

Chapter 2

Can the Diagrams Be Applied to All the Scales?

The answer to this question has to be positive. If it is negative, my one-dot theory, which is accompanied by the crab and frog motion model, cannot be said as being rigorous. It cannot withstand tests one after another at each scale, and it cannot be a “law,” let alone a (timeless) law as in natural science. However, my theory is very close to be a law as in natural science, because so long as there is one person in the world, who is applying or at least understand the one-dot theory, the unfalsifiable theory is a law, because it can help us to directly or indirectly rationalize everything at all the scales. Needless to say, the one-dot theory can be falsified, when human beings perished, as the book, *The World Without Us*, suggests.¹

There are at least eight levels (or scales in my crab and frog motion model) for us to understand the world, broadly defined. They are in the order of importance:

1. Religion (divinity)
2. Philosophy (dialectical and non-“dialectical”)
3. Science (natural and social)
4. Paradigms
5. Schools of thought
6. Theories
7. Models/patterns/modes
8. Concepts (for description, explanation, and inference)

Applying my model by first expanding the spectrum from having five numbers to eight numbers, religion (divinity) would be at 1, philosophy (dialectical and non-“dialectical”) at 2, and so on and so forth. In other words, religion (divinity) carries the most weight in the scale (as opposed to, before the conversion, level) and concepts (for description, explanation, and inference), the least weight in the same spectrum. In other words, we can visualize religion (divinity) as having the biggest dot, whereas concepts, the smallest dot.

¹ Alan Weisman, *The World Without Us* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2007).

As social scientists, we have to face reality, and our task is to verbally and in writing describe, explain, and infer (if not predict) our world's past, present, and future. Historians are not really social scientists, because they only need to dig the past. To social scientists, describing, explaining, and inferring the future are daunting tasks.

We would rely on the scales from 3 to 8 in my model. If that cannot help ourselves, we would go to the second scale. Thus, we have social scientists of almost all disciplines teaching a course or writing about it, the philosophy of science. However, as human beings, many, if not most, of us have religion. For example, many business people go to church, temple, or mosque to pray. Some of them would credit God, Buddha, or Allah for being able to make money or avoid (bigger) loss. As such, we, the social scientists, may also have to sometimes rely on religion or be at the religious scale to describe, explain, and infer certain phenomena.

In this chapter, I will discuss each scale. My purpose is to treat each scale as a dot by citing some examples related to this dot. If it is possible, it will have to mean that my one-dot theory can be applied at that particular scale. I will expand the seventh scale as a chapter. Therefore, I will not write something by conceptualizing it as one dot in this chapter.

Religion (Divinity) as One Dot

For the sake of simplicity, I will only discuss God, Buddha, and Allah here. Catholics and Christians worship God. The latter focus on Jesus Christ, while the former, on the Holy Trinity, that is, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Muslims have faith on Allah. Allah can be translated as God. However, some Muslims, especially in Peninsula Malaysia (or Malaya before independence after World War II), have reservations. Their reasoning is as follows: "This is because 'God' in other religions is translated as '*Tuhan*'² in Bahasa Malaysia or Arabic, not 'Allah.' 'Allah' specifically refers to God in Islam. If they understand that, they would use the word '*Tuhan*' instead." *Tuhan Yang Maha Kuasa* (in Mandarin Chinese, *QuanNengDeShangDi*) could also be used.³

Allah is supposed to be apolitical. Yet, Allah became a hot, political issue, because, in December 2007, the Malaysian government banned the Christian weekly magazine, *Herald*, to use the word Allah in Semenanjung (Peninsular Malaysia).⁴ In February 2009, the magazine legally challenged that ban. In December 2010, a Malaysian judge, Datuk LAU Bee Lan, ruled that it is all right for *Herald* to constitutionally use the term Allah in its publications.

² In Mandarin Chinese, it is translated as *ShangCang*.

³ See *Hua Daily News* (hereinafter *SHDN*) (Sarawak, Malaysia), January 12, 2010, p. 3.

⁴ Malaysia has also banned books that mentioned words like Baitullah (an Arabic phrase meaning House of God), Solat (prayer), and Kaaba (a cube-shaped building in Mecca, Saudi Arabia) and books that were not allowed to be imported to the country. See *SHDN*, March 6, 2010, p. 1.

Some believers of Islam in Malaysia are worried that, if Allah can be translated as God, some Muslims could be converted into Catholics or Christians. Ten percent has been mentioned.⁵ Some religious fundamentals would also point out that Allah does not have a son. As such, Jesus Christ is merely a human being, not God. So, Allah is not equivalent to the supernatural force as understood by, for example, the Christians. Other Muslims perceive that one day, the word Allah may appear on a cross, if Catholics and Christians are allowed to use the term Allah.⁶

Buddha also differs from God or Allah. Usually, people in the East believe in Buddhism. Karma and reincarnation are popular beliefs associated with this religion. A devoted Christian told me that Buddha is merely a philosopher, not a supernatural force. Yet, sometimes, the Christian would utter Buddhist terms, such as *SanShengYouXin*, to be the most supreme stroke of luck⁷ in the past, present, and future.

Four issues stand out. First, is God a dot? By the same token, is Buddha a dot or a second dot? And, is Allah a dot or a first, second, or even third dot? Second, can a person both believe in God and Buddha, only to switch to worshipping Allah? Third, which came first, God, Buddha, or Allah? I will discuss each issue in turn. Fourth, do we have only one life or do we have to live several lives?

