

1: Noah (Vol.1) - Pt.I, CH.3

*A Picture Gallery of Canadian History, vol.1, Ryerson, Toronto, , p pg.6 of 14 The White Man has not introduced a single item of environmental protection in the Arctic which was not already being used by the natives, and his substitute products are not yet as effective as the native ones.*

Human History in Three Dimensions, vol. But if treated as intended, namely, as a list of technical achievements, it may come as a surprise to find how many, how varied, and how fundamental have been the inventions of Hamitic people, and how great a service they have rendered to mankind in the field of technology. Hitherto our ethnocentrism in the writing of history has obscured this fact, but we now have a sufficient and ever-growing body of documented materials to justify this presentation. Some of these achievements may be considered slight by those who have never actually contributed anything new to the sum total of human invention. But one should not be deceived by simplicity: It could also be argued that if we can only point to one invention of note in some particular tribe, that people can hardly be termed inventive. However, if we have only mentioned one invention that does not mean it was their sole achievement. It was mentioned only because it illustrated a particular aspect of native ingenuity. Scarcely an anthropologist can be found who would not at once agree that even the most primitive of people are peculiarly ingenious in finding practical solutions to practical problems. That they do not invent more is merely because they do not see the need for more inventions. When needs arise their solutions tend to be uncannily effective and simple. What may be said with a fair degree of certainty is that up until the time when Indo-Europeans, i. We have been great borrowers, and somewhat tardy in acknowledging the debt. Some of the reasons why this borrowed technology has been advanced in such an extraordinary way are considered in Part V. I find myself in somewhat the same position. The other three play a supporting role and are very necessary for the validation of the thesis presented in the first one. Without reading them, it is likely that many informed readers will be continually aggravated because certain basic assumptions, essential to the argument, are set forth as if unquestionable, whereas in fact they require very careful substantiation. But, like Luther, one soon finds the opening paragraph cannot be written at all if it must answer all the objections raised against it before proceeding any further: It was further hypothesized that the Indo-Europeans are Japhethites, which few will challenge; that the Semites are of Shem, which scarcely anyone will question; and that the coloured races black, brown, "red," and yellow are from Ham, which many will deny. But granted this premise, the pattern of the subsequent history of these three divisions of mankind is remarkably reflected in Scripture in a number of surprising ways, as suggested in Part I. In this paper my purpose is only to seek to substantiate a rather bold claim made for the descendants of Ham, namely, that pg. The people whose inventiveness is to be explored and illustrated quite extensively are all assumed to be neither Semites nor Japhethites, and therefore descendants of Ham. This, in a word, includes all who are Negroid or Mongoloid, which comprehends, as a matter of fact, the founders of virtually all ancient civilizations in the Middle East, Africa, the Far East, and the New World, as well as presently existing or recently extinct primitive people. The acknowledgment of our own debt to them is long overdue. The arts and architecture of such people have been recognized and admitted as remarkable enough, but their technology is commonly believed to have been of little account except for an occasional odd device like the compass. In due time, when it was discovered that Eskimos, a people who are generally held to be as nearly representative of paleolithic man as one could expect to find, could be trained to operate and even repair such delicate and complicated devices as sewing machines or clocks more readily and more rapidly than it was possible to train the "white man," considerable surprise was expressed. Eventually, the ingenuity of these so-called primitive people became increasingly apparent and writers began to vie with one another in their search for superlatives to enlarge upon their native ingenuity. But it soon became evident that the Eskimos were not the only "backward" people who were intensely practical. Their wilderness of ice and snow and their inhospitable environment is shared in a different way by other primitive people, whom it now turns out have proved themselves to be quite as ingenious in making the most of the immediately available resources of their surroundings. Considering their situation, it is quite amazing to find what they

