction and maintain the right of the individual property of each man in the fruit of his labor; they come to understand the utility of exchanges freely consented to; and henceforth each man can devote himself to the special occupation for which he feels himself peculiarly fitted. He achieves greater results in the branch of labor to which he thus devotes himself, and produces more than is personally necessary to him; he lacks, on the other hand, everything that his individual labor is unable to supply, and exchange provides him with the means of establishing an equilibrium between what he produces himself and what he wants but can not produce; he gives his surplus in return for what he requires, and thus barter the services which he renders for those which he himself has occasion for.—When nations become greater and more enlightened, the division of labor becomes more marked. Certain individuals now devote themselves to hunting, to fishing, to the cultivation of the soil, others to manufactures: others there are again who devote themselves exclusively to the culture of the mind: these latter discover the laws of nature which God has placed at the service of man, whom he has charged to discover them and turn them to useful account. Thus they effectively help in the production of the wealth, upon the aggregate of which society subsists.—In each branch of production the division of labor tends to extend and multiply; farming adapts itself to the nature of the soil, and to the atmospheric condition of the land; in one place cereals are grown, in another the vine, in another cattle are raised: and these various products are afterward exchanged, one for another or for manufactured articles.—In the industries which convert raw material into manufactured products, the division of employments is soon pushed further still. One man becomes an iron worker; another hews wood; others still are weavers and cotton spinners.—To facilitate exchanges, yet another great industry is developed, namely, that which undertakes to place all products within the reach of the consumer, either by carrying them from one place to another, or by the simple division, on the spot, of the merchandise into quantities proportioned to individual wants: this is commerce. Here, too, division of employments soon takes place; the same merchants do not engage in sea, land and river transportation; the same merchant does not sell groceries, hardware and woolen goods. To facilitate commercial operations, a class of intermediary agents spring up, bankers, brokers, commission men.—It is

plain that the division of labor is both a consequence and a cause of the development of nations, and of the progress which they make in all branches of human knowledge. The division of labor tends constantly to increase, and is checked only by the limited extent of the market, that is to say, by the limitation which the wants of the population put to the possible sale of each kind of product.—In countries, remote from cities, where agricultural operations on a large scale are carried on, those who work in the fields cultivate, too, near their cottages, vegetables for their own use; while in the neighborhood of large cities, kitchen gardeners make it their sole business to cultivate vegetables and fruit; often even they devote themselves to a single branch of gardening; there are some who make floriculture, and even the culture of a single kind of flower, a specialty.—In villages in which consumption is limited, commercial industry does not admit of a division of labor; in such places there is often but a single shop, a grocer's, who sells sugar, coffee, candles, clothing, nails and stationery; while, on the other hand, in cities each of these branches becomes the object of a different commercial enterprise; each one of which frequently grows to an importance of great dimensions. Thus it is that in metropolitan cities huge emporiums exist for the exclusive sale of tea, candles or chocolate.—But it is especially in manufacturing industries that the division of employments has attained the most marvelous results, and that its influence is unparalleled in the increase of the values produced. Hence, the first economists who critically examined the vast mechanism of the production of wealth were struck at once with this great phenomenon.—Adam Smith says, in his "Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations": "The greatest improvement in the productive powers of labor, and the greater part of the skill, dexterity and judgment with which it is anywhere directed or applied, seem to have been the effects of the division of labor." (Book I., c. 1.) And to make the full bearing of this observation understood he instances the case of the pin-maker, and shows what an immense difference there would be between the results of a man who should attempt, alone and unaided, the manufacture of pins, and those obtained in a workshop where the labor is suitably subdivided among men skilled each in a distinct branch of their manufacture. Here one draws the wire, another straightens it, a third cuts it, while a fourth points it; it is a distinct process to prepare one end to receive the head, while the head itself is the result of two or three different operations. Then the pins have to be whitened; and lastly the perforation of the paper and the wrapping up are additional and separate departments. It is thus that in the important industry of pin-making there are 18 operations, which in certain factories are the work of as many different hands. The establishment which Adam Smith visited was, as he says, small, and

indifferently furnished with suitable machinery; only 10 workmen were employed, and yet it produced 48,000 pins a day, that is, an average of 4,800 apiece. In the presence of such production, and, owing to improved methods much greater to-day than when Smith wrote, how insignificant indeed would be the results of one attempting alone the manufacture of pins; scarcely would he perhaps by dint of the hardest labor make 20 in a day.—J. B. Say has taken as his example the manufacture of playing-cards, and there is no branch of industry in which immensely greater results are not obtained from the co-operation of individual effort and the division of employments.—If Adam Smith had extended his analysis, he might have shown that many other partial operations are divided among different workmen to complete that small product of human industry the value of which is so little, and which is called a pin. He might have directed attention to the work of the miner who brings to the surface of the earth the ore of copper, and to that of the miner having a different origin and habits, who, in another part of the world perhaps, has had to dig out the ore of tin necessary for alloyage and for whitening the pin. But in addition to the labor necessary to bring these metals to the requisite degree of purity, they must besides have been transported by sea and by land to the pin-maker's manufactory. How many different operations divided among an infinite number of workmen have not been necessary in the mere construction of the ship employed in carrying the tin from a port of India to England! And what shall we say of the compass which has been used in guiding this vessel across the seas? What an amount of time and of observations of different kinds, by a great number of individuals, was necessary to put mankind in possession of the compass! The imagination is appalled at the extent of the research needed to exhibit all the labor which has been necessary to bring to perfection the most trifling product, in a single branch of any manufacturing industry of our day.—To return to the consideration of the increase in productive force effected in a branch of manufactures by division of labor. Adam Smith attributes it to three causes: first, to the greater dexterity acquired by each workman in a single and often repeated act; second, to the saving of time commonly lost in passing from one kind of employment to another, and lastly, to the stimulus given to the mind concentrated upon a single purpose, to invent more rapid processes, or even machines to supplement human labor.—Undoubtedly the first two of these causes have a great effect; the saving of time is an important consideration in industry, bearing at once on the individual labor of the workman and on the capital employed in the undertaking, the interest being less heavy the shorter the term for which the interest is borrowed.—As to the invention of expeditious methods and of machines for supplementing human labor, division of labor certainly con-