There is no question that Buddha can be regarded as a dot. This is because worshippers enshrine and consecrate Buddha in the form of a statue. A living Buddha whom I spoke to in April 2008 agrees. A former colleague of mine was very happy, when I said a Buddha is a dot. A statue is a dot, for sure. If one argues that a statue looks more like a line, therefore, how can we say that a line is a dot? This is a non-“issue” because, first, if we look at a line from a distance, it is a dot and, second, we can also look from the angle of the top of the Buddha head, and there is no question that it is a dot when we look at it from a close range or from a distance.

Now comes the tough part. Is God a dot, and for that matter, is Allah a dot? There are religious fundamentalists in the world. Would they find my question strident? In December 2004, I informally proposed the one-dot theory. In April 2007, I set up the One-dot Theory Center. In early October 2007, I dared to formally associate one dot with that of God and presented it to my undergraduate students and graduate students in the same month. In late October 2008, I keyed in “one dot” and “God” in the Google system. There, I found Theresa J. Thurmond Morris’ writing, *Dot Theory of Everything*, dated July 27, 2008, mentioning “[i]n the beginning there was a dot, God, the word,” though with no elaboration, methodology, etc., I e-mailed her, but there was not reply. Some of my students can also accept my suggestion to begin a paradigm shift in our mind, that is, to conceptualize God as a dot. Later, two non-“Chinese” pastors and one Chinese reverend read my short piece, which is entitled *Is the God Particle Part of a Larger, Fuller Dot, God?* Let me first

⁵ *SHDN*, January 12, 2010, p. 3.

⁶ *GuoJiShiBao* (hereinafter GJSB) (Sarawak, Malaysia), January 14, 2010, p. B3.

⁷ <http://tw.dictionary.yahoo.com/dictionary?p=%E4%B8%89%E7%94%9F%E6%9C%89%E5%B9%B8>, accessed on July 25, 2011.

share with you what I wrote, my attempt of which was trying to conceptualize all the tangible and intangible things in terms of a common denominator, dot, and to pose the ultimate question—is God a (partial) dot?⁸

The word dot can be traced to Middle English and dated back to 1674.⁹ About 3,100 years ago, the *Yin* and *Yang* plus the five elements began to influence the Chinese mind and thinking. Come to think of it, they are collectively or individually but one dot. Perhaps the term, “zone of coalescing dots,” can be used here.

One Monday before July 1964, Peter W. Higgs declared to his colleagues that he had just experienced his one big idea, that is, how matter in the universe got its mass.¹⁰ In October 1964, his milestone article, “Broken Symmetries, Massless Particles and Gauge Fields,” was published. He was talking about an extra dimension or an illusive massive scalar elementary particle later predicted to exist by the Standard Model of particle physics. In December 2011, the excited scientists finally spotted the Higgs Boson particle. For decades, scientists yearn for an experimental observation of the Higgs boson or what is commonly called the God particle, which would help us to describe and explain how otherwise massless elementary particles cause matter to have mass.¹¹

On September 10, 2008, (to some, mad) scientists at the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), which was created in September 1954, have successfully switched on the historic biggest physics device, the Large Hadron¹² Collider (LHC),¹³ to search for the God particle, which was coined by Leon M. Lederman in early 1993. In layman’s terms, the LHC is an enormous refrigerator, because the steering magnets in it can be chilled to as low as -271°C (or -456.25°F), which is close to absolute zero and colder than the deep outer space.¹⁴ If the particle can be found, they can, as a next step, gradually unlock the secrets and mysteries of our universe, which is made up of more than 96% of the invisible extra dimensions, namely, the Higgs boson, “dark matter,” and “dark energy.”¹⁵ In the words of *National Geographic*, the simple and ambitious purpose is to get to the very bottom

⁸ See my book, *God is, by Inference, One Dot: Paradigm Shift* (Boca Raton, Florida: Universal-Publishers, 2010), pp. 185–192. The article has been slightly expanded and revised on July 22, 2011.

⁹ <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dot>. This implies that I am the first one in the world to conceptualize God in terms of a dot.

¹⁰ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p004y2b7> and <http://www2.ph.ed.ac.uk/peter-higgs/history.shtml>, accessed on July 27, 2011.

¹¹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Higgs_boson.

¹² Protons and neutrons.

¹³ A black hole could develop as the outcome of this test. On September 19, 2008, the world’s largest collider, due to an electrical fault or quench which is related to a helium leak, was forced to stop. It will take several months to repair. See *China Post* (hereinafter CP) (Taipei), September 28, 2008, p. 5. The first problem occurred 36 h after the September 10, 2008 launching. See *Taipei Times* (hereinafter TT) (Taipei), September 21, 2008, p. 6. In December 2008, we learned that the repair can be done in late June 2009.

¹⁴ CP, September 20, 2008, p. 8.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, September 9, 2008, p. 1.

of things or as what George F. Smoot, a 2006 Nobel laureate physicist, perceived: "... every day I go to work I'm making a bet that the universe is simple, symmetric, and aesthetically pleasing – a universe that we humans, with our limited perspective, will someday understand."¹⁶

If we want to get to the bottom of all things, to simplify or compress all phenomena, or to find out what should be the common denominator for all those tangible or intangible things or phenomena, we just have to call the God particle a dot.¹⁷

At this juncture, this author argues that 99.99% of tangible or intangible things and phenomena can be easily conceptualized as a dot.

If there are no other things and phenomena, which are smaller than an archaeon, archaeon is the smallest dot in the world. Individual archaea range from 0.1 μm to over 15 μm in diameter, and some form aggregates or filaments up to 200 μm in length. In other words, four million of archaea equal to a period, a full stop, or a dot at the end of a sentence.

The human being is a dot.¹⁸ Looking at a person from the angle of the head or a foot or both feet, he or she is a dot. One may ask what about if a person is standing or crawling? He or she is still a dot, just as an online dictionary mentioned the following sentence under the entry of dot: "She watched the train [or the Great Wall of China from outer space] until it was only a *dot* in the distance (emphasis in original)."

