

Special Issue

On the Concepts of Human Individual Practice and Human Collective Practice

Prof. Zhiyong Dong^{1*}

¹ Northwest University, P. R. China

* Prof. Zhiyong Dong, Northwest University, P. R. China

Received: October 10, 2019

Accepted: October 22, 2019

Online Published: October 30, 2019

doi:10.22158/wjeh.v2n2p34

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/wjeh.v2n2p34>

Abstract

This article gives Prof. Zhiyong Dong's own definitions on the Human Individual Practice and Human Collective Practice.

1. Introduction

The science and technology of the world is developing very fast at this moment, especially in IT and biological engineering, etc., with each passing day. The Google Company defeated Li Fetishist, one of the best players in the whole world of *go*, that is, *Weiqi* in Chinese pronunciation, a game played with black and white pieces on a board of 361 crosses, in March of the year of 2016, with the computer software of Alpha Go, which was programmed by the staff of Google Company, in the circumstances that competition reduced some rules of the game, mainly prohibited the robbing. Then some people began to guess that the artificial intelligence and robots would menace the existence of humans in the near future, and some ones even began to study the rights of robots.

However, I think that they entertain imagination or groundless fears, worry about troubles of their own imagining, because the computer thinking or artificial intelligence can never surpass the intelligence of humans.

One of the reasons that the artificial intelligence or robots would not menace the existence of humans or surpass the intelligence of humans is that the thinking of humans has the duality, or the dual functions, of individual thinking and collective thinking at the same time. The duality, or the dual functions, of humans' thinking are realized or carried out by the division of humans' thinking. The division of humans' thinking is connected and linked closely with the collective practice of humans. The human practice and thinking have been collective since their birthday. The humans can initiate themselves to improve and extend continually their collective practice and collective thinking

according to the historical circumstances which they face. No any robot or a group of robots can do it initially. For instance, the higher level officers of the remaining officers and soldiers of a battalion would readjust and regulate initially the responsibility of each remaining officers and soldiers in the battle according to the responsibility and task of the battalion in the battle, if the battalion commander and many officers of the battalion have died or wounded in the battle. Sometimes, the remaining officers and soldiers in the battle would do it initially themselves without any orders from the higher level officers, just like what happened in the history of the Chinese People's Liberation Army. Some experts have pointed out that one of the reasons for no computer could surpass or exceed the humans' intelligence for ever is that no independent computer can convince another independent computer to submit or obey to itself initially. To say nothing that the manufacture of a computer and the program or software of Alpha Go are the results of collective practice and collective thinking of humans. One of the best player of the contemporary world said, after the program of Alpha Go had defeated all the best players of *go* in the world, that if any individual player could defeated the program of Alpha Go only on the circumstances that there are bugs or the electricity stops. However, a single person can never let a electric system works well for ever.

Of course, any mind of an individual person cannot surpass or exceed a single computer for ever in many respects, such as in the respects of the big data calculation, pure memory, the data and picture retrieval, etc. Otherwise no one would have manufactured any computer at all. However, this issue is out of the field of the analysis of this book, and I do not give unnecessary words here.

2. Individual Practice and Collective Practice

The individual practice usually has the duality, or the dual functions, of individual practice and collective practice. That is, each practice is an individual practice, and at the same time, a part of collective or group practice. In other words, the individual practice of humans is the realizing form of collected or group practice, and the material bearer of collective or group practice. The individual practice of humans is the natural and social carrier of the collective practice. Without the individual practice, without the collective practice.

The reason for each human has to do collective practice is that the capacity of each individual human being to do practice is finite and weak, compared with the natural and social environment in which each individual has to survive. A single person has far less physical strength than a large carnivore, such as a tiger or a lion. An individual person is quite liable to be seriously hurt if he were to fight single-handed against a large carnivore or a group of large carnivores, even if he were to equip himself with stone weapons or sticks. In the more recent epochs of human history, a single person could successfully engage with metal weapons or firearms against a large carnivore or a group of large carnivores. But the production of the metal weapons or firearms cannot be achieved by any single person. Even the mere smelting of iron ore for the production of metal weapons or firearms cannot be carried out by any single person, to say nothing of the other relevant concrete labors, such as mining exploration or ore

retrieval. It is obvious that without the co-operation of other persons in various forms, either in the form of direct co-operation, or in the form of providing the necessary metal weapons or firearms, it would be difficult for a single person to survive in an environment where he is confronted by the menace of being pursued by a large carnivore or a group of large carnivores.

