

Peter Kien-hong YU

# Reinventing the Methodology of Studying Contemporary China

Re-testing the One-dot Theory

 Springer

# Reinventing the Methodology of Studying Contemporary China

Peter Kien-hong YU

# Reinventing the Methodology of Studying Contemporary China

Re-testing the One-dot Theory

 Springer

Peter Kien-hong YU  
Department of Ocean and Border  
Governance  
National Quemoy University  
Taiwan, Republic of China

ISBN 978-981-10-4429-8      ISBN 978-981-10-4430-4 (eBook)  
DOI 10.1007/978-981-10-4430-4

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017938828

© Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2017

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature  
The registered company is Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.  
The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721, Singapore

*This book is dedicated to all the dialecticians in the world in general and CHEN Tuan, in particular, if he was, indeed, the Daoist, who, according to one account, was born around the end of the [Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms period](#) (907–960 AD) and the start of the [Song Dynasty](#) (960–1279 AD), possibly in what is nowadays [LuYi County](#) in [HeNan Province](#) or [ZhenYuan of HaoZhou](#) ([AnHui Province](#)), and who created the original [TaiJiTū/TaiJi Diagram/Diagram of Cosmological Scheme/Supreme Ultimate](#), who may 100%, 50%, or 1% agree with me that dialectics can, in our mind and heart, perform intellectual magic, thus empowering us to rationalize everything MINUS ONE, and, more importantly, our dialectical approach and methods can enable us to be closer to 100% (alternative) reality than the non-dialectical studies on contemporary China, since the political (as opposed to legal) division of China in December 1949.*

# Preface

When we face an issue, a phenomenon, or a development, which constitute what I called (alternative) reality, there are two basic ways of conducting research and writing in social science(s), to wit, the purely classical way and the purely applied way. This dialectical study incorporates both, depending on the context. Differently put, I am not just describing, explaining, and inferring certain issue, phenomena, or development of something but also enabling statesmen, political figures, and politicians to apply the one-dot theory (of thought and action), which is derived from TaiJiTù/TaiJi Diagram/Diagram of Cosmological Scheme/Supreme Ultimate<sup>1</sup> and which, in turn, is equivalent to the (great) palm<sup>2</sup> of Buddha in *Journey to the West/The Monkey*, or, to be more precise, one-dot theory and non-one-dot theory, an example of which is TaiJiTù, by making sideway moves like a crab and by jumping or leaping like a frog from one crab and frog motion model to another crab and frog motion model for something, such as governing government agencies, common people, as well as land and territory, broadly defined. For example, one such model could be Taipei versus Beijing. Another model could be Beijing versus Taipei. A third model could be Taipei versus Beijing VERSUS Beijing versus Taipei. At a specific nodal point, one of them will change the fuller picture or emerge as the

---

<sup>1</sup>“...there is in the Changes the Great Primal Beginning. This generates the two primary forces. The two primary forces generate the four images. The four images generate the eight trigrams. The eight trigrams determine good fortune and misfortune. Good fortune and misfortune create the great field of action.” Translated by Richard Wilhelm and Cary F. Baynes, *The I Ching or Book of Changes* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1967), pp. 318–319. Zi Wei Dou Shu is an ancient Chinese astrology chart, which has been used as a tool to describe, explain, and infer a human being’s behavior. Heard from the Taipei-based Broadcasting Corporation of China’s radio program on February 24, 2017, from 4 to 5 pm. A short form or a further simplification of TaiJiTù is MengZi’s NeiFangWaiYuan/square internally, round externally. In other words, a person who has reached this level is said to be perfect, when facing other people, because he or she knows how to handle everything smoothly. On February 12, 2017, a Chinese herbal doctor in JinMen County, WANG Ching Hsiu/JingXiu, alerted me of MengZi’s NeiFangWaiYuan/square internally, round externally. Later, I searched the origin of these four Chinese characters. I found a gold mine, because what MengZi said was integrated into the TaiJiTù.

<sup>2</sup>Or WuZhiShan/Mountain of Five Fingers.

“winner” at time/space sequence [number (n)], if that is, indeed, the last time/space sequence.