Our earth is a dot. Before human beings realize that our earth is round, a flat earth is still a dot. It has the same logic as the logic of looking at a train from a distance.

In July 1965, after an 8-month voyage, Mariner 4 flew past Mars, collecting for the first time close-up photographs of the red planet. In November 2008, first fuzzy photographs of four gaseous planets outside of our solar system or exoplanets were published in online edition of *Science*. None of the planets are remotely habitable or remotely like Earth. One Lawrence Livermore National Lab (LLNL) astronomer said it is only a matter of time before "we get a *dot* that's blue and Earth-like [italics mine]."¹⁹

¹⁶ Joel Achenbach, "At the Heart of All Matter: The Hunt for the God Particle," *National Geographic*. See <http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2008/03/god-particle/achenbach-text>.

¹⁷ There are many synonyms, shapes which look like a dot, etc., for the word dot in alphabetical order: ball, (black) hole; (concentric) circle; cradle; decimal, epicenter; mark; period; (a centered) point; polka dot; ring; roll; round base, sentences like "she watched the train until it was a dot in the distance" or "the lake was dotted with boats or boats dotting the lake," the whole picture, each one of the latter could also be another dot; speck; sphere; spot; Venn diagram, and so on and so forth. The shape of the superior, original dot in our study could also be spherical, rod shape, spiral, circular, lobed, rectangular, or both flat and square.

¹⁸ In the January 2011 issue of *Meteoritics and Planetary Science*, we were told that "[a] wide range of asteroids were capable of creating the kind of amino acids used by life on Earth," according to National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)'s research. In June 2008, we learned for the first time that two bits of genetic coding, called nucleobases, contained in the meteor fragment in Australia are truly extraterrestrial. See *CP*, June 15, 2008, p. 5.

¹⁹ *CP*, November 15, 2008, p. 8. In the past 13 years, scientists have discovered more than 300 exoplanets.

Our universe is also a dot. Anthony Garrett Lisi, who is an American theoretical physicist, in November 2007, said: “I think our universe is this beautiful shape.” The diagram he drew shapes like our earth. To be sure, my one-dot theory was generated before his. In November 2009, Axel Mellinger of Central Michigan University (CMU) showed us a panorama of our Milky Way, which comes in an oval-shape. Our solar system, according to National Aeronautics Space Administration (NASA) is egg-shaped, another dot.

The Bible said it was God (or Allah) who spoke, and our universe [as opposed to multiple universes (multiverse)]²⁰ was created. In the universe, we see stars, gas, and dust, and each one of them is a dot. One galaxy may collide with another galaxy, including ours, the Milky Way, and it could result a merge or break up into numerous new (partial) dots. In the August 2011 issue of scientific journal, *Nature*, a new theory was advanced, saying, more than four billion years ago, our young earth had a big moon and a smaller or companion moon, and the latter very slowly merged with the former, creating the new one that lights up our night sky.²¹

The ultimate question is: Surrounded by an infinite number of dots, good or bad, is God also a (partial) dot? The term partial dot refers to, for example, a human being as a dot that is still part of God. The same logic(s) apply to archaean, the Earth, our universe, etc. But, can God be a partial dot?

This possibility cannot be ruled out. This is because, if God is everywhere, He can be in a bottle. In other words, a bottled God is a partial dot, logically speaking.

God has most often been conceived of as the creator and overseer of our universe. Theologians have ascribed a variety of attributes to the many different conceptions of God. The most common among these include omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, and omnibenevolence (perfect goodness).²² Is this not like what Smoot said—aesthetically pleasing?

To be sure, many, if not most, Catholics, Christians, and Muslims were taught that God comes in the form of a spirit. Therefore, it is not a dot. Many of them questioned or even feel offended²³: How could there be a boundary?

If God is not a dot, how come there are seven different world views regarding it? A pastor, who happens to be my relative, furnished me with the following views of God:

1. Theism
2. Deism
3. Panentheism

²⁰My student, Teran Jesus Francisco VALENCIA, believes in God. He said the multiple universes are in the universe created by God, dated September 18, 2008.

²¹<http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/Space/earth-moons-merged-theory/story?id=14233752> <http://xfinity.comcast.net/slideshow/news-science/news-science-20110803-US.SCI.Two.Moons/>, and <http://news.chinaitimes.com/world/110504/112011080500176.html>, accessed on August 5, 2011.

²²<http://www.nationmaster.com/encyclopedia/God>.

²³Valencia, Dumezweni Themba, Dlamini, and Mervin Acosta Magbuhat, who also believe in God said they are not offended, dated September 18, 2008.

4. Pantheism
 5. Polytheism
 6. Naturalism
 7. Pluralism
1. Theism: Theistic worldview that believes that an eternal God freely created all of existence (time, space, matter, celestial realms, and bodies) out of nothing (ex nihilo) and that He continues to act within the creation in varying degrees.
 2. Deism: Deism first diverges from Christian theism in its conception of God. While God is still powerful and transcendent, He lacks personality. Human knowledge of God is extremely limited and essentially unimportant. He created the world, but is now absent from human affairs.
 3. Panentheism: “All-in-God” is a belief system which posits that the one God interpenetrates every part of nature and timelessly extends beyond as well. Panentheism is distinguished from pantheism, which holds that God is synonymous with the material universe. God is greater than the universe and that the universe is contained within God.²⁴
 4. Pantheism: The view that everything is of an all-encompassing immanent abstract God or that the universe, or nature, and God are equivalent. God is simply the sum total of the world, and the world is God. He is the trees, the mountains, the ocean, and even the storms. God is nature, and since man is part of nature, we are gods.²⁵
 5. Polytheism: Polytheism is the belief in and worship of many gods. Typically, these gods are distinguished by particular functions and often take on human characteristics.
 6. Naturalism: As defined by philosopher Paul Draper, naturalism is “the hypothesis that the physical world is a ‘closed system’ in the sense that nothing that is neither a part nor a product of it can affect it.” More simply, nature is all there is, with no supernatural powers or beings.²⁶
 7. Pluralism: Religious pluralism may describe the worldview that one’s religion is not the sole and exclusive source of truth, and thus recognizes that some level of truth and value exists in at least some other religions.