have succeeded in extracting, out of it. Throughout this discussion of primitive culture, and in much of the treatment of more highly complex civilizations of non-Western tradition, it is necessary to bear in mind that the greatest displays of ingenuity frequently appear in the past. This recognition of their resourcefulness, given somewhat belatedly, is now being accorded at high levels. He might equally well have used the Indians of the Sonoran Desert in place of the Bedouin. And one could have included another rather rugged environment, the high altitudes of the Peruvian Andes, where the Aymara have shown themselves well able to hold their own with the Eskimo, the Bedouin, and the Indians of Arizona. Let us examine very briefly some of the achievements of such people. One of the best modern authorities of this aspect of Eskimo life is Dr. He has succeeded in adapting himself to an environment which offers to man but the poorest chances of survival. His technical solution of problems of the Arctic are so excellent that white settlers would have perished had they not adopted many elements of Eskimo technology. Wulsin, an authority on clothing problems for cold climates, says candidly that "there seems to be no doubt that Eskimo clothing is the most efficient yet devised for extremely cold weather. Moreover, to the Eskimo must probably go the credit for developing the first "tailored clothing" and, not unnaturally perhaps, the first thimbles. Solandt admitted frankly that: Newburgh, Saunders, Philadelphia, p. Only in his means of production has he the edge. Eskimos are described as very "gadget-minded" and are able to use and repair machinery such as motors and sewing machines with almost no instruction. It is impossible to give here a complete list of aboriginal Eskimo instruments the number of which and quality of which have been emphasized by all observers. The best known type of Eskimo house is undoubtedly the dome-shaped snow-house with its ice window. With extraordinary ingenuity, the very products of the cold are used here as a protection against it. It might be thought that once the idea was conceived, the construction of such a house would be comparatively simple. Actually it is remarkably difficult to construct a dome, without any means of supporting the arch while in the process of completing it. As the wall rises, it converges upon itself. Each new block overhangs more and more until near the top they rest almost in a horizontal plane. The problem is to hold each block in place until the next one ties it in, and then to hold that one until it, too, is tied in place. Given enough hands the process is not so difficult, but the Eskimos have overcome the problem so effectively that one individual can, if he has to, erect his own igloo single-handed, without too much difficulty. The solution is to carry the rising layers of blocks in a spiral instead of in a series of horizontal levels. This is shown in Fig. Thus as each block is added it not only rests on the lower level, but against the last block. One block would simply tend to fall in and, by experience, so do two or even three, when a new layer is started if the tiers are horizontally laid. But the Eskimo method entirely overcomes the problem. Most solutions are, when someone has discovered them for us. The problem is to visualize the solution before it exists. We tend to assume we would discover the way quite quickly, but experience shows that this is not true. Sayce has put it so 5. Davies reminds us of this fact when he pointed out: We listen to a radio receiver whose operation is utter magic to us and demand the ever more complex television. We are a race of lever-twiddlers, button-pushers, and knob-twisters, enjoying the prodigious technical labours of a comparatively few men. And Sayce joins with Davies in the article which was quoted above: Returning to the Eskimo again, we have to realize that his environment offers him little in the way of raw materials, and his solutions must always seem simple by nature. It is all the more to his credit that he has achieved so much. Edward Weyer in an article rightly entitled, "The Ingenious Eskimo," put the matter this way: Because of its sharp eyesight and keen intelligence, it is extremely difficult to approach in hunting. Yet the Eskimo kills it with nothing more formidable than a piece of flexible whalebone. He sharpens the strip of whalebone at both ends and doubles it back, tying it with sinew. Then he covers it with a lump of fat, allows it to freeze, and throws it out where the wolf will get it. When the Eskimo gets a walrus weighing more than a ton 6. Mechanical contrivances belong to a world in whose development the Eskimo has had no part. No implement ever devised by him had a wheel in it. Yet this does not prevent him from improvising a block and tackle that works without a pulley. He cuts slits in the hide of the walrus, and a U-shaped hole in the ice some distance away. Through these he threads a slippery rawhide line, once over and once again. He does not know the mechanical theory of the double pulley, but he does know that if he hauls at one end of the line, he will drag the walrus out of the water onto the ice. The deceiving thing about all his ingenuity is its very simplicity.

He makes all kinds of hunting devices that are effective, inexpensive in time, easily repaired and uses only raw materials immediately available. His harpoon lines have floats of blown-up skins attached, so that the speared animal is forced to come to the surface if he dives. To prevent such aquatic animals from tearing off at high speed dragging the hunter and his kayak, he attaches baffles to the line which are like small parachutes that drag in the water. A bone hoop and a skin diaphragm stretched over it, some thongs, and this is all that he needs. Marsh who discovered it. Marsh added at the end of his report this statement: Nevertheless, it is exceedingly unlikely that any friends who had seen a telephone would have seen the kind of arrangement this Eskimo had developed which, of course, used no batteries. We used to make a similar kind of thing as children with string and ordinary cans, but they were never of very much use, and in any case we got the idea from someone else. In this case, the Eskimo Finally, a word about Eskimo snow goggles. An illustration of one of these will be found in Fig. Like everything else the Eskimo makes, they are very effective, and often so designed that he does not need to turn his head to see to either side of him. This is important, since the game he usually hunts would catch the movement. Lapham has written illuminatingly of their genius for making much of little. Notwithstanding this forbidding aspect, to the initiated there is a veritable storehouse of the desert, from the widely scattered resources of which essentials in food, clothing, shelter, tools, cooking utensils, fuel, medicine, and articles of adornment or those sacred in ceremonial rites, have contributed for generations, and still are contributing to the needs of the Indian. Lapham gives many excellent photographs in which various plants are identified and the products which the Indians have extracted from them are also listed. These lists are very impressive. The desert ironwood, a small tree, is known for its extremely hard wood, is prized for the campfire, and has been used for arrow heads and implements.

**2: Commentaries on the Laws of England - Wikipedia**

*Vol. 1 of Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England - Rights of Persons. Based on the first edition, together with the most material corrections and additions in the second edition.*