Contemporary China is what you think it is or like it to be. This book does agree with what other academics and experts have already said: while no methodology should dominate the contemporary China studies field, no methodology should be left unexploited. Unfortunately, since October 1949, if not December of the same year, the field of contemporary China studies is fraught with modified and abandoned non-dialectical theories and models. Why is that so?

The sincere plea of this author is that we should start from scratch, that is, return to square one by conducting a paradigm shift and take the dialectical approach *first*, because there is no question that, on the whole, the Chinese (communist) mind and heart, especially in ancient times, have not been non-dialectical since TaiJiTu surfaced. Writings by Karl H. Marx, SUN Yat-sen, MAO Zedong, etc. are merely a partial dot of that diagram or the one-dot theory.

This book can enable readers to be closer to (alternative) reality by following a process of dialectically describing, explaining, and inferring modern China since January 1, 1912, in general and contemporary China, since October 1, 1949, if not December of the same year, in particular. This study focuses on ZhongGuoDaLu/mainland China, which in July 1997 became the NeiDi/Chinese mainland from the Beijing perspective, so as to embrace XiangGang Special Administrative Region (SAR)/Hong Kong SAR. Taiwan area (including JinMen/Quemoy County and Mazu County<sup>3</sup>) is part of the Republic of China (ROC) or mainland China from August 1945. XiangGang was returned to the People’s Republic of China (PRC) motherland in July 1997 and AoMen/Macau SAR in December 1999. Those four entities, including WaiMengGu/Outer Mongolia, constitute what I had been taught or indoctrinated since the primary school days, that is, one China, up to now. Readers will be able to see the expansion and contraction of this contemporary China, as time and space change.

Under the classical and/or applied ways, we have to continue to elaborate on methodology. The main emphasis of this book is actually placed on methodology, which is another way of saying means of generating knowledge and which basically refers to approaches, either dialectical or non-dialectical, and methods, such as non-dialectically either induction or deduction or dialectically, both. To this day, none of the books, monographs, journal articles, working papers, etc. published in the Chinese and non-Chinese academic world have ever dealt with what I have uniquely done. The Chinese translation of this book title is as follows: 徹底改造就研究當代中國的方法論:再度檢驗一點理論.

In April 2007, I created the One-dot Theory Center and formally put forward my one-dot theory,<sup>4</sup> which can describe, explain, and infer *all* tangible and intangible

---

<sup>3</sup>This minor archipelago was not occupied by the Imperial Japanese troops.

<sup>4</sup>At a meeting before July 2001, I urged the then prominent East Asian Institute (EAI) director, WANG Gungwu, and my colleagues at the National University of Singapore (NUS) to conduct research and writing by applying a specific, chosen theory, so as to make a real impact in the China studies community. After the meeting, the then director, WANG Gungwu, emailed us all, explain-

things in the nonhuman and human world from time/space sequence (1) to time/space sequence (n) MINUS ONE. What is that ONE? Readers can find out the answer in the third last paragraph of the last chapter. In any case, all the information, (scientific and technical) data, and analysis can be easily slotted into my one-dot theory.

When we talk about logic(s),<sup>5</sup> we have to eventually talk about the application of a theory and model. When we have a theory, we must have a (series of) model(s) to shore it up, and, in this study, the one-dot theory is accompanied by a big diagram or model and four small diagrams or models, or 1 + 4, for short, and contemporary China qua concept is simply defined as one dot, a dot, or “but a dot,” and, as for noncontemporary China, it is non-one dot, non-a dot, or non-“but a dot,” each one of which can still be a dot.

Trying to urge non-dialectical readers to start from scratch by shifting from their paradigm(s) to the one-dot theory paradigm, given that many Chinese and non-Chinese people have at least seen TaiJiTū, I have challenged 12 selected publications, long or short, which have been (co-)authored and/or (co-)edited by (preternaturally) learned, prolific scholars, who have a (quite) firm grasp on basic things Chinese. I have conducted a methodological critique of each publication, hoping to flesh out the kind of long-delayed, blatant, and yawning research gaps, inadequacies, problems, etc. that each publication has.