A devoted Christian said I belong to the third world view, and my relative pastor said my world view is a hybrid of the third and fourth ones, each of which can be related to a dot.

Richard Dawkins, who is an evolutionary biologist at Oxford University, pointed out that some theologians say that their God is not complex but simple.²⁷ If it is simple, God can be simplified or compressed as a (partial) dot. Dawkins also pointed out that others go to the opposite extreme, admitting that their God is always complex.

²⁴ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panentheism>.

²⁵ http://www.bible.org/page.php?page_id=4434.

²⁶ <http://www.columbia.edu/~rcc20/naturalism.html>.

²⁷ *CP*, April 23, 2008, p. 4.

If God is complex, inside this (partial) dot, we do see complexity and complication, especially after the Big Bang: A myriad of things were created and evolved.

If God is, indeed, a (partial) dot, then the one-dot theory becomes the one-dot law (as in natural science). However, I can only infer that God is one (partial) dot, because there is no direct proof. I also cannot conduct laboratory test, unlike the CERN scientists on the Higgs boson.

There is another problem. Those who believe in God will either go to Heaven, Purgatory, or Hell. It is a one-way street. In other words, they cannot return to our world to tell us whether God is one (partial) dot. As to the Buddhists, Buddha is definitely a dot. It was confirmed in April 2008 when I spoke to a living Buddha in Taipei.²⁸ Buddha can come in the form of a statue. A statue is a dot. Here, we must bring in the concept, reincarnation. After ten times of coming back to our world, one could become a Buddha by saying good things and doing good things. However, thus far, none of us can tell whether Buddha or a living Buddha has met God in person.

The Bible states: "Let God transform you into a new person by changing the way you think. Then you will know that God wants you to do." This author calls for a paradigm shift in our mind. To me, God or, for that matter, Buddha, is the superior, original dot of all dots.²⁹ It is the original, biggest dot, or the superior and supernatural forces and elements. The Higgs boson is just part of this unique dot.

Human beings like to play a role of God by creating new creatures. In July 2007, J. Craig Venter announced that his team of 17 researchers has passed an important milestone in their efforts to create a bacterial cell whose genome is entirely synthetic, which will be housed within an existing bacterial cell—constructed chemically from the building blocks of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA), to wit, adenine (A), guanine (G), cytosine (C), and thiamine (T), which are not easy chemicals to artificially synthesize into chromosomes.³⁰ In January 2008, the team achieved the technical feat by creating the largest man-made DNA structure by synthesizing and assembling the 582,970 base pair genome of a bacterium, *Mycoplasma genitalium* JCVI-1.0. Spore, developed by Will Wright and on sale in September 2008, is an

²⁸ "Buddha Boy," Ram Bahadur Bomjam, who is 18, rose to fame in May 2005 after supporters in the kingdom of Nepal said he could meditate motionless for months without water, food, or sleep. However, he has been spotted nibbling on fruit and catching a nap. Mahiswor Raj Bajracharya, president of the Nepal Buddhist Council (NBC), said, "He may have achieved great heights in meditation, but that alone does not make him a Buddha. A Buddha needs life experience...." See *Taipei Times* (hereinafter TT) (Taipei), November 23, 2008, p. 5 and <http://www.buddhistchannel.tv/index.php?id=39,3877,0,0,1,0>, dated March 27, 2007.

²⁹ My former colleague, Shawn S. F. Kao, said: "GOD is ONE for ALL, and ALL for ONE. Moreover, ONE can be EMPTINESS and COMPLETION as well. That is the ALL MIGHTY who created the universe—a DOT." E-mail from him, dated September 13, 2008. The other former colleague of mine, Emily W. Chow, added the following words: "And what 'emptiness' is? It is not the antonym of 'full.' It is the freedom of mind. An attitude of our minds to enjoy the dot, dot or no dot." E-mail from her, dated the same day.

³⁰ <http://www.greencarcongress.com/2008/01/venter-institut.html>.

electronic creature creator game,³¹ allowing a person to create and evolve his or her creature in our universe. In the same month, the CERN scientists are also playing a role of God by switching on the collider.

Last but not least, if our universe, before the Big Bang, began in the shape of a marble or even the tip of a needle, we can say that the God dot can be expanded, reduced, or remain the same, depending on the time/space sequence. When a Catholic, Christian, or Muslim prays, God must be in their heart and/or mind. In this connection, if God interacts with His creations, since words like omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, and omnibenevolence apply to Him or Jesus Christ, who is part of the Holy Trinity and, in turn, a dot, the latter is a partial dot. If there is a partial dot, by inference, there must be a fuller or more complete dot—God.

Please bear in mind that the Bible said that we are part of God and God is part of us, since we have been done according to the image of God.³² It is also said that God is the trunk and we all are the branches (again, image of a tree with trunk and branches). So, we totally link to the supernatural force, be it God, Buddha, or Allah, and without Him, there is no life.