Later on, we saw also that labour, too, possesses the same two-fold nature; for, so far as it finds expression in value, it does not possess the same characteristics that belong to it as a creator of use values. I was the first to point out and to examine critically this two-fold nature of the labour contained in commodities. As this point is the pivot on which a clear comprehension of political economy turns, we must go more into detail. The coat is a use value that satisfies a particular want. Its existence is the result of a special sort of productive activity, the nature of which is determined by its aim, mode of operation, subject, means, and result. The labour, whose utility is thus represented by the value in use of its product, or which manifests itself by making its product a use value, we call useful labour. In this connection we consider only its useful effect. As the coat and the linen are two qualitatively different use values, so also are the two forms of labour that produce them, tailoring and weaving. Were these two objects not qualitatively different, not produced respectively by labour of different quality, they could not stand to each other in the relation of commodities. Coats are not exchanged for coats, one use value is not exchanged for another of the same kind. To all the different varieties of values in use there correspond as many different kinds of useful labour, classified according to the order, genus, species, and variety to which they belong in the social division of labour. This division of labour is a necessary condition for the production of commodities, but it does not follow, conversely, that the production of commodities is a necessary condition for the division of labour. In the primitive Indian community there is social division of labour, without production of commodities. Or, to take an example nearer home, in every factory the labour is divided according to a system, but this division is not brought about by the operatives mutually exchanging their individual products. Only such products can become commodities with regard to each other, as result from different kinds of labour, each kind being carried on independently and for the account of private individuals. In the use value of each commodity there is contained useful labour, i. Use values cannot confront each other as commodities, unless the useful labour embodied in them is qualitatively different in each of them. In a community, the produce of which in general takes the form of commodities, i. Anyhow, whether the coat be worn by the tailor or by his customer, in either case it operates as a use value. Nor is the relation between the coat and the labour that produced it altered by the circumstance that tailoring may have become a special trade, an independent branch of the social division of labour. Wherever the want of clothing forced them to it, the human race made clothes for thousands of years, without a single man becoming a tailor. But coats and linen, like every other element of material wealth that is not the spontaneous produce of Nature, must invariably owe their existence to a special productive activity, exercised with a definite aim, an activity that appropriates particular nature-given materials to particular human wants. So far therefore as labour is a creator of use value, is useful labour, it is a necessary condition, independent of all forms of society, for the existence of the human race; it is an eternal nature-imposed necessity, without which there can be no material exchanges between man and Nature, and therefore no life. If we take away the useful labour expended upon them, a material substratum is always left, which is furnished by Nature without the help of man. The latter can work only as Nature does, that is by changing the form of matter. We see, then, that labour is not the only source of material wealth, of use values produced by labour. As William Petty puts it, labour is its father and the earth its mother. Let us now pass from the commodity considered as a use value to the value of commodities. By our assumption, the coat is worth twice as much as the linen. But this is a mere quantitative difference, which for the present does not concern us. We bear in mind, however, that if the value of the coat is double that of 10 yds of linen, 20 yds of linen must have the same value as one coat. So far as they are values, the coat and the linen are things of a like substance, objective expressions of essentially identical labour. But tailoring and weaving are, qualitatively, different kinds of labour. There are, however, states of society in which one and the same man does tailoring and weaving alternately, in which case these two forms of labour are mere modifications of the labour of the same individual, and not special and fixed functions of

different persons, just as the coat which our tailor makes one day, and the trousers which he makes another day, imply only a variation in the labour of one and the same individual. Moreover, we see at a glance that, in our capitalist society, a given portion of human labour is, in accordance with the varying demand, at one time supplied in the form of tailoring, at another in the form of weaving. This change may possibly not take place without friction, but take place it must. Productive activity, if we leave out of sight its special form, viz. Tailoring and weaving, though qualitatively different productive activities, are each a productive expenditure of human brains, nerves, and muscles, and in this sense are human labour. They are but two different modes of expending human labour power. Of course, this labour power, which remains the same under all its modifications, must have attained a certain pitch of development before it can be expended in a multiplicity of modes. But the value of a commodity represents human labour in the abstract, the expenditure of human labour in general. And just as in society, a general or a banker plays a great part, but mere man, on the other hand, a very shabby part, [14] so here with mere human labour. It is the expenditure of simple labour power, i. Simple average labour, it is true, varies in character in different countries and at different times, but in a particular society it is given. Skilled labour counts only as simple labour intensified, or rather, as multiplied simple labour, a given quantity of skilled being considered equal to a greater quantity of simple labour. Experience shows that this reduction is constantly being made. A commodity may be the product of the most skilled labour, but its value, by equating it to the product of simple unskilled labour, represents a definite quantity of the latter labour alone. Just as, therefore, in viewing the coat and linen as values, we abstract from their different use values, so it is with the labour represented by those values: As the use values, coat and linen, are combinations of special productive activities with cloth and yarn, while the values, coat and linen, are, on the other hand, mere homogeneous congelations of undifferentiated labour, so the labour embodied in these latter values does not count by virtue of its productive relation to cloth and yarn, but only as being expenditure of human labour power. Tailoring and weaving are necessary factors in the creation of the use values, coat and linen, precisely because these two kinds of labour are of different qualities; but only in so far as abstraction is made from their special qualities, only in so far as both possess the same quality of being human labour, do tailoring and weaving form the substance of the values of the same articles. Coats and linen, however, are not merely values, but values of definite magnitude, and according to our assumption, the coat is worth twice as much as the ten yards of linen. Whence this difference in their values? It is owing to the fact that the linen contains only half as much labour as the coat, and consequently, that in the production of the latter, labour power must have been expended during twice the time necessary for the production of the former. While, therefore, with reference to use value, the labour contained in a commodity counts only qualitatively, with reference to value it counts only quantitatively, and must first be reduced to human labour pure and simple. In the former case, it is a question of How and What, in the latter of How much? How long a time? Since the magnitude of the value of a commodity represents only the quantity of labour embodied in it, it follows that all commodities, when taken in certain proportions, must be equal in value. If the productive power of all the different sorts of useful labour required for the production of a coat remains unchanged, the sum of the values of the coats produced increases with their number. But assume that the duration of the labour necessary for the production of a coat becomes doubled or halved. In the first case one coat is worth as much as two coats were before; in the second case, two coats are only worth as much as one was before, although in both cases one coat renders the same service as before, and the useful labour embodied in it remains of the same quality. But the quantity of labour spent on its production has altered. An increase in the quantity of use values is an increase of material wealth. With two coats two men can be clothed, with one coat only one man. Nevertheless, an increased quantity of material wealth may correspond to a simultaneous fall in the magnitude of its value. This antagonistic movement has its origin in the two-fold character of labour. Productive power has reference, of course, only to labour of some useful concrete form, the efficacy of any special productive activity during a given time being dependent on its productiveness. Useful labour becomes, therefore, a more or less abundant source of products, in proportion to the rise or fall of its productiveness. On the other hand, no change in this productiveness affects the labour represented by value. Since productive power is an attribute of the concrete useful forms of labour, of course it can no longer have any bearing on that

