

# The Social System Defined by Trialism

**Jian Ding**

## Abstract

Truth is not only absolute fairness, but also means unanimous consensus, which lies herein as the key that truly drives social progress today. Although every truth must have absoluteness and immutability, and does not exist in reality, and belongs to the category of metaphysics, it has continuity with relevant objective things in reality, and its intrinsic mechanism is inertia. Based on this, I initially created the “Trialism on things' limits”, which resolved the dilemma that truth had no place to reside in dualism and could only be passed over ambiguously, and expanded the philosophical view of materialism to the category of metaphysics. The major social systems in the world today all aim for fairness as their goal pursued. Among them, the obedience of the minority to the majority constitutes the main body of the dualistic social system, and its flaw lies in imposing the consensus of part of the people on others. And the social system defined by Trialism is based on dualism to add unanimous consensus as a third aspect, and a unity of opposites is formed by virtue of the absoluteness of truth together with the democracy and centralism in reality. With the reasonable return of methodology from dualism to Trialism, war can hardly begin because ambiguity disappears. The higher the proportion of consensus, the higher the productive forces. As a result, we can more reasonably and efficiently do that “concentrate on accomplishing major tasks” in a long-term peaceful environment to escort the pursuit of a better life for humanity.

**Key Words:** trialism, truth, inertia, continuity, communism, unity of opposites

**DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20051564**

## Introduction

I am over seventy years old, and looking back on this life, the highlight has lain in discovering that there is continuity between truth and the relevant objective things in reality, and its intrinsic mechanism is inertia. Based on this, I initially created the “Trialism on things'

---

**Corresponding author:** Jian Ding

**Address:** Integrated Electronic Systems Lab Co. Ltd. (Retired), Jinan 250100, China

**e-mail** ✉ [jiandus@163.com](mailto:jiandus@163.com)

limits”, which resolved the dilemma that truth had no place to reside in dualism and could only be passed over ambiguously, and expanded the philosophical view of materialism to the category of metaphysics.

In reality, everything is always in the process of change, and the only constant is the change itself. As the argument of this article, this is a truth. Truth must have absoluteness and immutability, and does not exist in reality, and belongs to the category of metaphysics. Every truth cannot be proved by empirical methods, but rather is a unanimous consensus reached by gradually approached through repeated practice based on objective facts. Therefore, any hypothesis that can be confirmed by the means in reality is an objective fact in the process of change. In other words, anything in reality has a life cycle. Any “thing” that is eternal and unchanging does not exist in reality.

The principle of seeking limit in mathematics, gradually approaching the limit value by the way of infinite subdivision, is abstracted from the physical processes of identifying truth. In other words, “Practice is the sole criterion for testing truth” corresponds to the process of seeking limit in mathematics, while the truth corresponds to the limit value in mathematics. As for the term “abstract”, when used as a verb, it corresponds to the process of seeking limit in mathematics, and when used as a noun (must be no ambiguity), it corresponds to the limit value.

Most of the existing authoritative theories are summarized on the premise of dualism by using the research method of reasoning from science to philosophy—that is, truth is tested by practice, or as the saying goes, “crossing the river by feeling the stones”. Given that truth has no place to reside in dualism and is in the dilemma that is passed over ambiguously, only experimental facts can be used as criteria, and even the most basic objective law in the universe can be ignored, that is the argument of this article—everything in reality is in a process of change. As a result, there are inevitably some errors, which need to be tested by a process of reasoning from philosophy to science under the premise of Trialism. And truth, as the starting point of the reasoning process, not only is a unanimous consensus without ambiguity, but also has absoluteness and immutability. By virtue of the fact that there is continuity between truth and the relevant objective things in reality, the conclusion must be correct as long as there is no problem with the process of reasoning. This conclusion can be called a (unanimous) consensus rooted in truth and obtained through reasoning.

The major social systems in the world today can be distinguished by Western democracy and Eastern democracy, and the goal pursued by both is fairness. Whether Western or Eastern democracy, the obedience of the minority to the majority is a common rule for both, while the difference lies in political manipulation. The former focuses on “the strong formulate rules and take priority”, while the latter

focuses on “democratic centralism”. In conclusion, the flaw of both is imposing the consensus of a part of people on others.

Therefore, whether the democracy where the minority is subordinate to the majority or the centralism where the strong make decisions, can hardly obtain the consensus rooted in truth through reasoning. As a result, the consensus rooted in truth and obtained through reasoning is in the dilemma and can only be passed ambiguously. Ambiguity breeds chaos and consensus harbors peace. This means that under a social system of dualism, the transition between peace and war can only follow the law of quantitative change leading to qualitative change, presenting periodic changes that are either A or B.