After reading the piece, my relative pastor mentioned panentheism and pantheism. The other curious pastor wanted to take me to lunch, so as to learn more about the one-dot theory. In June 2011, I attended a church service performed by the reverend. At the end of the service, he, at the door side, said, I am welcomed back again to listen to his preaching of sermons next time. Needless to say, there are Catholics and Christians who do not agree with me in equating God as a dot. Their concern could be related to blasphemy.

In any case, my argument is simple and straightforward. Our universe, after the Big Bang, can be called a natural science dot.³³ If our universe is a dot, in the context of God, it is a partial dot. If the partial dot exists and, indeed, it has been in existence for a long period of time, there must be a larger, fuller dot, namely, God, unless God comes after the birth of our universe. In short, I can safely *infer* that God is one (partial) dot, to wit, the superior, original dot of all dots.

As to the second issue, it is possible for a person to change his or her religious belief. I know one Catholic who later became a Christian. I also heard from a living Buddha that one Christian would visit her house of worship and listen to her teachings. I happen to hear that there is one religion, which embraces all kinds of religions in Kuching, Sarawak, Federation of Malaysia (FOM). How do we build a model to describe, explain, and infer seemingly contradictory phenomena as one dot?

It is not impossible, if we apply my crab and frog motion model, each one of which is but a dot. For example, from a Christianity perspective, Christian would be placed at 1 and Catholic at 5. At time/space sequence (1), the person as a baby, for example, is in the danger zone, because he or she is not yet religious. Later at time/

³¹ In September 2008, it began on sale.

³² E-mail from SAWADOGO Wilfried Relwende, who is my student and who is very religious, dated November 18, 2008.

³³ <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/main.jhtml?xml=/earth/2007/11/14/scisurf114.xml>, accessed on November 14, 2007.

space sequence (10), say 5 years old, he or she went to a Catholic church. Then, at times/space sequence (100), the person chooses to be a Christian. Needless to say, before becoming a Christian, the person had to travel to 3, which is a mixture of Christian and Catholic, because he or she may have to overcome the inner struggle of eventually accepting Christianity.

The same logic(s) apply, when we arrange a religion, which embraces all kinds of religions. Here, at least two models are needed: first, the said religion versus the non-“the said religion.” The non-“the said religion” could refer to each religion by itself or each religion, which does not mix with other religions. Second, if there are one million religions in the world since ancient times, we cannot use the 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 spectrum. We need to construct a new spectrum, accommodating the first religion to the one millionth religion. Before making the arrangement, one has to determine and decide which religion carries more weight than the other. If Buddhism comes first, then Buddhism will be positioned at 1. The one millionth number would stand for that religion, which is the least important in the eyes of the believers of the said religion.

Regarding the third issue, which came first, God, Buddha, or Allah? The question is important and ought to be posed, because if we can show that each one of them can be regarded as a dot, which one came first would make a big difference. Thus, if God came first, Buddha by itself is still a dot. However, it is a partial dot of God. The same logic(s) apply to Buddha. This is because, to the Buddhists, it is Buddha, who created everything first. As to both God and Allah, a special arrangement should be made. From a Catholic point of view, for example, the model as one dot would be God at 1 and Allah at E. However, the Catholic should navigate to 5, which presents a mixture of God and Allah. And, from a Muslim perspective, the following model as one dot should be created: Allah at 1 and God, at E. Again, the Muslim should go to 5, which is, again, a hybrid of 1 and E.

As to the last issue, the question is: Do we have only one life or do we have to live several lives? Here, it is a question of whether or not one believes in reincarnation. On the one hand, Buddhists certainly do. In passing, let me say something about those people who believe in Hinduism. I was invited to present an invited talk at Women’s Christian College in Chennai City, Tamil Nadu State, Republic of India (ROI) in February 2010. During lunch time, a chairperson of an Economics Department told me what is going on in the rural area of that populated country. The main reason that two persons got married is because they owe each other. An Indian husband would often scold and beat up his wife. The latter would simply accept it, because if she fights back in this life, she still has to pay back in her next life with the same husband. The opposite is true, if she does nothing bad in this life to her husband, meaning that she can be released from the vicious cycle. Such is the logic(s), regarding reincarnation.

On the other hand, some non-“Buddhists” are confused. One female Christian, talking to a male, said what he did suggest that his previous life is a female. I thought there is only one-way street, that is to say, after death, we go to somewhere and will not come back to earth. Another Christian showed me a video, captioned A

Sister Went to Hell Saw Pope John Paul II and Michael Jackson in Hell.³⁴ What the title suggests is that one can travel from earth to either Heaven or Hell and come back alive to tell the story. How to conceptualize this paragraph and the one before this paragraph as one dot?

Again, several crab and frog motion models or a series of them are necessary: one life at 1 versus several lives at E, several lives at 1 versus one life at E, one life at 1 and several lives at 5 versus non-“one life at 1 and several lives at 5,” several lives at 1 and one life at 5 versus non-“several lives at 1 and one life at 5,” Heaven at 1 and Purgatory at 5 versus Hell at E, etc. As a reminder, when we see more than one model at work, it means that one model may be again at odds with another existing model. In short, once applying my model or a series of my models, one dot or the concept of more than one dot should surface in our mind.

To sum up, the second diagram is related to God, Buddha, or Allah. Right after the Big Bang, the *Yin* and *Yang* diagram must be applied. *Yin* may stand for God, while *Yang*, non-“God.” The fourth diagram simply shows that God can be expanded, reduced, or remain the same. With the existence of Buddha and Allah, there could be confusion, even among the minds of religious people. As such, the fifth diagram must be employed. As a rule of thumb, when there is confusion, one should move to 5, which stands for the middle way, after putting, for example, God at 1; Buddha, 3; and Allah, 5, until confusion disappears one day, which could be when human beings ceased to exist, because when nobody can think, there would be no more confusion.