labour, so soon as we make abstraction from those concrete useful forms. However then productive power may vary, the same labour, exercised during equal periods of time, always yields equal amounts of value. But it will yield, during equal periods of time, different quantities of values in use; more, if the productive power rise, fewer, if it fall. On the one hand all labour is, speaking physiologically, an expenditure of human labour power, and in its character of identical abstract human labour, it creates and forms the value of commodities. On the other hand, all labour is the expenditure of human labour power in a special form and with a definite aim, and in this, its character of concrete useful labour, it produces use values. This is their plain, homely, bodily form. They are, however, commodities, only because they are something two-fold, both objects of utility, and, at the same time, depositories of value. They manifest themselves therefore as commodities, or have the form of commodities, only in so far as they have two forms, a physical or natural form, and a value form. Turn and examine a single commodity, by itself, as we will, yet in so far as it remains an object of value, it seems impossible to grasp it. If, however, we bear in mind that the value of commodities has a purely social reality, and that they acquire this reality only in so far as they are expressions or embodiments of one identical social substance, viz. In fact we started from exchange value, or the exchange relation of commodities, in order to get at the value that lies hidden behind it. We must now return to this form under which value first appeared to us. Every one knows, if he knows nothing else, that commodities have a value form common to them all, and presenting a marked contrast with the varied bodily forms of their use values. I mean their money form. Here, however, a task is set us, the performance of which has never yet even been attempted by bourgeois economy, the task of tracing the genesis of this money form, of developing the expression of value implied in the value relation of commodities, from its simplest, almost imperceptible outline, to the dazzling money-form. By doing this we shall, at the same time, solve the riddle presented by money. The simplest value-relation is evidently that of one commodity to some one other commodity of a different kind. Hence the relation between the values of two commodities supplies us with the simplest expression of the value of a single commodity. The two poles of the expression of value. Relative form and Equivalent form The whole mystery of the form of value lies hidden in this elementary form. Its analysis, therefore, is our real difficulty. Here two different kinds of commodities in our example the linen and the coat, evidently play two different parts. The linen expresses its value in the coat; the coat serves as the material in which that value is expressed. The former plays an active, the latter a passive, part. The value of the linen is represented as relative value, or appears in relative form. The coat officiates as equivalent, or appears in equivalent form. The relative form and the equivalent form are two intimately connected, mutually dependent and inseparable elements of the expression of value; but, at the same time, are mutually exclusive, antagonistic extremes i. They are allotted respectively to the two different commodities brought into relation by that expression. It is not possible to express the value of linen in linen. On the contrary, such an equation merely says that 20 yards of linen are nothing else than 20 yards of linen, a definite quantity of the use value linen. The value of the linen can therefore be expressed only relatively i.

**3: OHCHR | Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities**

*pg 1 of 15 With this very brief explanation of how we are using the terms, we can go one step further and observe that while Semitic people have tended to lay the emphasis on the search for righteousness, the Japhetic or Indo-European peoples have laid the emphasis on the search for understanding, and the Hamitic people have searched for power.*