In this study, I have also challenged the selected non-dialectical theories and models, which are usually first generated in the West, such as the admittedly powerful game theory and rational (choice) theory. It is very doubtful that they can do a better job than the one-dot theory in describing, explaining, and inferring contemporary Chinese studies, past, present, and future.

At this juncture, I would like to mention that it is not easy to be an academic, because nobody can tell what life would throw at him or her. It took me some 3 years to finish the first draft of my doctoral dissertation. After more than 30 years of practice writing, it took me only 3 months to complete the first draft of this book. The number of words, as I recall, was about the same. This means that I was able to put my thoughts together rather quickly, decades later. I wish to thank Hans Kuijper, who is a sinologist turned system scientist, for his serious, meticulous advice on how to improve upon part of my manuscript's first draft. He urged me to show my manuscript to the following academics, who are very knowledgeable on *yin* and *yang*: Chung-ying CHENG, Tze-ki Hon, Chenyang LI, LIU Da-jun, Robin R. Wang, Zhihe WANG, Wen-Ran ZHANG, and Tze-ki HON. Hans thinks that it is a must to understand what HU Wei (1633–1714) wrote in *YiTuMingBian/Clear Recognition of the Diagrams in the Book of Changes* plus mereology (from the Greek μέρος, ‘part’). I would urge readers to read Hans' papers (uploaded to his [www.academia.edu](http://www.academia.edu) page), in particular the two complementary articles “Comprehending the

---

ing his view. In the preface of my 2005 book, which was written in December 2004, I mentioned the same thing.

<sup>5</sup>A book title has the concept, logic. See Steven J. Rosen and Walter S. Jones, *The Logic of International Relations*, 8th ed. (Cambridge, MASS.: Winthrop Publishers, 1974).



Complexity of Countries” and “The Cinderella Complex: Putting Countries into Comparative Perspective,” which were uploaded in September and October 2016, respectively. I am also grateful to the three reviewers for their positive comments. Needless to say, I alone am responsible for the final version of this book.

Last but not least, I would like to mention Frederic Evans Wakeman, Jr.’s 2003 book, *Spymaster: Dai Li and the Chinese Secret Service*.<sup>6</sup> Bob Bergin, who is a former US Foreign Service officer and who writes about the history of aviation and Office of Strategic Services operations in Southeast Asia and China, reviewed this book. In the first sentence, Bergin wrote the following words: “*Spymaster* is a rich, but very complex book, difficult to read in places, but rewarding for the reader willing to struggle through the difficult parts.” I think many, if not most, readers of my book will have to struggle through to understand the internal logic(s) of my verbal model. Yes, once firmly grasped the difficult parts, they will agree with me, saying understanding and applying TaiJiTū as a social science tool is as easy as writing A, B, and C, just as DENG Xiaoping once said dialectics is PuShi/pure and simple/down to earth.

National Quemoy University,  
JinMen County, Taiwan Province, R.O.C.  
April 2017, marking the tenth anniversary  
of the creation of the One-dot Theory Center

Peter Kien-hong YU/俞劍鴻

---

<sup>6</sup>General LI Mi should be mentioned. In December 1949, CHIANG Kai-shek flew to Taipei, the LinShiShouDu/provisional capital of the Republic of China (ROC). From May to July 1951, LI’s troops, after receiving weapons from the Overseas Southeast Asia Supply Corporation (SEA Supply), recovered 14 counties in YunNan Province. However, by mid-July of the same year, his troops retreated to Burma. We also ought to remember the 30,000+ ROC (military) officials, soldiers, etc. who were forced to live in three places of the then Republic of Vietnam in the early 1950s.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Launching a New Methodology for the Study of Contemporary China</b> .....	1
1.1	Ontology and Epistemology.....	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Applying the One-Dot Theory Again to Describe, Explain, and Infer Contemporary China</b> .....	33
<b>3</b>	<b>Conducting a Critique of the Non-one-dot-theory Study of Contemporary China</b> .....	99
<b>4</b>	<b>Challenging Other Theories and Models in General and Those Related to Contemporary China in Particular</b> .....	121
<b>5</b>	<b>Sharing Some Major Findings in This Study of Contemporary China</b> .....	135
5.1	Preface.....	135
5.2	Chapter 1’s Findings .....	136
5.3	Chapter 2’s Findings .....	150
5.4	Chapter 3’s Findings .....	155
5.5	Chapter 4 and 5’s findings.....	161
<b>6</b>	<b>Closing and Non-closing This Book on the Study of Contemporary China</b> .....	163
	<b>Appendix</b> .....	169