Philosophy (Dialectical and Non-“dialectical”) as One Dot

We often hear some philosophers and non-“philosophers” say “My philosophy is...”. Or an elder person, who is experienced in life, will tell you to be philosophical, when you cannot get what you wanted to have at a point in time or when you are facing many setbacks and do not know how to handle them. And, one of my students, who has a keen interest in philosophy said, among the philosophers, they still quarrel with each other. After writing those three different contradictory points, the beginner of philosophy may already be confused. However, by conceptualizing them in terms of my one-dot theory and the crab and frog motion model, confusion should be reduced, if not cleared away. It is doubtful that non-“dialectical philosophy” can accomplish the same job, for the simple and straightforward reason that, facing

³⁴ The Lord said the Pope “... would never speak the truth as it is. He never said the truth and they know the truth and although he knew the truth, he preferred money over preaching about salvation...” As to Jackson, he had satanic covenants with the devil in order to achieve fame and attract many fans. Those steps that he performed are the way demons walk, while tormenting people in hell. There is one step that the demons dance, sliding back and not moving forward. No date, accessed on July 22, 2011.

a myriad of contradictions, a non-“dialectical approach” cannot help us to come out of a turbid and perilous ocean of myriad contradictions.

The very first model to be applied is rule of law politics/government by law at 1, rule of law politics/legal system at 3, rule of dialectical politics at 5, and rule of men politics at E. It is philosophical, because all the phenomena can be stretched from time/space sequence (1) to time/space sequence (n), which can stand for ten million years from now.

Certainly, we will see a myriad of models at work under 5. One of them is Philosophy versus non-“Philosophy.” So, the person who ever uttered “My philosophy is...” is in the safe zone spectrum. Some of them may not understand what philosophy is or have studied it in-depth and, yet, talk about it. When you are being philosophical, you are in the safe zone. When you are not, you are in the danger zone, feeling agonized, confused, depressed, etc. And, being a philosopher, you may still argue with other philosophers, even though what they talk about are usually very broad things. Precisely because those things are broad, they are at the same time abstract. Abstract things are usually difficult to grasp. To accept or not to accept the other philosophers’ views already poses a big headache. To accept, it means that you have at least partially surrendered to those philosophers. So, subscribers to (neo)liberalism are Marxian, because they believe that it is good for us human beings to have wealth, although individually. If you do not accept other philosophers’ views, they may equally challenge yours; the end result could be disastrous for both sides. The safest thing to do perhaps is to arrange all the philosophers and their teachings in the safe zone spectrum, because, by doing so, all the philosophers have to learn to tolerate each other’s views.

To sum up, we can regard philosophy as a pure dot. Whoever is the first philosopher in the world since ancient times enjoy this status. However, as soon as the second philosopher was born, we have to apply the *Yin* and *Yang* diagram. Again, the first philosopher may be *Yin* and the second, *Yang*, if their philosophies are opposite of each other. If not, both philosophers could be placed in the safe zone spectrum. When the number of philosophers in the world grows by leaps and bounds, the ZHU diagram will have to be used. Because many of us do not understand which philosophy is closer to reality, we may have to stick to the curvy line in the *Yin* and *Yang* diagram or 5 in my crab and frog motion model.

Science (Natural and Social) as One Dot

Earlier, we mentioned the God particle. A particle is a dot. So, natural science can be easily regarded as a dot. What about social science?

The adjective social should be discussed first. It was coined in the early sixteenth century,³⁵ involving at least two persons. If Adam were the first human being,³⁶ he can

³⁵ <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/social>, accessed on July 24, 2011.

³⁶ See footnote 18 of Chap. 2.

be regarded as a dot. What about both Adam and Eve? We can look at each of them as a dot. But, socially, they are two halves. To be sure, two halves are still one dot. In October 1999, the world population reached six billion, according to the United Nations (UN) Population Division (UNPD). In fall 2011, we have seven billion people in the world, a new record. We can still conceptualize them as a dot under the concept, human beings. In short, social science less Adam can be regarded as a dot.

From Adam's perspective, does social science come before natural science or just the opposite? This may well be a philosophical question, just like the riddle between the chicken and the egg—which dot came first?

A literal historic account of the Bible's Genesis 1 would place the chicken before the egg.³⁷ Ancient philosophers' writings indicate that the proposed problem was perplexing to them. For example, Aristotle concluded that both the bird and egg must have always existed: "If there has been a first man he must have been born without father or mother—which is repugnant to nature. For there could not have been a first egg to give a beginning to birds, or there should have been a first bird which gave a beginning to eggs; for a bird comes from an egg."³⁸ And, in July 2010, British scientists claim to have finally come up with the definitive answer: the chicken.³⁹ The scientists found that a protein found only in a chicken's ovaries is necessary for the formation of the egg, which can only exist, if it has been created inside a chicken. To be sure, the protein speeds up the development of the hard shell, which is essential in protecting the delicate yolk and fluids, while the chick grows inside the egg. The scientists said: "It had long been suspected that the egg came first but now we have the scientific proof that shows that in fact the chicken came first."

To sum up, both natural and social science can each be regarded as a dot. However, under science, each one of them is a half dot. So, science is equivalent to the pure circle. The *Yin* and *Yang* diagram sets in, when we discuss both natural and social sciences. Since a lot of energy, effort, time, budget, etc., have been used on natural and social sciences, the ZHU diagram has to be expanded. If both natural and social sciences help each other out, the safe zone spectrum in my model can be employed. If not, one of them will be positioned at one extreme and the other, the other extreme.

Paradigms as One Dot

I will first only discuss two sentences in natural science. First, the earth is flat. And second, the earth is round. Why do we say each sentence is a paradigm? This is because we are talking about so many people holding the same view, understanding, etc., of something.