The truth, namely absolute fairness or unanimous consensus, lies herein as the key that truly drives social progress today. Under the social system defined by Trialism, people can, by virtue of the continuity between truth and the relevant objective things in reality, reach the consensus rooted in truth and obtained through reasoning. As ambiguity disappears, war can hardly begin. Once the consensus rooted in truth and obtained through reasoning gradually replaces the current social rule of the minority's obedience to the majority, it will signify that we have crossed the threshold into communist society. Compared with the existing disadvantage in various democratic systems today both in the East and the West that the higher the level of democracy, the lower the GDP growth, this is a qualitative change. A higher degree of consensus means higher productive forces, enabling more reasonable and efficient “concentrate on accomplishing major tasks” and better safeguarding humanity's pursuit of a better life.

Marx's communism coming to China can truly be said to have been a worthwhile trip. Nurtured by traditional Chinese culture, such as the “three begets all things” in the *Tao Te Ching* and “the golden mean is virtue” from Confucius, it has evolved into Trialism and will regain rebirth. The term “communism”, with the prefix “com” in it, derives from Latin and signifies “common”, which can express two levels of meaning in Chinese: “common ownership” implies democracy and fairness, while “consensus” will lead to higher productivity.

In other words, the communist social system should be classified under the category of social systems defined by Trialism. It is based on the current democratic systems (which belong to dualism) both in the East and the West to add unanimous consensus as the third aspect according to the principle that it must form the qualitative opposites with the two opposing aspects in reality, that is, a unity of opposites is formed by virtue of the absoluteness of truth together with the democracy and centralism in reality. This is a new connotation provided to realize a community with a shared future for mankind on the basis of theoretical innovation. That is to say, the communist social system is oriented towards all mankind.

The key point of what has been discussed above is to understand how truth (that does not exist in reality) produces continuity with the help of the inertia of objective things.

### **Inertia produces continuity**

Inertia is an inherent attribute of objective things in reality. When it comes to inertia, the first thing that comes to mind for most people is Newton's first law (also known as the law of inertia), which is stated as follows: Everybody perseveres in its state of rest, or of uniform motion in a right line, unless it is compelled to change that state by forces impressed thereon.

The bodies and the state of rest or uniform straight-line motion described therein do not exist in reality, as they are merely the limit values, that is, absolute motion or abstraction, of objects in reality and their states of motion. So, based on the coordinate system established by the formula that the straight-line distance  $S$  is equal to the velocity  $V$  of uniform linear motion multiplied by the time spent  $T$  consumed, namely  $S=VT$ , the concepts of the absolute time and absolute space in Newtonian mechanics are abstracted, referred to as absolute space-time. Only with this as the criterion can we start from an absolutely error-free consensus to explore the changes of objective things in reality through reasoning. On the basis of dualism, as the introduction of the third aspect, absolute motion is equivalent to truth and has unanimous consensus. It can be seen that Newton's first law, as the starting point of classical physics, is founded based on the ideas of Trialism. In fact, Newton's first law has successfully broken through the knowledge framework of dualism, and with the help of continuity, has gone from the quantitative change of real space all the way deep into the qualitative change of ideal realm, which is not only practical but also perfect.

Furthermore, this law also suggests that once we return to reality, all objective things (including matter or particles) possess inertia, so it is also known as the Law of Inertia. Given that truth has no place to reside within the dualistic framework, it can only be left in a dilemma and be ambiguously ignored. Therefore, the intrinsic mechanism by which inertia produces continuity should be deeply studied. Because once continuity is lost, it means that the absolute motion described in this law would be meaningless for objective things. Additionally, the conceptual similarities and differences between things and objects have not been deeply studied, and are likewise ambiguously ignored, thereby overlooking that there is continuity between truth and the relevant objective things in reality.

This means that within the dualistic framework, people's understanding of inertia can only be in a state of "blind men touching an elephant", making it difficult to see the whole picture. Such as "the natural law is always against changing the current state of objective

things” described in Chapter 40 of the *Tao Te Ching*, which is precisely the characteristic that inertia presents and is more universal. For another example, the interaction between positive and negative charges described by Lenz's Law reveals the microscopic mechanism of inertia. But to this day, these concepts have not been widely accepted. Since it is difficult to see the whole picture of inertia based on the viewpoint of dualism, let's shift our perspective and explore how inertia produces continuity from the perspective of continuity.