## About the Author

**Peter Kien-hong YU** (Ph.D., New York University, October 1983) is a Professor and a former director at National Quemoy University, Taiwan, Republic of China. From October 1983 up to now, he has worked in various capacities such as the Dean of Research and Development at an institution of higher education, full professor at the National SUN Yat-sen University, senior research fellow at the National University of Singapore, full professor (at the managerial level) at Swinburne University of Technology, Australia, and visiting scholar at the University of Illinois and visiting (research) professor at Xiamen University and the East China Normal University which is affiliated with NYU. He is the author, co-author, editor, and co-editor of some 20 books in both English and Chinese, and some 120 journal articles and book chapters published in the West. He is the recipient of many fellowships, awards, and grants.

# Chapter 1

## Launching a New Methodology for the Study of Contemporary China

We face many things in the world. An issue<sup>1</sup> could first surface, to be followed by a phenomenon, and vice versa. We may also see development of that issue or phenomenon. All of them constitute what I called (alternative) reality. How do we handle an issue, a phenomenon, or a development, individually or collectively? What should we do first? Dialectically, we can put issue at 5; phenomenon, 3; and development, 1, in my crab and frog motion model, which will be described, explained, and inferred later on. Non-dialectically, it is up in the air.

Basically, there are two ways of conducting research and writing in social science(s), to wit, either the 100% purely classical way or the 100% purely applied way, which is a synonym of nonclassical way. A third way can be both or a hybrid. This study dialectically incorporates both, depending on the context. On the whole, more description, explanation, and inference are related to the classical way.

The classical way has to do with the following: Something happened, be it an issue, a phenomenon, or a development, and we the researchers try to take a closer, dialectically and/or non-dialectically look at the issue, phenomenon, or development. As to the applied way, dialectical and non-dialectical moves, in terms of words and deeds, have to be made, so as to enable an actor or actors to fulfill the vision, mission, goal(s), and objective(s). Differently put, by applying my dialectical one-dot theory (of thought and action) or, to be more precise, one-dot theory and non-one-dot theory, I am not just describing, explaining, and inferring certain issue, phenomena, or development *of* something but also enabling statesmen, political figures, and politicians to apply the one-dot theory mimicking sideways moves and by jumping or leaping from one model, which could be the crab and frog motion or non-crab and frog motion, to another model *for* fulfilling the vision, mission, goal(s), and objective(s), if and when necessary. For example, one crab and frog motion model could be Taipei versus<sup>2</sup> Beijing. Another model could be Beijing versus Taipei, as readers will be able to see later on. A third model could be Taipei

---

<sup>1</sup>Synonyms are problem and topic.

<sup>2</sup>Dui(Kang) in Mandarin Chinese

and Beijing. The next model could be Beijing and Taipei. And the last model could be Taipei versus Beijing versus Beijing versus Taipei. At a specific nodal point, one of them will change the fuller picture. As a reminder, under both the classical and applied ways, we have to know how to deal with methodology.

A big difference does exist between the study of natural science(s) and social science(s). In the former, we can generate a law, given time, whereas in the latter, it is impossible, even if we the human beings are able to exist one zillion more years. An example of the former is as follows: You mix two chemicals, and the result will be the same; if you do it, I mix it, and a third person one zillion years from now is doing it. We sometimes hear academics and experts talk about, for example, Drucker's law<sup>3</sup> [or the American oath, do you solemnly (swear/affirm) that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, (so help you God/under pains and penalties of perjury)], as if it can be evinced or is possible to generate a law in social science(s), including business and management. It is definitely misleading, because the expert who originally advanced this law has already made qualifications or confined himself within a framework or even a cage in the first place. So, what Drucker was talking about was merely theoretical. In addition, we need just to find a shred of evidence or one contrary instance to falsify/TuiFan this quasi-law, which is a generalization known to have at least one exception.<sup>4</sup> Yes, it is in that context, the Drucker law has been generated, which is tantamount to a theory reflecting partial (alternative) reality and nothing else. It is, at best, like what Henry Nelson Goodman, a philosopher known for his work on counterfactuals, has said lawlike.<sup>5</sup> To reiterate, if one were well versed in social science(s), he or she would realize that Drucker's law does not reflect 100% truth, because it is only part of a fuller picture. If it is partial, we are still in the realm of theory and model or the process of theorizing and modeling.