Certainly as far as Western Civilization is concerned the three most important religions are Judaism, Islam Mohammedanism, and Christianity. Many authorities, for example, point out that Confucianism is not in any sense a religion and only in a limited sense a philosophy. It seems desirable to make some effort at this point to distinguish between philosophy and religion. There is plenty of room for disagreement here, but I think that certain points of vital distinction can be noted to which there will be general assent. In the first place revelation is essential for religion, but for philosophy it must be rejected, human reason being the only justifiable tool. Religion is concerned with morals, philosophy with ethics: Morals are absolute, ethics are relative. If we may substitute metanature for metaphysics, we may say that the subject matter of philosophy is metanature the subject matter of science is Nature, but the subject matter of religion is supernatural. In religion, miracle is in a sense an essential adjunct, but in philosophy miracle is simply of no concern. The end object of all religion is to find God, but the end object of philosophy is to find the truth. This does not mean that religion does not have the discovery of truth as an object, but only that it is a secondary one. All men are religious to some extent and the nature of their gods tends to reflect something of their own personal goals. The gods of the Semites, and pre-eminently the God of Israel, rewarded conduct that was righteous. This is true of Judaism, Islam, and, of course, Christianity. But to a large extent it is also true of that form of paganism which, deriving its source of inspiration from the Babylonians and Assyrians both of whom were Semites, subsequently spread in modified forms far beyond the confines of its original home in Mesopotamia. The extent to which this pagan religion underlies the religious beliefs of many non-Christian people is remarkably revealed by A. Hislop in his well-known book *The Two Babylons*. To sum up thus far, it seems clear that from the Semites have come all the religions, rightly so-called, both false and the true. The contribution of Shem has been fundamentally to the spiritual life of man. To preserve the characteristic order of these three names, it would be proper to deal next with Ham. But there are reasons for considering Japheth first. One feels somewhat at a disadvantage here because to avoid misunderstanding the ideal approach would be to state the whole case at once. Of course this is impossible, so we have to take it a step at a time and trust that the reader will be patient until he has heard the end of the matter. First, we should state the proposition. These are not philosophy as philosophers understand the term, because they had a purely practical purpose. Only Indo-Europeans have continually returned to the fundamental problems of metaphysics: This does not mean that non-Indo-Europeans have never produced philosophers, though this observation is so nearly true that it could be argued very forcibly. Popular opinion is contrary to this view, but informed and authoritative opinion supports it almost unanimously. A few notable exceptions such as Paul Radin, for example, can be quoted as holding the opposite view. But for every authority who would support the latter, one can find dozens who will agree that philosophy has been the unique contribution of Indo-Europeans. Jacques Maritain made this observation: In this quotation the words, "on the other hand," are used by the author because he has just made a broad sweep of all other civilizations of non-Indo-European origin, ancient and modern, and shown that they were not characterized by any particular interest in this kind of speculative thought. As we shall see, it was not until the philosophizing aptitude of Japheth was brought to bear upon the pabulum of technology provided by the Hamitic peoples that science became possible. Before we turn to the positive contribution which the Hamites have made to world civilization, we should perhaps give a few authoritative statements to bear out the observation made previously that they have not produced philosophers. The Chinese are Mongols and therefore derived from Ham, so Confucius seems a good man to begin with, because almost everyone thinks of him as a philosopher. Epiphanius Wilson, an authority in this field, put the matter this way: Wilson, Epiphanius, *The Literature of China*, vol. To the popular mind he is the founder of a religion, and yet he has nothing in common with the great religious teachers of the East. The present life they despised, the future was

to them everything in its promised satisfaction. The teachings of Confucius were of a very different sort. Throughout his whole writings he has not even mentioned the name of God. He declined to discuss the question of immortality. When asked about spiritual beings he remarked, "If we cannot even know men, how can we know spirits? He was no transcendentalist. His teaching was of the earth, earthy. He died almost without warning in dreary hopelessness. In view of the fact that philosophy must be added to technology if science is to emerge, it is striking to find A. Kroeber, no mean authority on patterns of cultural interactions, making the following remarks: They have sought a way of life but neither an understanding nor a control of nature beyond what was immediately useful. They are of course not abnormal in their attitude: It is, with minor exceptions, only the few civilizational growths that have at one time or another been under the influence of Greek example which really tried to develop Science. It may be argued that these are prejudiced views. We may, however, quote a Chinese scholar, Liu Wu-Chi, writing specifically on this question. First of all it is a moral system which is both practical and practicable. Without any trace of the metaphysical philosophy and the supernatural religion, its contents are readily understood by the man in the street; and its ethical teachings, replete with wisdom and common sense, can be applied in daily life. Philosophy, Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, and religious rites are far less significant in China. Chinese Buddhism ceased to be a matter of other worldly mysticism. When Buddhism first came to China the method used for attaining spiritual illumination followed the lines of Indian Yoga: But this did not really appeal to the practical spirit of the Chinese, who wanted a Dhyana that could be applied to every day life. We may thus speak of the wisdom of China but scarcely of their philosophy, though this is in no way intended to challenge their intellectual capacity. The Chinese who adopts to some extent Western modes of thought and forms of speech is every bit as capable as we of philosophical abstraction of the purest kind. It should be noted that the same is true of Semitic people. But as Jessie Bernard has pointed out, it is not Jewish people who remain true to their religion who make this contribution. The great Semitic philosophers were unorthodox Jews, and culturally speaking had turned their backs upon their unique Semitic heritage. This, too, is a false impression. Martin Engberg says, "Nowhere is there any indication that Egyptians were interested in theoretical problems. Though intelligent and quick to learn, he had a mind of the practical unimagined type. He was a materialist and not given to deep speculative thought and seems to have been unable either to evolve or to express a purely abstract idea. In spite of the great contribution they rendered in the field of medicine, James Newman, speaking of one of their best known medical texts, remarked: Dreamers were rare among them. The Rhind Papyrus, though it demonstrates the inability of the Egyptian to generalize and their penchant for clinging to cumbersome calculating processes, proves that they were remarkably pertinacious in solving everyday problems. Frequent reference is made by various authorities to the fact that the science of mathematics was not developed by these highly practical people. Their methods of calculation were clumsy in the extreme, their tables were empirically derived, and though they achieved considerable practical skill in the manipulation of figures yet there is no evidence of the discovery or even the search for connective theories. But the moment we come to a consideration of Hindu philosophy originated by that branch of the Indo-European Japhetic family which penetrated into India in the second millennium B. Robert Lowie points out that "the Hindus made their contribution in the field of pure mathematics, to which they added the concept of negative numbers. Reference should have been made to a notable collection of papers in a volume edited by H. Frankfort, and published by the University of Chicago, in and This later title is an exact description of the subject matter of the papers. The conclusion reached by all the contributors to this volume is that philosophy did not exist prior to the time of the Hindu philosophers in India, or the Greek philosophers who were very nearly their contemporaries. The beginnings of Philosophy are as a rule attributed to the Greeks, but the Indian ideas of the sixth century B. On the other hand these same Japhetic people, until comparatively recently, have shown a remarkable indifference to technology. As Ralph Linton pointed out: The material world was felt to be of so little importance that minor advances in its control were not considered worth the trouble of changing established habit. Those who are acquainted with the views of the Greek philosophers in this matter will recognize the close kinship of sentiment, for to the Greeks it was almost a sin even to be tempted to seek any practical application of their ideas. In passing, it may be noted that both the Greeks and Aryans claimed Japheth as their ancestor. The