The change of anything has continuity. This axiom can also be referred to as the principle of inertia, that is, the developmental tendency of anything attempts to maintain its current state. This tendency is inertia, which can be expressed as having an “arbitrarily small value” appended along the direction of the motion or change of things. It is precisely such a type of the arbitrarily small value that constitutes the absolute positions and boundaries of everything in reality, which can also be regarded as “background”. Do not make light of this type of the arbitrarily small value, where truth resides and with the help of it a continuity is created between truth and the relevant objective things in reality. So, does inertia exist in reality?

As far as I can see, though inertia is only the arbitrarily small value, it can go from the things in reality all the way deep into the ideal realm in the form of tendency. Among them, the “things” mentioned include both in the objectively existing objects and the phenomena presented that those objects interact with other objects through their own inertia. Phenomena enable people to form recognitions and perceptions of objects, and after reasoning and summarization, these cognitions are elevated to knowledge. Knowledge, which includes people's understanding of varying degrees to phenomena, such as cognition, attribute, and essence. And inertia also belongs to a phenomenon, which likewise originates from objects and generates continuity, serving as a necessary condition for reasoning. Therefore, it can be determined that inertia exists in reality based on the fact that inertia originates from the objectively existing objects.

The above discussion may seem redundant, but it is actually of vital importance. In terms of inertia, as a tendency, it is an arbitrarily small value, so the “phenomena” in things belong to objective existence and can only reside therein. Therein, if we compare where the phenomena reside with where the truth resides, there is an essential difference between the two. Truth doesn't exist in reality, but the gap between it and the relevant objective things is smaller than an arbitrarily small value, so it can produce continuity by means of the inertia of things. Seeing the essence through the phenomena, continuity is a phenomenon and inertia is the essence. Inertia produces continuity, which is a necessary condition for reasoning.

Thus, in physics, the measure of the magnitude of an object's inertia is defined as mass, which is equal to density multiplied by volume, and density is the amount of matter contained per unit volume. In

other words, according to Newton's first law, anything in reality must possess mass. Therefore, within the framework of Trialism, philosophy has two objections to science: first, the mass of a photon is not equal to zero; second, the mass of an electron is not a constant.

### **The law of the unity of opposites should have been a Trialism**

In reality, everything contains two aspects that are both opposing and unifying, which is the fundamental law of materialist dialectics and also the core idea of dualism. In this regard, the evolution from dualism to Trialism would be a long process. As for its cause, the key lies in the degree of cognition of truth. Dualism emphasizes the two aspects in reality, whose states are presented as either oppositional or complementary, but the premise is that there must be qualitative opposites between the two. For example, spear and shield, opposition and unity, good and bad, matter and spirit, yin and yang, male and female, and so on.

And Trialism is to add another third aspect under the premise of dualism—that is, the unanimous consensus recognized by both opposing aspects (without any ambiguity; also called absolute consensus). Like truth, such consensus does not exist in reality and belongs to the category of metaphysics. Its characteristic is to form the qualitative opposites with the two opposing aspects in reality, which implies rules and unity. In this regard, we actually use it every day but do not deliberately explore it in depth.

For example, the consensus is unanimous for each specific point position on the number axis. Taking the natural number “1” as an example, only the point position where its noumenon is located is absolutely accurate. But if one uses actual means to confirm it, no matter how accurately one approaches it, the point position determined must have ambiguity, and can only lie between two sets of point positions that are less than 1 ( $1-10^{-n}$ ) or greater than 1 ( $1+10^{-n}$ ) (where  $n>0$  is a natural number). And these values all seem to be doing their best to indicate that there is continuity between the two sets of point positions, and a unity has been formed through the point position that is absolutely equal to 1 but does not exist in reality—that is, a unanimous consensus is reached.

Imagine that, without the point position that is absolutely equal to 1 but does not exist in reality serving as the “background”, the point position on the number axis where the natural number is “1” would give rise to ambiguity and fail to live up to its name. That is to say, every absolute point position on the number axis, as the third aspect, does not exist in reality and belongs to the category of metaphysics. And as the “background”, every absolute point position forms the qualitative opposites with its adjacent point positions. Based on this, one can not only clearly distinguish any two adjacent point positions on the number axis according to whether they exist in reality, thereby

reaching a unanimous consensus, but also form a continuity between them, thus achieving unity.