Besides, an individual always needs the protection of the community as a whole in which he lives against the threat of potential injury or murder by any of the other individuals, who are the same intelligent, in the same community, or by the individuals in a nearby community (no matter friendly or hostile), or even by a nearby hostile community as a whole. Many sorts of injuries and murders have been happening every day from the most primitive stage of human history until the present time, even in the most developed societies such as the United States of America, Great Britain, France, etc., at present. One of the essential reasons why citizens in the most developed countries have to pay taxes to support financially the continuous existence of policemen and soldiers is that they need them to prevent or at least reduce these sorts of injuries and murders.

Besides the security of his own living body, there is another important issue which each human confronts: that is, the pursuit and acquisition of a higher standard of living either for himself, or for his immediate offspring, or for both.

The concept of standard of living encompasses an individual's life-span, the quantity and quality of food and dress, a person's dwelling, various health services, the means to satisfy the spiritual needs and the curiosity of humans, including the geographical space for touring, the means for people to enjoy various arts, etc.; in short, the multiplicity of goods and services made available for general daily consumption.

In order to provide the necessary material conditions and substantial circumstances for a higher standard of living, people would have to be conscious of the many relevant factors which together promote the goals of socio-economic welfare in a given environment; that is to say, they would have to be acquainted with the diversity of scientific principles that equip mankind to harness the necessary scientific knowledge, to master various skills, and so on. But the capacity of each individual human being to learn scientific knowledge and master various skills is always limited. For example, the use of buses in people's daily lives can improve their living standards. In order to meet the continuing demand, people have to produce buses and fuel, etc. In order to produce buses and fuel, people have to have a command of the relevant scientific knowledge and skills, such as the capacity to produce iron and steel, electrical cables, plastic moulding, various other bus components, etc. But no single person could command so many necessary skills or knowledge, to say nothing of producing the whole vehicles, or indeed usable fuel, in isolation.

Some individuals and groups of humans would make use of violence to get better or more sexual partners by hurt his or their competitors, who have got the same intelligence. Humans can never get rid of these kind of incidents, because humans are animals at bottom. Therefore humans have to get their safety by their collective powers.

The collective practice is the reason, aim and content of co-operation, from the perspective of the human impact on the nature, that is, from the perspective of the impact on the objects by the subjects. Conversely co-operation is the natural and social form to realize the collective practice. The collective practice cannot be realized without the co-operation. And the co-operation would lose its reason and aim without the collective practice.

We can deduce further from the above cognition that only by developing the co-operation can we develop the collective practice.

3. Developing Moments of Collective Practice

The developing moments, or stages, of collective practice and collective thinking are collective practice, collective cognition, division, collective practice again on the basis of division, collective cognition again on the basis of division, enlarged division, collective practice again on the basis of enlarged division, collective cognition again on the basis of enlarged division, re-enlarged division again on the basis of enlarged division. This process will circulate, and content of each circulation will go on a higher level. The developing moments, or stages, of individual practice and individual thinking are practice, cognition, re-practice, re-cognition on the basis of re-practice, re-cognition. This process will circulate, and the content of each circulation will go on a higher level. That is to say, the developing moments, or stages of collective practice and collective thinking are one more moment than the individual practice and individual thinking, that is, the division or enlarged division.

The division of practice is the natural realizing form and social realizing form of cooperation. This can be demonstrated clearly in the process of the social production of today's societies. For instance, the collective practice of producing buses is carried out but all the individual practice which connected with the production of the buses, just like what has been stated above. There would not been any collective practice in the bus production, if there had not been any individual practice. The collective practice would lose its material carrier or existent form. Therefore, the collective practice is only one limitation or prescription which the humans add to the individual practice. The individual practice is the sole material entity of practice in the material world, though the concept of practice has got many definitions. Of course, the different prescriptions, which the humans add to the individual practice, always reflect certain objective connections between different individual practice or collective practice. But the objective connections between different individual practice or collective practice are always demonstrated or manifested by certain material entity. The material entity is the individual practice.