others were named Sharma Shem? To conclude this brief discussion of the descendants of Japheth, we may say that their scientific enthusiasm has strangely proved most fruitful where the objective has been pure understanding without regard to subsequent practical usefulness. This is Japheth at home. It may also be said, though the statement Perry says, "The Celts, like the Teutons, never invented anything. As a result the Romans invented almost nothing. Unless the rotary quern be attributed to them, the ancient Europeans of the Mediterranean Basin launched only one valuable mechanical technique, namely, the pot chain pump. Gordon Childe says that "in the next years one can scarcely point to a first class invention or discovery. Inventors they have never shown themselves to be. Needham, Joseph, Science and Civilization in China, vol. There was a period of mild inventiveness while their religion was settling down into its various sects but since that process was completed about years ago, no Moslem has invented anything. This is concurred in by Rene Albrecht-Carrie who points out that the Arabs were not so much innovators as collectors and carriers of the contributions of other times and other peoples. He adds, "This is not to deny or minimize the crucial importance of their role or ignore the fact that they made some valuable contributions of their own. Grau, speaking of the pure Arabs, 41 No science was developed; no new industry or even trades sprang up; the political unity, which religious enthusiasm and the Prophet had created crumbled away.

**4: Economic Manuscripts: Capital Vol. I - Chapter One**

*Professional Training Series THE CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH HR/P/PT/19 United Nations publication Sales No. EXIV.2 ISSN*

Marx says that surplus value is "merely a congealed quantity of surplus labor-time" nothing but objectified surplus labor. One part of the working day is the time necessary in order to produce the value of the workers labor power. The second part of the working day is surplus labor time, which produces no value for the laborer, but produces value for the capitalist. The rate of surplus value is a ratio of surplus labor time  $s$  to necessary labor time  $v$ . Capitalists often maximize profits by manipulating the rate of surplus value, which can be done through the increase of surplus labor time. This method is referred to as the production of absolute surplus value. In this case capitalists merely increase the length of the working day. Though there are physical restrictions to the working day, such as general human needs, the working day is by no means fixed. This allows for great flexibility in the number of hours worked per day. This flexibility in working hours leads to a class struggle between capitalist and worker. Similarly, the worker demands the full value of his own commodity. The worker needs to be able to renew his labor power so that it can be sold again anew. The capitalist sees working fewer hours as theft from capital, and the worker see working too many hours as theft from laborers. This class struggle can be seen throughout history, and eventually laws such as Factory Acts were put in place to limit the length of a working day and child labour. This forced capitalists to find a new way in which to exploit workers. The Concept of Relative Surplus-Value, Division of Labour and Manufacture, and Machinery and Modern Industry. In Chapter 12, Marx explains a decrease in the value of labour power by increasing production. Chapters 13-15 examine ways in which the productivity of this labour is increased. Remember, the value of labour-power is "the labour-time necessary to produce labour-power. Marx calls this decrease in necessary labour and increase in surplus value as relative surplus-value whereas when there is an actual lengthening in the working day and surplus value is produced, this is called absolute surplus-value. For this to happen, the productivity of labour must increase. The perpetual drive of capital, according to Marx, is to increase the productivity of labor, leading to a decrease in the value of commodities. In this, the value of the workers means of subsistence decreases, resulting in a decrease in the value of his labour power. Co-operation[ edit ] According to Marx, co-operation happens "when numerous workers work together side by side in accordance with a plan, whether in the same process, or in different but connected processes. Marx says, "If the labour process is complicated, then the sheer number of the co-operators permits the apportionment of various operations to different hands, and consequently their simultaneous performance. The time necessary for the completion of the whole work is thereby shortened. While this is the case, Marx is quick to note that the collective powers of co-operation are not created by Capital. This, according to Marx, is a disguise or a fetish. Marx cites the building of the pyramids , which occurred prior to the organization of a capitalist mode of production. The Division of Labour and Manufacture[ edit ] Section 1. The Dual Origin of Manufacture In this section 1, The Dual Origin of Manufacture, Marx examines manufacture as a method of production involving specialized workers, or craftsmen, working on their own detailed task. Marx cites the assembly of a carriage as an example of the first way this is brought about. In this, multiple skilled workers are brought together to produce specialized parts once unique to their craft, contributing to the overall production of the commodity. Another way this manufacture arises is by splitting up a single handicraft into multiple specialized areas, further introducing a division of labour. The Specialized Worker and his Tools In this section, Marx argues that a worker who performs only one task throughout his life will perform his job at a faster and more productive rate, forcing capital to favor the specialized worker to the traditional craftsman. The Two Fundamental Forms of Manufacture- Heterogeneous and Organic In this section, Marx argues that a division of labour within production produces a hierarchy of labor, skilled and unskilled, and also a variation in wages. Yet according to Marx, this division within the labour process reduces a workers skills collectively, which devalues their labour power. The Division of Labour in Manufacture and the Division of Labour in Society In this section, Marx