For this concept of “qualitative opposites”, please refer to Mr. Pang Pu's self-selected collection, *Three Begets All Things*. Discussions related to this concept have focused on the trichotomy, that is, “one divided into three”, which was a new philosophical term first proposed by him in the late 20th century, based on the concept of “three begets all things” in the *Tao Te Ching* and the idea of “the golden mean is virtue” from Confucius. On the basis of the dichotomy, the “middle” of the golden mean has been added as the third party, thus resolving the rigid dilemma that the dichotomy is either A or B. Strictly speaking, Mr. Pang Pu's trichotomy cannot yet be called a Trialism. Because as long as this third party exists in reality, it is unable to form the qualitative opposites with the two opposing aspects, and there must be ambiguity. As a result, a unanimous consensus cannot be reached between the two opposing aspects. So the unifying of the two opposing aspects can only be in a vague state that is not easily discovered by ordinary people, which is precisely where the difference between dualism and Trialism lies.

Therefore, the law of the unity of opposites should have been a Trialism. The three are indispensable, cause and become effects for one another, coexist and perish together. Once a consensus is formed, with the help of inertia and its resulting continuity, our reasoning process can break through the bondage of finite thinking, go from the quantitative change of real space all the way deep into the qualitative change of ideal realm, and expand the philosophical view of materialism to the category of metaphysics. This means that those contents attributable to truth in metaphysics neither divorce from practice, nor are merely obtained by observing objective things in a one-sided, isolated, and static way of thought. Seeing the essence through the phenomena, thus the true nature of metaphysics has been restored, and make dualism reasonably return to Trialism.

Within the framework of Trialism, philosophical theories such as *Lao Tzu's* “the three beget all things”, Confucius’s “the golden mean is virtue”, and Pang Pu’s “one divided into three” can be interpreted uniformly within the context of Western philosophy. This signifies the unification of Eastern and Western philosophies—after all, they describe the same natural law.

### **Brief explanation of the key points**

In China, everyone learns to sing “We Are the Successors of Communism” from childhood. This means that, as long as the topic of faith is mentioned, most people will think of Communism and know that it originated from Marx's *The Communist Manifesto* and *Das Kapital*.

But in terms of theoretical research, it is still confined within the knowledge framework of dualism. The adherence to the dialectical materialist worldview, which advocates the methodology that matter determines consciousness, is undoubtedly correct. As for what a communist society is truly like, it has been in a vague state apart from a few fragmentary remarks by some authorities. Therefore, it has hovered in a state where scientific communism is roughly equivalent to scientific socialism up to now. And in reality, everything is in the process of change, so hovering means the consumption of life!

As mentioned earlier, once we realize that there is continuity between truth and the relevant objective things in reality, the knowledge framework of dualism can be broken through. When the philosophical view of materialism is extended to the category of metaphysics and rooted in truth, we can eliminate ambiguity, distinguish right from wrong and grasp the overall situation.

Drawing on Aristotle's definition for reference and distinguishing different domains of definition based on whether they exist in reality, we can conclude that metaphysics is the first philosophy, and the knowledge covered does not exist in reality; science is the second philosophy, defined as all the knowledge that has continuity except for metaphysics and mathematics. According to this, under the premise that mathematics is treated as a separate category, the Trialism on things' limits is equivalent to the materialism that has been extended to the metaphysical category, and all knowledge covered by it must have continuity with relevant objective things in reality. Therein, things, limits, and inertia are the three elements that constitute the Trialism on things' limits.

From this, it can be seen that the relationship between science and metaphysics (referring only to content attributable to truth) is just like the process of seeking a limit in mathematics and the corresponding limit value, which belong to two different domains of definition on existence and non-existence, respectively. Therefore, the content within science does not contain truth; that is, there would inevitably be erroneous cognitions. The so-called science is nothing more than the knowledge summarized by people in the process of constantly correcting errors in order to explore objective laws or pursue truth.

Under the premise that mathematics is treated as a separate category, the previous text has normalized and defined all knowledge based on the facts that inertia is a necessary condition for generating continuity, continuity is a necessary condition for reasoning in reality, and there is continuity between truth and the relevant objective things. After the above norms and definitions, idealism is equivalent to Trialism and covers all knowledge and ideas, while mathematics contains their abstraction.

Among them, that part of knowledge which has continuity with objective things is shared with materialism. Similarly, the content contained in philosophy depends on how to normalize and define the content in metaphysics based on the continuity. If it is considered that the necessary condition of philosophy is reasoning, then the knowledge it covers is equivalent to the 'Trialism on things' limits. It can be seen that the 'Trialism on things' limits is like a ruler which can eliminate the ambiguous dilemma passed over in dualism, and clearly distinguish respective contents covered by philosophy and idealism and materialism from all knowledge.