From the perspective between the nature and humans, what makes the individual practice to have got the duality is cooperation. That is to say, from the perspective of the relations between the nature and humans, what makes the individual practice to have got the duality of individual practice and collective practice simultaneously is the inevitable relations between different individual practice, which are demonstrated or manifested by the direct cooperation in the forms of collected animal hunting, or collected carrying of heavy things, or indirect cooperation in the forms of using the tools, installations

or facilities which are made or manufactured by other humans, etc.

It is the division of practice which makes the individual practice unite with the collective practice, because the practice itself is not only a natural process, but also a social process as stated above. Only through the moment of division can a community make the contents of cooperation, and further contents of collective practice onto the individual practice, which is the natural carrier of collective practice, and makes the collective practice possible. Humans make the development of practice through the development of cooperation. The degree of the development of division demonstrates and manifests the degree of the development of collective practice. The more developed the division is, the more developed the collective practice is. It is also the basic reason for us to have to face the process of today's globalization of the economic and social development. The historic facts have shown that the social and economic development have made people get to know that only through the continuous enlargement of the scope and range of the cooperation can the people continuously develop their the abilities of cognition and practice, and further to raise their absolute level of living.

However, the scope and range of the cooperation cannot be enlarged without a limit. It is because that the various natural resources, which the earth has got, such as water, oxygen, etc., are limited, and the sum total population, which earth can bear is limited.

Summarizing above points, we have gone through the process of logic reduction as follows: the humans have to undertake the collective practice as the form of their practice; collective practice has to undertake the cooperation as its natural realizing form; cooperation has to undertake the division as its social realizing form.

We can see, from above statements, that the concepts of cooperation and division have got different contents. The division is the social realizing form of cooperation, while the cooperation is the natural realizing form of division. From the dialectical perspective, the relationship between the collective practice, cooperation and division is a series of contents and forms. Among them, collective practice is the living content of cooperation, while the cooperation is the natural and social realizing form of collective practice. Another moment is that the cooperation is the living content of division, while the division is the natural and social realizing form of cooperation. The collective practice of humans, through the series of the above medial moments, is implemented onto the individual practice, and make the collective practice realized.

We can deal with the relations between the cooperation and division better and timely if we can make clear the relations between the cooperation and division beforehand. We can follow the principle of the historical materialism that contents determine the forms and the forms can make reaction on the forms better and easier, if we understand the above relations between the cooperation and division. We can adjust the division of practice timely and on our own initiative, if we have changed the forms of cooperation, based on the better understanding about the objective knowledge on the environment around us, in order to suit and fit the changed forms of cooperation.

Another reason for us to distinguish the difference between co-operation and division, and to redefine

the concepts of individual practice, collective practice co-operation, division of practice, etc., in a new way, and to study the relations between these concepts in detail is that it is directly linked with one paragraph which was stated by Karl Marx in his work *Preface To A Contribution To The Critique Of Political Economy*. This paragraph is as follows:

The general result at which I arrived and which, once won, served as a guiding thread for my studies, can be briefly formulated as follows: In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the changes of economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations, a distinction should always be made between the material transformation of economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic—in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself, so can we not judge of such a period of transformation by its own consciousness; on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained rather from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social productive forces and the relations of production. No social order ever perishes before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed; and new, higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society itself. Therefore mankind always sets itself only such tasks as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely, it will always be found that the task itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution already exist or at least in the process of formation. (Note 1)

The above paragraph is one of the most important and basic statements in the theory of historical materialism founded by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. In this paragraph, Marx stated explicitly and rightly the most fundamental principle of historical materialism. The principle is that the development of material productive forces indispensably leads to the development of the relations of production, and the level or magnitude of the development of material productive forces determines the historical forms of the relations of production, that is, the economic structure of society.

However, in the above paragraph or in other works of Marx, he did not state further what are the

indispensable social moments or social mediums through which the development of material productive forces leads to the development of the relations of production step by step. That is, Marx never explained explicitly how the development of material productive forces leads to the development of the relations of production step by step. However, the historical facts show that only through some indispensable social moments or social mediums can the development of material productive forces lead to the development of the relations of production. Among these social moments are individual labour, extended individual labour, collective labour, co-operation, division of labour, etc. Consequently, it become the historical responsibility and task which is unavoidable for Marxist school in the fields of philosophy and political-economics to supplement the explanation to expound what these moments are and how these moments work in the historical process of impelling the relations of production to change and develop.