states that division of labour has existed in society long before the establishment of a capitalist mode of production. Marx argues that despite its existence prior to capital, division of labor is unique under capital because its goal is to increase the rate and mass of surplus value, not create a "combined product of specialized labours. The Capitalist Character of Division In this section, Marx discusses an increased class struggle that is brought about by capital, or in this case in the division of labour. By creating such a division, it disguises the efforts and work of such a division as that of the capitalist. Division of labour under capitalism, according to Marx, is a subdivision of a workers potential and sets limitations on his mental and physical capacity, making him reliant upon the capitalist to exercise his specialized skill. Machinery and Large-Scale Industry[ edit ] Section 1. Development of Machinery In this section, Marx explains the significance of machinery to capitalists and how it is applied to the workforce. The goal of introducing machinery into the workforce is to increase productivity. When productivity is increased, the commodity being produced is cheapened. Relative surplus value is amplified because machinery shortens the part of the day that the worker works for his or her means of subsistence and increases the time that the worker produces for the capitalist. Marx claims that many experts, including himself, cannot distinguish between tools and machines. Marx states that they "call a tool a simple machine and a machine a complex tool. Marx gives a precise definition of the machine when he says "The machine, therefore, is a mechanism that, after being set in motion, performs with its tools the same operation as the worker formerly did with similar tools. Whether the motive power is derived from man, or in turn from a machine, makes no difference here. The motor mechanism powers the mechanism. The transmitting mechanism, wheels , screws , and ramps and pulleys. These are the moving parts of the machine. The working machine uses itself to sculpt whatever it was built to do. Marx believes the working machine is the most important part of developed machinery. It is in fact what began the industrial revolution of the eighteenth century and even today it continues to turn craft into industry. The machine is able to replace a worker, who works at one specific job with one tool, with a mechanism that accomplishes the same task, but with many similar tools and at a much faster rate. One machine doing one specific task soon turns into a fleet of co-operating machines accomplishing the entire process of production. This aspect of automation enables the capitalist to replace large numbers of human workers with machines which creates a large pool of available workers that the capitalist can choose from to form his human workforce. The worker no longer needs to be skilled in a particular trade because their job has been reduced to oversight and maintenance of their mechanical successors. The development of machinery is an interesting cycle where inventors started inventing machines to complete necessary tasks. With so many machines being developed, the need for new machines to create old machines increased. For example, the spinning machine started a need for printing and dyeing , and the designing of the cotton gin. Along with the press, came the mechanical lathe and an iron cutting machine. Labor assumes a material mode of existence which necessitates the replacement of human force by natural forces. The Value Transferred by Machinery to the Product As seen in the previous section, the machine does not replace the tool, which is powered by man. The tool multiplies and expands into the working machine that is created by man. Workers now go to work not to handle the tools of production but to work with the machine, which handles the tools. It is clear that large-scale industry increase the productivity of labor to an extraordinary degree by incorporating its fast paced efficiency within the process of production. What is not as clear is that this new increase in productivity does not require an equal increase in expended labor by the worker. Machinery creates no new value. Only labor power, which is bought by capitalists, can create new value. Machinery transfers its value into the product at a rate, which is dependent upon how much the total value of the machinery is. Otherwise, the machinery would not be effective in raising surplus value and instead depreciate it. This is why some machinery is not chosen to replace actual human workers because it would not be cost effective. The Proximate Effects of Machinery on the Workman Section Three examines some of the effects of the industrial revolution on the individual worker. It is divided into three subsections, the first of which discusses how the use of industrial equipment enables capitalists to appropriate supplementary labor. The second subsection describes how mechanisation, by increasing labor productivity, can effectively shorten the working-time needed to produce an individual commodity item. However, because of the need to recoup the capital outlay required to introduce a given machine, it must be productively

operated for as long as possible every day. In the third subsection, Marx discusses how mechanization influences the intensification of labor. Although the introduction of the Factory Acts limited the allowable length of the work day, it did nothing to halt the drive for more efficiency. The Factory Marx begins this section with two descriptions of the factory as a whole. In the first description, the workers, or collective labor power, are viewed as separate entities from the machine. In the second description, the machine is the dominant force, with the collective labor acting as mere appendages of the self operating machine. Marx uses the latter description to display the characteristics of the modern factory system under capitalism. The division of labor and specialization of skills re-appear in the factory, only now as a more exploitative form of capitalist production work is still organized into co-operative groups. Work in the factory usually consists of two groups, people who are employed on the machines and those who attend to the machines. The third group, outside of the factory, is a superior class of workers, trained in the maintenance and repair of the machines. Factory work begins at childhood to ensure that a person may adapt to the systematic movements of the automated machine, therefore increasing productivity for the capitalist. Marx describes this work as being extremely exhausting to the nervous system and void of intellectual activity. Factory work robs workers of basic working conditions like clean air , light , space , and protection. Marx notes that, by the early nineteenth century, the introduction of power looms.