duces to it, and instances can be given of more than one improvement in mechanism due to the workmen themselves, the discovery of which has permitted of economizing and replacing labor. It must at the same time be observed that it is not alone to the division of labor in workshops, that the great and numerous discoveries constantly made in the arts and sciences are due. The honor of these discoveries belongs rather to the division of labor among all classes; it is to the power that the mind can attain when devoted to one single line of study and investigation, that the greatest achievements are due, that is to say, the discovery of all the laws of nature we are acquainted with, and the combination of means to be employed to render them practically useful.—The advantages of the division of labor in the production of wealth are, therefore, incontestable; but we must not forget to call attention to the drawbacks which may be consequences of these advantages. The most glaring and one specially calculated to attract the attention of generous minds, is the effect which the restriction of a man to a single piece of work always the same and constantly repeated, may have upon his moral development. It is a melancholy thing, it has been observed, for one reaching the end of life to have to realize that his every day has been passed in making pin heads. Those who present the disadvantages of the division of labor under this dramatic form are, in part at least, unjust to humanity. Man must not be thus personified in the only work which it is his business to do; though a worker, he is one of a family; he is a citizen; in addition to the labor which he gives in exchange for the services of others of which he has need, he participates in all the advantages of the society in which he lives; he has his share in the progress made about him. In all vocations the working man has intervals of rest, and it is especially according to the use to which he turns his spare moments that man can elevate himself and come to enjoy the general advantages offered him by society. A steady and unvaried occupation does not necessarily dull the mind; and the artist who, during a year or two, grows pale over the same plate of copper or steel that he may produce a master-piece, does not live wholly amid the regular lines traced successively by his graver.—It would, moreover, narrow the question of the division of labor to see it and to study it within the walls of a manufactory only; it is not less worthy of observation in the little work shops of a great city like Paris. There, occupations are not only apportioned among the workmen employed, but also among a great number of petty manufacturers, each the possessor of a small capital, each conducting for himself some undertaking and affording employment to one or two workmen and an apprentice. A single little article of Parisian manufacture is thus often the result of the successive co-operation of many; for instance, the wood-work of a lady's work box is made by a cabinet maker; each separate article

which goes to complete it comes from a distinct trade, that of the turner, the cutler, the engraver, etc.; while finally, another tradesman, a furnisher, having selected these different articles, fits up the inside of the box. In the manufacture of artificial flowers the division of the labor of workmen and of manufacturers into departments is carried to quite as great an extent. The manufacture of what are called the preparations for flowers is very extensive, and gives rise to important industries; there are color makers, and mould makers, those who crimp the cloth, and those who make the stamens, the seeds and other accessories, and all these different people hand over their productions to the *monteurs*; among these latter, again, some make buds only, others roses, and others mourning flowers, and so on. This great division of labor largely reduces the cost of production, and the article is of improved quality. It may be observed, also, that among this vast laboring class where each one's employment is so narrow, quickness of wit and intelligence is developed to a much greater extent than in vocations where work is less subdivided.—Thus division of labor greatly facilitates and increases production; but it is at the same time a material aid to investigation and to the development of the sciences. Hence its influence is as deserving the attention of philosophers as of economists.

HORACE SAY.

DIVORCE. The right of the husband to repudiate the wife preceded divorce in all nations, just as force always precedes justice. The Persians, Hebrews and ancient Romans made extensive use of the right which they had arrogated to themselves. The principle of equality between man and woman began to be sanctioned, under Solon in Greece, Herod at Jerusalem, and Domitian at Rome, by the right given the wife of repudiating her husband. The fathers of the church themselves were much divided upon this important question of the indissolubility of marriage, and if Sts. Ambrose and Epiphanius permitted divorce, St. Augustine rejected it with all his energy. In 860 pope Nicholas I., who wished to force Lothair I. to take back his wife Teutbergia, maintained the doctrine of the absolute indissolubility of marriage with so much authority that the king finally yielded. This was a sort of recognition, by the civil power, of the principle established by the court of Rome. Still later the rupture of the eastern and western churches, and the reformation, divided Europe into two factions on the subject: the Roman Catholics holding to the indissolubility of marriage, on the one hand; the Greek Christians and Protestants making a large practice of divorce, on the other. At last the law of 1792 allowed divorce in France. The provisions of this law rendered very easy the rupture of a union become irksome to the married couple. It provided for two kinds of divorce: separation by mutual consent, and divorce on account of incompatibility of temper.—When two people,