The reason for us to redefine the relevant concepts and to expound the relations between these concepts in detail is not only to develop Marxist school in the fields of philosophy and political-economics, but also to help us in understanding and reforming better the present world in which we are living.

4. Two Processes of the Division of Labour

The topic should be transited from practice to labour, which is an extension of practice, and from division of practice to division of labour, one extension of the division of practice, in order to explain the characteristics of practice and division better, because labour has got the most forms among all the existent forms of practice, and labour is the most complex form among all the existent forms of practice, and the labour can represent the all the existent forms of practice from now on.

I put forward the proposition that “labour is...the multi-moment activities defined by reference to the moment of social compulsion” (Note 2) in my book *Absolute Value and the Concept of Human Rights*. The so-called multi-moment activities are the activities which are defined and refined activities by humans themselves. The so-called multi-moment activities refer to the human practice and rational activities. The main reason for me to call human practice as the multi-moment activities is that it will make me be able to quantify labors absolutely in the latter part of the above book, as stated above.

I also pointed out in the above book that each community has to do collective labour through the division of labour in order to improve the productivity and raise the absolute level of human spiritual and material living standards. And each community has to make the division of labour go through two social processes in order to realize the cooperation, collective labour, enlarged individual labour, etc.

One process is to separate out all the multi-moment activities which have to be performed in a given time into a certain number of concrete labours, each of which can be performed in the given time by one labourer. This roughly equates to a theory of demarcation. This process can be called the technical process of the division of labour. It is the process of the particularisation of the concrete labours. The result of this process is the delineation of various concrete labours, such as the work which has to be performed by a prime minister; the work which has to be done by a chef; the work which has to be

done by ten thousand postmen, etc.

The other process in division of labour is to force each member of the community to carry out one of the concrete labours which have to be performed in a given time. This process can be called the social process of the division of labour. During this process, every necessary concrete labour of the community is individually instantiated. In this process, each member of a community is forced to undertake an occupation, a social position, a profession (or to join one estate, in Hegelian terminology), and variously to become a prime minister, a porter, a farmer, a chef, a train driver, a surgeon, a retail manager, etc.

It is obvious that the objects which have to be dealt with respectively by the two processes are different. In the technical process of the division of labour, the object, i.e., what the community as a whole through its agents deals with, is the relationship between the labourers and the objects of their labour. The agents of a community as a whole refer to the relevant particular members of the community, such as the administrators, tribe chiefs, noblemen, employers, government officials, heads of families, etc. In this process, what the community as a whole is most concerned with is the quantity of a particular kind of concrete labour which can be performed by a particular labourer in a given time and how many particular posts or jobs should be set up. For instance, in 1994, the total number of employees in the Postal Services and telecommunications in Great Britain was about 361,000. (Note 3) The reasons for the number of postal workers and the demarcated division of labour in that organization in Great Britain are based upon the number of the concrete labours needed in that field in that year which could be carried out successfully on time, given the working conditions and the demands made upon the staff working in this particular field. A village, or a town, or a small community is a subdivision of the whole, and the distribution of manpower required in this field of work is dependent on, and determined by, the requisite quantity of concrete labours to be completed in that specific year. The demands on labour associated with the sphere of posts and telecommunications are based on antecedent historical prerequisites, and are contingent on all the other fields in a given community.

In the second process, i.e., in the social process of the division of labour, the object is the labourers. In this process, what the community as a whole is most concerned with is who could and should undertake the relevant task and perform the concrete labour in each particular case: that is, how to arrange and ensure that each member of a community carries out one, or a number, of the concrete labours which have to be performed in a given time. What the community as a whole is most concerned with is the functional question: it must assure that every necessary post is undertaken and every necessary concrete labour is carried out within the given time constraint. In this process, what the community as a whole deals with is the social relationship between its members. The result of this process is the formation of various labourers with certain defining titles according to the characteristics of the sorts of concrete labour which the labourers have undertaken respectively, such as prime minister, chef, cleaner, peasant, soldier, policeman, retail manager, etc.