That being said, a conscientious and responsible social scientist at a university should in the first 3 min of the first class remind his or her students, especially the undergraduate ones, about this cruel and harsh (alternative) reality: Do you want to waste your time, effort, energy, etc. on studying, for example, political science that is ever changing and dynamic, and more importantly, is it never possible to get 100% truth, when a second human being existed? The student, after hearing that statement, should decide whether or not to further study political science, economics,<sup>6</sup> sociology, law, psychology, etc. Unfortunately, most professors have failed to do that, and some of them may even feel flattered, when, for example, news

---

<sup>3</sup>Peter F. Drucker, who is a management consultant, with a nod to Murphy's Law, formulated his Drucker's Law, in dealing with management's complexity: If one thing goes wrong, everything else will, and at the same time. See his book, *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, and Practices* (New York: Truman Talley Books, E. P. Dutton, 1986).

<sup>4</sup>Abraham Kaplan, *The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science* (San Francisco, CA.: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964), p.96

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p.92.

<sup>6</sup>Many, if not most, first year undergraduate students of business department do not know that business and management are only part of economics.

reporters or even their colleagues call them a great master or guru of something. One case in point: A Harvard University business professor was very popular, because he has been invited by many universities in the world to talk about his model for making (more) profit. Yet, after some 30 years, the company that he helped to cofound, ironically, was declared bankrupt in November 2012. Sadly, the then Republic of China (ROC) president, MA Ying-jeou, still invited him to visit the Taiwan area.

Let me elaborate on how I would introduce my current Department of Ocean and Border Governance, as opposed to Department of Political Science or, simply, Politics, Department of Economics, etc. to the incoming new batch of undergraduate and graduate students, some of whom, after a few years, may still wonder what is going on, regarding the courses or course design.

As a high school student, one may start looking for a university and a department. He or she may think about being a student of political science. Well, in terms of a Department of Political Science's courses, there are two dimensions: purely political and non-purely political. By the former, it is clear that we only focus on the core concept of power, which again could be purely related to power and non-purely related to power. For the latter dimension, there could be subdivided into economic, social, legal, and psychological, and so on and so forth levels. So, the course, constitution or comparative constitutions, could be taught in a Political Science Department or a Department of Law. As another example, the course, political sociology, could be taught in a Political Science Department or a Sociology Department. Sooner or later, a student of Political Science may realize that what the Department of Political Science offered is not enough, and therefore, the student would take some courses in pure economics. By the same token, after a while, he or she may again realize that it is better for him or her to take some courses related to law while still trying to absorb new knowledge related to politics and economics. After an extended period of time, the student may finally wake up, realizing that what he or she had been doing is tantamount to knowing all the social sciences or interdisciplinary. It goes without saying that at the end of the day, a social scientist must also embrace some knowledge related to natural science, such as knowing how to use a personal computer. Needless to say, when one becomes older, he or she may also explore things related to philosophy and religion.

No, in social science(s), we can only be closer to (alternative) reality. Asian students have usually been misled by multiple choice questions, as if there are only right and wrong answers. It is definitely not possible to get 100% truth, even if one were involved in an issue, phenomenon, or development. We can only say that we have a fuller (as opposed to complete) picture than some others.

All social scientists and, for that matter, natural scientists face a common problem of how to navigate within a turbid and perilous ocean of myriad contradictions. In other words, human beings definitely live in a world of contradictions. However, most of us can think, rationalize, and make sense as well as, as a next step, choose a better methodology to dissolve all the contradictions logically, systematically, and coherently. How can we be closer to (alternative) reality? In other words, how do we

approach<sup>7</sup> it? To this author, we have to first decide which way to adopt: the purely classical way and/or the purely applied way. In each of these three ways, we have to touch upon methodology. Then, we have to choose the dialectical and/or non-dialectical approaches, which will be elaborated later on.