### 5: Noah (Vol.1) - [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com), CH.1

*Chapter 1 - Purpose and Background S. citizenship is a unique bond that unites people around civic ideals and a belief in the rights and freedoms guaranteed by.*

The Rights of Persons[ edit ] The Rights of Persons is by and large concerned with the relations of status in the English social structure, from the King of England and the aristocracy down to the untitled commoners. Also dealt with here were common relationships such as that of husband and wife , master and servant in modern-day terminology, employer and employee , and guardian and ward. The vast majority of the text is devoted to real property , this being the most valuable sort in the feudal law upon which the English law of land was founded. Property in chattels was already beginning to overshadow property in land, but its law lacked the complex feudal background of the common law of land, and was not dealt with nearly as extensively by Blackstone. The various methods of trial that existed at civil law were also dealt with in this volume, as were the jurisdictions of the several courts, from the lowest to the highest. Almost as an afterthought, Blackstone also adds a brief chapter on equity , the parallel legal system that existed in English law at the time, seeking to address wrongs that the common law did not handle. Here, Blackstone the apologist takes centre stage; he seeks to explain how the criminal laws of England were just and merciful, despite becoming later known as the Bloody Code for their severity. He does however accept that "It is a melancholy truth, that among the variety of actions which men are daily liable to commit, no less than an hundred and sixty have been declared by Act of Parliament to be felonious without benefit of clergy ; or, in other words, to be worthy of instant death". Legacy[ edit ] Blackstone for the first time made the common law readable and understandable by non-lawyers. At first, his Commentaries were hotly contested, some seeing in them an evil or covert attempt to reduce or codify the common law which was anathema to common law purists. For decades, a study of the Commentaries was required reading for all first year law students. Lord Avonmore said of Blackstone: He found it a skeleton and clothed it with life, colour and complexion. He embraced the cold statue and by his touch, it grew into youth, health and beauty. In the United States, the common law tradition was being spread into frontier areas, but it was not feasible for lawyers and judges to carry around the large libraries that contained the common law precedents. The four volumes of Blackstone put the gist of that tradition in portable form. They were required reading for most lawyers in the Colonies, and for many, they were the only reading. Quotations[ edit ] "Of great importance to the public is the preservation of this personal liberty; for if once it were left in the power of any the highest magistrate to imprison arbitrarily whomever he or his officers thought proper, as in France it is daily practised by the crown, there would soon be an end of all other rights and immunities. Some have thought that unjust attacks, even upon life or property, at the arbitrary will of the magistrate, are less dangerous to the commonwealth than such as are made upon the personal liberty of the subject. To bereave a man of life, or by violence to confiscate his estate, without accusation or trial, would be so gross and notorious an act of despotism, as must at once convey the alarm of tyranny throughout the whole kingdom; but confinement of the person, by secretly hurrying him to jail, where his sufferings are unknown or forgotten, is a less public, a less striking, and therefore a more dangerous engine of arbitrary government. Hence it follows, that the first and primary end of human laws is to maintain and regulate these absolute rights of individuals. And yet there are very few, that will give themselves the trouble to consider the original and foundation of this right.

### 6: Kill Bill: Vol. 1 () - IMDb

*Volume I, Part 1, begins with a consideration of truth and liberty in the seventeenth century, continues with a study of the issues of the American Revolution, and concludes with a study of the Confederation and the Constitution.*

### 7: Capital, Volume I - Wikipedia

## **VOL. 1 PT. 1. THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS pdf**

*Do Black People Need Their Own POLICE FORCE? Vol. 1: Starring Brandon Albert part 1 Do Black People Need Their Own POLICE FORCE Vol. 1: Starring Brandon Albert part 2 - Duration:*

*Blacks criminal law books A letter from the Reverend Mr. Ralph Erskine to the Reverend Mr. Geo. Whitefield. Anti-Terrorism Risk Assessments Arithmetic for college students Intelligent Innovation The future of hospital services Fairy Tale Factory Volume 1: Six short fairy tales, some with unhappy endings An Introductory Guide to Industrial Tribology (Introductory Guide Series (REP)) Spatial Data Modelling for 3D GIS God family counselor manual Automating the survey interview with dynamic multimodal interfaces Michael Johnston The Military Balance, 2000-2001 Irwin Prairie State Nature Preserve Sins of My Mother Appendix: La filla del emperador Contasti. Books on love stories How to run your business with dBASE II Dragonlance campaign setting Class 10 board papers Enhancing development cooperation effectiveness to implement the National Strategic Development Plan 2006 Coherence of Gothic conventions The Breakdown of Democratic Party Organization, 1940-1980 When every note counts Equinox and other poems Whither the welfare state? Latino Health in the U S Susan snedaker business continuity Adult tumors of the choroid and retina Judging and enforcing : courts and compliance Group Psychotherapy for Women With Breast Cancer Managing emotions in the workplace mit DogStar (Sirius Mystery, A) A Pod of Killer Whales Bringing down the moon Therapeutic impasses and encounters Vb.net language tutorial The joy of caring Reproducing furniture in miniature The Medical School Interview The Constitution of the United States in reconstruction*