Of course, in this process, the community does not necessarily compel a person to take only one

particular concrete labour as his profession or occupation for his entire working life. A peasant can spend some of his working time in farming wheat and cotton, but may also diversify into other fields such as bricklaying, spinning and sewing, even modern retailing and manufacturing, etc., depending on the weather conditions and on the seasons, like what is happening in today's China.

It is of great importance in philosophy and political-economics to recognize and acknowledge the above two processes which the division of labour has to go through. It is the moment we cannot leap over in the process of our understanding why human society has to set up and maintain many social systems, such as the ownership of labour power, the ownership of the living body of human beings, the ownership of marriage right, the ownership of the person, the ownership of products, the ownership of natural resources, etc. In other words, it is the key for us to understand why human society has to set up and maintain the most fundamentally economical systems mentioned above.

The relationship between the two processes of division of labour, that is, between the technical process of the division of labour and the social process of the division of labour, is the content and realizing form. The technical process of the division of labour is the content of the social process of the division of labour. Conversely, the social process of the division of labour is the realizing form of the technical process of the division of labour from the perspectives of dialectical logic and reductionism.

Unlike other animals, human beings can separate most of the processes of seeking living materials and making shelters clearly from the processes of making use of them. For instance, in developed countries of the present age, the process of production of almost all fruit is separated quite clearly from the process of the consumption of the fruit. Most of the fruit consumers are not the immediate fruit producers. Between the action of fruit-picking by the fruit pickers and the action of eating by the consumers, there are a lot of processes for people to go through, such as cleaning, grading, packing, storing, transporting, and especially the processes of selling and buying. Each of these processes might be carried out (and usually are) by different people who might never know each other at any stage in their life. It is the same in the case of house-building. In human society, the process of house-building can be (and usually is) separated from the process of making use of the house. Some processes, mainly selling and buying, can be put between the house-building and house-dwelling. The user or dweller of a house need not be the builder of the house, nor the maintainer of the house, nor the offspring, or nearest relatives of the house-builder or house-maintainer.

There is a necessity for human beings to separate out the process of producing and supplying the living materials and living circumstances required for survival into many different concrete processes, because the capacity of each individual human being to produce and supply living materials and living circumstances is quite finite and weak, in relation to the natural environment in which each individual human being has to survive. What should be noted here is that the above phenomenon, viz., the separation of the process of producing and supplying living materials and living circumstances from the process of enjoying and making use of them, has a basis in nature. This natural basis makes it possible for people to divide and classify multi-moment activities into two separated categories: one involves

consumption, enjoyment and amusement, and the other involves labour, production and the supply of services.

From the biological point of view, any able-bodied individual human being can ensure the natural and biological process of the reproduction of his own living body and can continue doing so to the biological limitation of his life by just making use of the necessary living materials and services. However, an individual can go on living comfortably, consuming plentiful supplies of food and drink, dressing in suitable clothes, making use of a warm house, adequate furniture and bedding, enjoying up-to-date health-care facilities and services, other relevant social services, including the public security of a safe community, etc., only so long as someone else will produce and supply them for him. Most individuals are without doubt willing to engage in activities which are classified in the category of personal consumption and enjoyment. This is because this category of multi-moment activities derives from the individual's biological instinct, and he has to engage in such activities if he wants to continue to live and enjoy a better life.

But it is another story in the case of labour, production and supply. No one would engage in labour, production or supply, if there were no social imperative to do so, as human history shows. No one could guarantee that each member of a community would risk his life in battle with a hostile community when he is needed, if there were no forms of social enforcement, such as moral pressure, laws demanding military service, etc. Neither could anyone guarantee that each member of a community would do a quantity of strenuous, dull or dangerous labour, such as tunnel-building, road-cleaning, lumbering, fire-fighting, etc., if there were no social enforcement, either in the form of immediate social enforcement, such as feudal servitude, or in the form of non-immediate social enforcement, such as the poverty and embarrassment due to unemployment. However, from the social and material point of view, many individuals and possibly entire communities would be denied the basic needs of life if some individuals did not engage in production or supply-side activities. No one could make use of food, fruit, clothes, etc., if no one produced them. No one could make use of anything.