To repeat, under both classical and applied ways, we have to face methodology. Methodology has to do with two core concepts, namely, approaches and methods or, in short, means of generating knowledge.<sup>8</sup> We definitely want to be closer to 100% (alternative) reality, and therefore, we acquire knowledge or generate it either dialectically and/or non-dialectically. Why do I say and/or? This is because some researchers may conduct a comparative dialectical and non-dialectical study of the same issue, phenomenon, or development. As a next step, we rely on methods, which would be much more complex and complicated. Arguably, the dialectical approach can enable us to be closer to (alternative) reality, when we study contemporary China. As to noncontemporary China, the same approach can enable us to be logical, systematic, and coherent. As a reminder, my one-dot theory, which was formally put forward in April 2007, when I created the One-Dot Theory Center, can describe, explain, and infer *all* the things in the human and nonhuman world in general and contemporary China in particular from time/space sequence (1) to time/space sequence [number (n)] MINUS ONE. What is that ONE will be answered in the third last paragraph in the last chapter.

What we write could be of little value and even be treated as garbage,<sup>9</sup> if our assumption turns out to be wrong in the first place. Game theory and/or rational (choice) theory, for example, assume that each one of us is rational. In October 2016, two professors became Nobel Prize winners in economics, applying the contract theory, which is derived from game theory. Is it possible for all of us to be rational all the time since Adam and Eve, if they were, indeed, the first human

---

<sup>7</sup>Approach has been commonly translated as TuJing, which is misleading, because TuJing may also be way in classical way or applied way. To each social scientist, the term, approach, may be defined differently. To Allen S. Whiting, an approach can be conceptual or personalized. See his book, *The Chinese Calculus of Deterrence: India and Indochina* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1975), p.viii and p.225. In the same book, he said his approach is perceptual analysis. See p.xxii. To Richard W. Wilson, when we study many voices of political culture, we can assess them, using different approaches, such as the hermeneutic or interpretative approach. Sometimes, he has been dialectical, such as mentioning on page 273 the culturalist-rationalist dichotomy. See his review article, *The Many Voices of Political Culture: Assessing Different Approaches*, *World Politics*, Vol.52, No.2 (January 2000), pp.246–273. Wilson authored the book, *Learning to be Chinese: The Political Socialization of Children in Taiwan* (Cambridge, MA.: The M.I.T. Press, 1970). An approach can be inductivist or deductivist. See, for example, J. M. Bochenski, *Marxism in Communist Countries* in M. M. Drachkovitch, ed., *Marxist Ideology in the Contemporary World* (Palo Alto, CA.: Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, 1966), p.67.

<sup>8</sup>To Allen S. Whiting, content analysis is a form of methodology. See his 1975 book, p.xxiii. See other books related to methodology: Abraham Kaplan, *The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science* (San Francisco, CA.: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964); Howard Kahane, *Logic and Contemporary Rhetoric: The Use of Reason in Everyday Life* (Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1971); and Donald R. Cooper and Pamela S. Schindler, *Business Research Methods*, 10th ed., (New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, 2008).

<sup>9</sup>An academic in the West used the term, dross.

beings?<sup>10</sup> In this connection, some politicians in the Taiwan area say, for example, LaoTianYeBaoYouTaiWan/May Heaven Save or Bless Taiwan. A former Xiang/township head in the TaoYuan County said he is a Christian, and he hopes that the 14th and current Dalai Lama, [Tenzin Gyatso](#), would not visit his country again, because, after his visit each time in the past, a disaster would take place, due to ShangDiZhiNu/wrath of God.<sup>11</sup> In other words, an almighty, LaoTianYe, is involved. Can we apply game theory and play with LaoTianYe or another supernatural force? If we do not want to be shallow in our study of contemporary China, we should start from the first, highest level, religion (divinity):

Religion (divinity)

Philosophy

Natural science(s) and social science(s)

Paradigm(s)

Mainstream schools of thought

Theories

Model(s)

Concept(s)

In passing, if applying my crab and frog motion model, religion (divinity) would be put at (1); philosophy, (2); natural science(s) and social science(s), (3); paradigm(s), (4); mainstream schools of thought, (5); theories, (6); model(s), (7); and concept(s), (8). I will explain that later on.