³⁷ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chicken_or_the_egg, accessed on July 24, 2011.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/38238685/ns/technology_and_science-science/t/which-came-first-chicken-or-egg/, accessed on July 24, 2011.

Before human beings can fly, they would regard earth as flat because that is what they see. A flat earth is still a dot, because it looks like a line, and a line is a dot.

When human beings realized that our earth is round, it is still a dot. However, can a round earth become a flat earth again? This possibility cannot be ruled out, because what if an asteroid struck our planet again or what if our galaxy collides and merges with another galaxy, resulting a change in the shape of our earth?

In social science, some social scientists also use the term paradigm. Carl J. Joachim and Z. K. Brzezinski created a new version of totalitarianism, treating it as a paradigm to describe and explain the former Soviet Union in the late 1940s up to the mid-1950s.⁴⁰ By the 1970s, many Communist countries have gradually changed by becoming authoritarian, and therefore, a paradigm shift had taken place. Just as the Republic of Singapore (ROS) had been regarded as a (red) dot, the former totalitarian Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) was also a dot. Referring to the December 25, 2009 plot to blow up an airliner with nearly 300 passengers on board, American President Barack H. Obama, II uttered the following words in January 2010: Antiterrorist agents “had sufficient information to have uncovered this plot... But our intelligence community failed to connect those dots.”⁴¹ Steve Jobs, who has a knack for taking complicated ideas and making them easy to understand, in August 2011 resigned as the chief executive officer (CEO) of *Apple, the company he founded* and turned into the largest technology company in the world. A news report cited one of his remarks on design in February 1996: “... A lot of people in our industry haven’t had very diverse experiences. So they don’t have enough dots to connect, and they end up with linear solutions without a broad perspective on the problem. The broader one’s understanding of the human experience, the better design we will have.”⁴² In passing, it should be noted that, as an extension of the “One China, Respective Interpretation,” Beijing made a remark regarding the location of the Taiwan Pavilion in the Expo 2010 Shanghai China site: “The location of the Taiwan Pavilion is a dot in Zone A, which hosts the China Pavilion and national pavilions for Asian countries except Southeast Asian ones. The China Pavilion is also a dot in Zone A.” In October 2011, Taiwan Pavilion also for the first time participated in the 8th China-Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Expo, which was held in the Chinese Nanning City of Guangxi Province and which featured commodity trading, investment cooperation, and service trading. Here, we have to construct a series of models: China, which is equivalent to the pure circle or dot; since China does not exist by itself, the *Yin* and *Yang* diagrams should be applied, to read China and non-“China;” Zone A versus non-“Zone A;” Zone A or the safe zone spectrum, which is equivalent to Taiwan, for example, at 1 + other Chinese provincial pavilions, for example, at 2 + national pavilions for Asian countries except Southeast Asian ones, for example, at 4, etc.

⁴⁰ See their book, *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy* (New York: Praeger, 1956).

⁴¹ Cited in *God is...* (note 14), p. 116.

⁴² Jennifer Valentino-DeVries on Twitter @jenvalentino, accessed on August 25, 2011 from Mike Wong’s e-mail dated August 25, 2011.

In any case, when there is a change in our mind, a paradigm shift takes place from one dot to another dot. This is possible in both natural science and social science.

To sum up, each paradigm is equivalent to a pure circle. When there are more than two paradigms, the *Yin* and *Yang* diagram must be applied. The ZHU diagram becomes applicable, when we have more than one paradigm. To arrange them logically, systematically, and coherently, my model sets in. It is still a dot.

Schools of Thought as One Dot

There are four mainstream schools of thought after the end of World War II, namely, realism and neorealism, liberalism and neoliberalism, constructivism, and (neo) Marxism. The fifth one is emerging, to wit, international and global governance.

Indeed, time has changed.⁴³ The realists or, for that matter, the neorealists cannot just focus on, for example, a central government's external behavior when they study, for example, international relations. It is state centric, emphasizing power, assuming that each state only wants to be more powerful, tangibly and intangibly. So, many countries perceive that, by being economically robust, mainland China will become militarily powerful as well, given time; hence, the term China threat since the early 1990s.

With economic development in general and the rise of civil society at both national and international levels in particular, international and global governance should be closer to reality, because we have to look at both the state and non-“state-sponsored” dimensions. For governance, we have to first mention state, to be followed by non-“state,” and for economy or business, it is the reverse, that is, non-“state” and state-sponsored. To be sure, there are a zillion words, terms, etc., which belong to the non-“state” category, such as economy, business, class, or private think tank or foundation. After having identified the state and non-“state,” one can proceed to study, for example, political economy, which is very complicated and complex, because many issues are involved in a given area.

(Neo)liberalism basically focuses on market and contract, and it demands less government involvement. Getting rid of or reducing tariff is one big concern of the (neo)liberalists. When people buy and sell something, they are in a market. If the volume is big, the buyer and seller have to sign a contract for mutual protection. Before goods and services can be delivered, banks, insurance companies, etc., are involved. Politics could follow that, hence the term (international) political economy. In other words, to the (neo)liberalists, politics is the superstructure of economics. In a sense, they subscribe to the (neo)Marxian school of thought. However, the

⁴³ Updated from the preface of Peter Kien-hong YU, et al., *International Governance, Regimes, and Globalization: Case Studies from Beijing and Taipei* (Lanham, MD.: Lexington Books, 2010).

study of international and global governance embraces the non-“state”-sponsored dimension. Hence, it is broader than that of the (neo)liberalism school of thought.