In some species of other animals, such as bees and ants, there are biologically specialized members of the species. In these cases, the biologically specialized members of a colony, such as worker bees, on the basis of their biological instinct, seek and supply the living materials and living circumstances for themselves and for the other biologically specialized members in the same colony, such as the queen bee and soldier bees. But there are no such phenomena or biological characteristics in the case of human beings. Each community of human beings has to force each of the members to do some quantity of the second category of multi-moment activities in a certain concrete forms, such as providing governmental infrastructure or military service, or house building, or grain production, or car production, etc., according to the level of development of its collective labour capacity.

How, then, are we to distinguish labour, production and supply from consumption, enjoyment or amusement, in each particular case? The answer is that labour, production and supply are the multi-

moment activities defined by reference to the moment of social compulsion; while consumption, enjoyment or amusement do not bear the characteristics of social compulsion. This element of social compulsion must also have a quantitative determinateness or requirement. That is, a particular multi-moment activity should be classified into the category of production, supply or labour if it is exercised pursuant to a definite and particular quantitative regulation by specific order or requirement from the community as a whole through its agents, such as administrators, tribal chiefs, noblemen, employers, government officials, husband, wife, father, son, etc., depending on each particular circumstance. A specific multi-moment activity should be classified into the category of enjoyment or amusement (and not labour) if it does not bear the characteristics of social compulsion with a quantitative determinateness.

As for the concrete measurement of the socially compulsory activity, it depends on the particular characteristics of the concrete labour it involves in each particular case. It might be the working hours required, or the output or effects required, etc. For instance, in the case of a battle between two hostile armies, the measurement might be the time taken in the battle. In the case of the concrete labour of goods-transportation, the measurement might be tonne/kilometre/day. In the case of bread-baking, the measurement might be loaf or baker's dozen.

In most cases and circumstances, it is quite easy to distinguish production, supply and labour from consumption, enjoyment or amusement. For instance, no one would classify the work of building a railway tunnel or taking part in internecine conflict in a war as consumption, enjoyment or amusement; neither would anyone classify watching a football match on holiday or taking a meal or drinking a tea at home as labour.

However, in some cases and circumstances, it is not so simple, because the same sorts of concrete activities can be classified into both categories. For instance, it is definitely an amusement to read a popular novel for most people in most circumstances; nevertheless, it is obviously a job and labour for the editor to read it before it is accepted for publication and for the university teachers who have to comment on it in their courses. To ancient people and many present-day undeveloped communities, fishing and hunting are obviously labour. But in the developed countries of the present age, many people see fishing and hunting as the preferred way to spend their spare time. To them, fishing and hunting are simply recreational. Many current amusements in developed countries, such as carpentry, gardening, mountain-climbing, boating, horse-riding, etc., were considered solely as labour in earlier stages of human history. Conversely, many sorts of concrete labour in developed countries, mainly in the industries of entertainment and sports, such as singing, dancing, painting, basketball, football, baseball, chess, snooker, etc., began their history as pure recreation, amusement and fun.

Actually, every specific concrete action can always be determined and classified definitely into the categories of labour, production, supply, consumption, enjoyment or amusement by the people concerned in their daily life. It is because every specific action is always initiated in historically and socially specific circumstances. To a concrete community, it is a matter of applying the relevant

constitutional and legal frameworks and institutions to each action in order to decide whether the action should be practised compulsorily or not. For example, in Britain today, when a professional football player is taking part in a football match or training, most people would consider that the player is doing his work. Nevertheless, when a young university chemistry student is playing football on the university playing field on a Sunday with his classmates, no one would classify the playing of football by the student into the category of labour.

What lies behind the different classifications of the same sorts of activity, such as playing football, is that people are aware that the professional football player has chosen football-playing as a career and as a means of livelihood, and has to play football in a given timeframe, in the forms of training or taking part in a football match, according to the restrictions mutually agreed when he signed the contract with his employer, the football club. The given time during which the football player has to play football, whether training or taking part in a football match, serves here as the socially compulsory quantitative determinateness in this particular case. Meanwhile, the student does not have to play it at all if he does not want to at any particular time. The chemistry student can follow any other sporting or non-sporting activity instead of playing football without affecting any other person at all in the sense of social demand. On the contrary, in the case of the professional football player, the football club would have to choose another player to take the place of the player who does not want to be a professional player any more, or who does not observe the relevant regulations any more.