Before discussing each level, we should first have a firmer grasp of ontology and epistemology. An atheist also has to ponder ontology. This is because, if it turns out that a supernatural force does exist, his or her scientific findings would be considered as falsified or garbage. I immediately have in mind Peter W. Higgs, who became a [Nobel](#) laureate for his work on the mass of [subatomic particles](#) in October 2013. Thinking like a dialectician, he in his September 1964 article, *Broken Symmetries, Massless Particles and Gauge Fields*, pointed out that it was *non-mass* which generated the mass of all particles. There are other natural scientists in the West,<sup>12</sup> who applied, for example, *yin* and *yang* to understand the mother nature. Niels H. D. Bohr is a well-known Nobel Prize winner in physics, who designed his own [coat of arms](#), which featured a partial TaiJiTu<sup>13</sup> and the motto in [Latin](#), *contraria sunt*

<sup>10</sup>Given that the historical evidence is too sketchy to allow us to get a definitive dating of Jesus Christ's birth. According to the University of Barcelona statistician, Fergus Simpson, around 100 billion human beings have already lived. <https://uk.news.yahoo.com/one-500-chance-humankind-going-214405633.html>, accessed on November 18, 2016.

<sup>11</sup><http://www.CRNTT.com> 2016-09-16 00:13:58, accessed on September 19, 2016

<sup>12</sup>A Chinese mainland academic said Albert Einstein, who is a German theoretical physicist, does not understand dialectics. See *ZiRanBianZhengFaZaZhi/Natural Dialectics Magazine* (in literal translation), No.1 (Shanghai: ShangHaiRenMinChuBanShe, June 1976), pp.70–71.

<sup>13</sup>“... there is in the Changes the Great Primal Beginning. This generates the two primary forces. The two primary forces generate the four images. The four images generate the eight trigrams. The eight trigrams determine good fortune and misfortune. Good fortune and misfortune create the great field of action.” Translated by Richard Wilhelm and Cary F. Baynes, *The Iching or Book of Changes* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1967), pp.318–319. ZiWeiDouShu is an



*complementa* (opposites are complementary), which is equivalent to 1 and 5 in my crab and frog motion model. An atheist, nevertheless, still has to ponder whether or not extraterrestrials (ETs)<sup>14</sup> exist or questions like whether or not (killer) (co-)robots would command and control human beings in the future.<sup>15</sup> In any case, when we see an issue, a phenomenon, or a development on earth and non-earth, we have to first take ontology and epistemology into consideration. After that, we have to choose either the classical way and/or the applied way as well as non-either the classical way and/or the applied way, a synonym of which is both classical and applied ways.

## 1.1 Ontology and Epistemology

Ontology, simply put, is the study of being. As can be seen, we already face a daunting task, and we can possibly go nowhere, because it is not possible for us to know whether Buddha,<sup>16</sup> God, Allah, and so on and so forth or a hybrid of (some of) them do exist. Even if a supernatural force does exist, we still have to figure out which force, be it Buddha, God, Allah is 100% the real one. Besides, if they are almighty, being able to control everything, we still have to make sure that the supernatural force can be 100% in charge while sleeping or being sick, if they do sleep or get ill. The safest way to resolve this problem is none other than to be dialectical, that is, writing at least three versions of the same manuscript but using the same, exact source materials: Yes (which is equivalent to 100% 1 in my crab and frog motion model), No (which is equivalent to 100% E), or being agnostic (which is equivalent to both 5 and A). An author could use 100 words to prove something to be yes. Yet, another author, using the same 100 words, can juggle with those words, to prove it the opposite way. It is still possible for the same author to spend additional time to use those 100 words to arrive at the conclusion of being both yes and no. It goes without saying that this kind of intellectual exercise is definitely overwhelming, because it would take a lot more time, effort, energy, money, etc. to complete the three versions.