However, it is no easy task to completely break away from the ambiguity of dualism, to truly understand what is contained in metaphysics, and to reach a consensus on it. As far as the truth is concerned, that is, the third aspect, as the "background", it must form the qualitative opposites with the two opposing aspects in reality. Readers may question its immutability. For example, the noumenon or absolute motion mentioned above possesses both absoluteness and immutability. By contrast, the above-mentioned consensus rooted in truth and obtained through reasoning seems to have only absoluteness, but lacks immutability. It is actually the objective things that change, while the "background" remains unchanged. Because everything in reality is in a process of change, this is the most fundamental objective law in the universe.

Similarly, the saying "truth lies within the range of cannon fire", although its origin is unknown, has become a famous saying because it is extremely philosophical. The reason for this is that the term "truth" in this saying is equivalent to "Taichong" in traditional Chinese philosophy, which is precisely the above-mentioned consensus rooted in truth and obtained through reasoning. Taichong, here, refers to the middle line of absolute balance between the two opposing sides.

Moreover, within the dualistic framework, metaphysics is like a waste storehouse, into which all thoughts or cognitions that do not exist in reality are moved. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish according to whether they have continuity with relevant objective things in reality. This means that the transition from dualism to Trialism would be a long evolutionary process.

Under the social system defined by Trialism, as ambiguity disappears, war can hardly begin. As a result, we can more reasonably and efficiently do "concentrate on accomplishing major tasks" in a long-term peaceful environment to escort the pursuit of a better life for humanity. This is a new connotation provided for how to implement the community with a shared future for mankind on the basis of theoretical innovation.

As for implementability, with the reasonable return from dualism to Trialism, social systems will be innovated, peace will be sustained, and productivity will increase substantially, and rightfully so. For example,

the current approval procedures of Party and government ministries and commissions in China typically take twenty to thirty days. If an AI approval system rooted in truth is developed on this basis, it will be able to provide correct conclusions through reasoning, and complete the entire process within a maximum of three days, while also ensuring that the entire process is lawful, compliant, and reasonable. The key to such high efficiency lies in the consensus rooted in truth and obtained through reasoning, which provides an extremely reliable basis for decision-makers. Once the ambiguity is resolved, there will be no need to fret over the thoughts of higher-ups and to simply follow the rules.

This means that the social system defined by Trialism, whether evaluated from the perspectives of peaceful democracy, fairness and justice, or productivity, is superior to the current democratic systems both in the East and the West, and is highly implementable. It is a blessing bestowed upon all humanity by the laws of nature and should be the optimal choice for achieving a community with a shared future for mankind.

## References

- Jian D. The theory on thing's limits. Part 4: The definition of philosophy. *Open Access Journal of Physics* 2025; 3 (3): 1-6.
- Jian D. The theory on thing's limits. Part 3: The Root Cause of Modern Physics' Century-Long Wandering. *J Mat Sci Eng Technol* 2024; 6 (1): 1-9.
- Wang B and Lou Y L. *The Collation and Explanation of Tao Te Ching by Lao Tzu*. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 2008. (in Chinese)
- Suo Q Y. Confucius' Doctrine of the Mean and Its Modern Value. *Advances in Philosophy* 2024; 13 (6): 1147-1153. (in Chinese)
- Pang P. *SANSHENG WANWU* (The three begets all things of the world). Beijing: Capital Normal University Press, 2011. (in Chinese)
- Jian D. The Theory on Thing's Limits. Part 2: A Brief Analysis of the New Knowledge of Newton's First Law. *Journal of Electronic & Information Systems* 2023; 5 (1): 10-19.
- Sakyamuni. *Dirghagama-sutra* (Vol. 19). Recited by Buddhayasas, Translated by Zhu Fonian. Beijing: Sino-Culture Pres, 2013. (in Chinese)
- E Lenz. Ueber die Bestimmung der Richtung der durch elektrodynamische Vertheilung erregten galvanischen Ströme. *Annalen der Physik und Chemie* 1834; 107(31): 483-494.
- Baidu Encyclopedia. The principle of inertia. (in Chinese) <http://www.neuroquantology.com/journal/index.php/nq/article/view/325>
- Accessed date: June 24, 2025.
- Jian D. The theory on thing's limits. Part 1: The Norm of Identifying Truth. *EAS J PsycholBehavSci* 2022; 4 (4): 101-104.