Therefore, whether a specific deliberate action should be classified into the category of labour or the category of recreation is determined by whether the specific action has a socially compulsory quantitative restriction or a quota set by the community as a whole.

What should also be pointed out is that in the process of classifying a specific multi-moment activity into labour or amusement, the interests of the agents play no role. Even if a professional football player, for instance, does consider the sport to be his favorite activity, people still classify his football playing as labour and pay him a very high salary. Vice versa, even if a chemistry student likes swimming most of all, society would not see his swimming as labour. What is more, the agent's interest in performing any activity can only play a role in certain circumstances, but not all circumstances, in the process of deciding whether he should or should not perform the activity. In ancient Rome, the interest and the personal will of the slave gladiators played very little role in the process of deciding whether they should take part in any fighting. They were forced to take part in the fighting, just as similarly the other slaves were forced to do all the other sorts of heavy labour, such as working in mines.

From the perspective of deductionism, the relationship between the division of labour and the technical division of labour and the social division of labour is genus, or abstract end, or essence, or intention, and species, or existent forms, or extension, or concrete end. The division of labour is the genus, or essence, or intention of the technical division of labour and the social division of labour, while the technical division of labour and the social division of labour are the species, or existent forms, or extension of division of labour.

The relationship between the two processes of division of labour, that is, between the technical process of the division of labour and the social process of the division of labour, is content and realizing form. That is to say, the technical division of labour and the social division of labour are two parallel concepts. The technical division of labour is the content of the social division of labour. Conversely, the social process of the division of labour is the realizing form of the technical process of the division of labour. Therefore, the human society, through its agents, has to implement the universal principle of the dialectical materialism that the content determines the form and the forms react on the contents, when it deals with the relation between the technical division of labour and the content of the social division of labour. The society has to initially reduce or increase the total number of the staff of a concrete industry, such as agriculture, steel production, etc., that is, to change the social division of labour, in order to suit the change of the technical division of labour, so long as the development of the humans' cognition and acknowledgement has brought the change of the technical division of labour. It should let or make the mummy enterprise to go bankrupt or impoverished if the enterprise was no longer in need by the community economically. More important is that the community should provide the suitable realizing forms in time for the change of the social division of labour in order to suit the change of the technical division of labour. For instance, the society should change in time its existent forms of social classes, the ownership of the produce of the consumption, the ownership of the means of production, ownership of the labour power, ownership of the living body of human beings, ownership of marriage right, ownership of the person, etc. (Note 4)

What should be pointed out here is that the degree of the development of the division of labour is the measurement of the degree of the development of the collective practice of a community. The more developed the division of labour the community has got, the higher the degree of the collective practice the community has got. Vice versa, the lower the degree of the collective practice the community has got, the less developed the division of labour the community can get. Certainly, the degree of the development of the division of labour refers to the degree which can raise the productivity of a community, but not the degree of the division of labour which can reduce or lower the collective productivity of a society, or a community of humans. The community here could refer to a matriarchal family, a patriarchal family, a monogamist family, an independent accounting unit, a factory, a village, a township, a county, a nation, a province, a state, a country, etc., so long as the members of it have got some necessary or inevitable connection when they are doing labour.

Notes

Note 1. Karl Marx, *Preface To A Contribution To The Critique Of Political Economy*, Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 1, pp. 362-363, Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958.

Note 2. Dong Zhiyong, *ABSOLUTE VALUE AND THE CONCEPT OF HUMAN RIGHTS*, ISBN: 978-981-11-3863-8, Self-publishing, registered in Singapore in August 2017, available for sale in

www.amazon.co.uk. For more detailed can be contacted with Prof. DONG Zhiyong, and dongzy@nwu.edu.cn

Note 3. Central Statistical Office, *Annual Abstract of Statistics 1995*, No 131, p. 104.

Note 4. Compare DONG Zhiyong, *Absolute Value And The Concept Of Human Rights*, registered in Singapore, 2017, pp. 87-284 (monograph). ebook available for sale in www.amazon.co.uk. For more detailed can be contacted with Prof. DONG Zhiyong, dongzy@nwu.edu.cn