Constructivism became popular since the early 1990s. It has pooled many theorists to the school. According to James C. Hsiung, my mentor and friend, two major concepts are often being mentioned: idea and ideal. The sentence which ought to be remembered is: It is all in your mind. Thus, Alexander Wendt said anarchy is what states make of it. In this connection, if we were in a political science class, whether or not the Republic of China (ROC) on Taiwan is a country is of secondary importance. This is because, being a citizen or non-“citizen” of the ROC, it does not matter, so long as we can discuss or debate on it logically. However, if a ROC student or a ROC politician wants to visit a foreign country and he or she cannot get a visa (on time), then the question of whether the ROC is a country becomes a (big) concern. In August 2009, former ROC President, CHEN Shui-bian, made a bizarre move, suing Obama and US Secretary of Defense, Robert M. Gates, for failing to place Taiwan under their military occupation, which CHEN claims has continued since October 25, 1945. To be sure, the study of international and global governance also incorporates the study of idea, ideal, etc. For example, the UN model for good governance mentions the following concepts: accountable, transparent, responsive, equitable and inclusive, consensus-oriented, participatory, follows the rule of law, and effective and efficient. Some concepts are ideas and others, ideals. For instance, “follows the rule of law” is an ideal, because if we put it in context, can a grade or junior school student follow the rule of law, when he or she has a vague idea of what the law is? In short, constructivism can be a part of international and global governance, broadly defined.

One of (neo)Marxism’s main concepts is class struggle. The poor people versus the rich people or “rich people become richer and poor people become poorer” has often been mentioned. In the eyes of Karl H. Marx, class comes before nation, country, or state or it is more important than other things. One class will inevitably replace the other, and this is the history of human development, ending with Communism or Utopia. In September 2008, we witnessed a global economic crisis. Many state practices became socialist, including Obama’s America. However, the study of international and global governance can also embrace class study, by virtue of the term, non-“state.” In sum, international and global governance can forcefully challenge those old schools of thought and even replace them as the mainstream school of thought, given time. Needless to say, after an extended period of time, international and global governance school of thought will be replaced by a more cutting-edge school of thought.

To sum up, each school of thought can be regarded as a dot. We can also arrange them in terms of my model. Since the international and global governance may well be the next mainstream school of thought, we can put it at 1 or 2, if we perceive that someday the international and global school of thought will be replaced by another new school of thought. As to others, we can first discuss with other schools of thought subscribers, so as to arrive at a closer to reality arrangement.

Theories as One Dot

Theories⁴⁴ and models are related. Therefore, I do not have to elaborate here. There is no question that each theory can be regarded as a dot. Game theory, for example, has only two words, and the emphasis is on game. Game is a dot, for sure, so is systems in systems theory, which is a transdisciplinary study. It is appropriate for David Easton to apply the theory to the study of political science.⁴⁵ Inputs are part of the systems theory, just as feedback and others. However, there could be no relationship between, for example, the inputs and outputs, at certain time/space sequence.

To sum up, each theory is a dot. Therefore, each theory can be a pure circle. However, since there are many theories in the world, the *Yin* and *Yang* diagram will have to be applied right away. The ZHU diagram is certainly relevant to theories. The same thing speaks for my model. This means that the safe zone spectrum needs to be expanded, so as to embrace all the theories in the world.

Concepts as One Dot

A concept is a dot by itself. The same logic applies to other levels from the first to the seventh. Since religion carries the most weight, it will be positioned at 1 and concept, 8.

There are an infinite number of concepts in the world. The term globalization became an entry in a dictionary in 1961. As such, our model will have to embrace them, from 1 to that infinite number. At time/space sequence (1), one may choose 5; at time/space sequence (1,000), one may select one millionth, etc.

To sum up, the circle diagram is equivalent to concept. The *Yin* and *Yang* diagram has to be applied, when we begin to mention the second concept. Thus, the model could be the first concept versus non-“the first concept.” The ZHU diagram is needed, so as to emphasize whether or not there are only two concepts or an infinite number of concepts, in addition to remind us about the middle way. And, to arrange the concepts logically, systematically, and coherently, my crab and frog motion model must be applied.

In sum, if we conceptualize all the things in the world, including the possibility of God, as dots, is it not our world inundated with dots? The answer is “yes,” but the world seems to be less colorful. However, we can still have different ways of

⁴⁴ To James C. Hsiung, “theory... is an explanatory device, something that will explain a given phenomenon or puzzle. In terms of its origin, it is a generalization of findings from earlier studies. Hence, it can explain, or anticipate the outcome of, a similar set of variables in another setting, *ceteris paribus* (all things being equal).” E-mail from him, dated November 27, 2010.

⁴⁵ See his book, *A Framework for Political Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965).

looking at each dot. First, we have to figure out, depending on the time/space sequence, what is the subject (*ZhuTi*) and what is the object (*KeTi*) or the mainstream and the non-“mainstream.” If possible, taking a public opinion poll is a desideratum, so as to figure out the subject and object at a specific time/space sequence. However, not many of us can conduct surveys, due to lack of budget and funding. Second, we can arrange all the dots, big and small, in the safe zone. This is not impossible. Look at the computer binary, which is but a version of *Yin* and *Yang*, and there are an infinite number of possibilities. There is no need to show all the dots, because we can figure out what is the subject and what is the object. This means that the following model must be applied: to simplify reality versus non-“to simplify reality.” At most, we need only to figure out the three forces, the subject, the object, and somewhere in between the subject and the object. Besides, it is not possible for us human beings to remember all the things in the world, even if you have a photographic memory. Sooner or later, we will forget something or unable to (clearly) think of something.

One-dot Theory Described, Explained, Inferred, Justified,
and Applied

YU, P.K.-h.

2012, XII, 114 p. 15 illus., 9 illus. in color., Softcover

ISBN: 978-1-4614-2166-5