---

ancient Chinese astrology chart, which has been used as a tool to describe, explain, and infer a human being's behavior. Heard from Taipei-based Broadcasting Corporation or China's radio program on February 24, 2017, from 4 to 5 pm. A short form or a further simplification of TaiJiTu is MengZi's NeiFangWaiYuan/square internally, round externally. In other words, a person who attends this level is said to be perfect, when facing other people, because he or she knows how to handle everything smoothly. On February 12, 2017, a Chinese herbal doctor in JinMen County, WANG Ching Hsiu/JingXiu alerted me of MengZi's NeiFangWaiYuan/square internally, round externally. Later, I searched the origin of this four Chinese characters. I found a gold mine, because what MengZi said was integrated into the TaiJiTu.

<sup>14</sup>Or unexplained aerial phenomenon, unidentified aerial phenomenon, or anomalous phenomena

<sup>15</sup>In winter 2016, I began to realize that the fourth industrial revolution has to do with robots. In early 2017, a news report said that some three million French people would be jobless within 10 years, due to industrial robots replacing manpower.

<sup>16</sup>Regarding the ancient Chinese faith, see Olga Gorodetskaya/GUO JingYun, *TianShenYuTianDiZhiDao* (Shanghai: ShangHaiGuJiChuBanShe, April 2016).

We should not only discuss the supernatural force(s). We should also say something about the (killer) (co-)robots and co(laborative)-(ro)bots, which physically can interact with humans in a shared workspace since December 1996<sup>17</sup> and beyond as well as the ETs, which could have existed before contemporary China.

The first robots were constructed between 1948 and 1949, and they are performing some tasks that human beings find it tedious, difficult to carry out, or dangerous. What if some [killer] (co-)robots were programmed to be active 100 years later, destroying a country or even the entire earth and other habitable planets?

The existence of ETs has long been a conspiracy theory, and therefore, it is another issue. Aliens could help us or even do harm to us. Can National Aeronautics Space Administration (NASA) of the United States unveil the real truth? Vatican City State/The Holy See has made it clear that the existence of alien life is real, and we cannot have doubts.<sup>18</sup> In January 2017, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) released sensitive documents about ETs.

That being said, our study of contemporary China would be much more complex and complicated. Even if we have resolved the ontology issue, we still have to discuss the epistemological issue, which has to do with two core concepts, that is, validity and limitation.

Certainly, we have limitations in this study. First, it is not possible for us to have a device or instrument to prove that the kind of supernatural force(s) and non-supernatural force(s) that we have talked about do exist. Faith, being a very abstract term, alone is no proof. (Feeling the existence of a supernatural force is also no proof.) Besides, we cannot skip logic and jump to faith, because, for example, the Bible dealt with logic, such that there is a sequence when we see the Old Testament and the New Testament or that it did not mention a single Buddhist or Daoist.<sup>19</sup>

Second, Buddhists speak of reincarnation. It is not clear whether we the human beings and, for that matter, plants, have to come to earth six or 20 times, before finishing our GongKe/homework, so to speak. Besides, if some of us did go to heaven, how come by now we are, yet, to see, in writing or digital image, that he or she in his or her second or even the 20th reincarnation on earth has met Buddha or even God or Allah in the heaven?

Third, Han Yü,<sup>20</sup> who was an essayist and poet from the Tang dynasty and who had a strong influence on the development of neo-Confucianism, once said WenQiongErHouGONG/scholarship gets better when one becomes poorer. Ideally, China students in general as well as sinologists, FeiQingZhuangJia/experts on Chinese Communist Bandits, China hands, China watchers, China specialists,

---

<sup>17</sup>[http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1996-12-11/business/9612110101\\_1\\_hoist-assembly-worker-robotics](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1996-12-11/business/9612110101_1_hoist-assembly-worker-robotics), accessed on August 31, 2016

<sup>18</sup><http://humansarefree.com/2015/08/the-vatican-about-ets-existence-of.html>, accessed on August 31, 2016. If so, why did the Bible fail to mention that?

<sup>19</sup>One practitioner is TU Jin-sheng, a QiGong master. In November 2006, he pulled an airplane attached to his genitalia in the USA.

<sup>20</sup>OuYangXiu also said the same thing.