

Trialism on Things' Limits

Jian Ding*

Retired, Integrated Electronic Systems Lab Co. Ltd., Jinan 250100, China

*Corresponding author: Jian Ding, Retired, Integrated Electronic Systems Lab Co. Ltd., Jinan 250100, China.

Submitted: 06 October 2025 Accepted: 13 October 2025 Published: 16 October 2025

 <https://doi.org/10.63620/MKNJASR.2025.1053>

Citation: Ding, J. (2025). Trialism on Things' Limits. Nov Joun of Appl Sci Res, 2(5), 01-04.

Abstract

Truth means absolute fairness and unanimous consensus, which lies herein as the key that truly drives social progress today. Although 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 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 the 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. Under the social system of the trialism, war can hardly begin as 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.

Keywords: Trialism, Truth, Inertia, Continuity, Unity of Opposites.

Introduction

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. Although it does not exist in reality and belongs to the category of metaphysics, there is continuity [1]. between it and relevant objective things in reality, and its intrinsic mechanism is inertia. 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. 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. Herein, the truth is equivalent 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, it corresponds to the limit value [2].

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, crossing the river by

feeling 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 the 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 [3].

And the 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, or called absolute consensus, and belongs to the category of truth. Its characteristic is to form the qualitative opposites with the two opposing aspects in reality, which implies rules and unity [4]. In this regard, in fact we use it every day, just not deliberately reflected upon.

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 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 [5]. 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.

Furthermore, this law also suggests that once we return to reality, all objects (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. Furthermore, the conceptual similarities and differences between things and objects have not been deeply studied, and are ambiguously ignored, thereby overlooking that there is continuity between truth and the relevant objective things in reality. At the moment, people's understanding of inertia is still 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 is more universal, which is precisely the characteristic that inertia presents. And the interaction between positive and negative charges described by Lenz's law should be the origin of inertia [6].

Since it is difficult to see the whole picture of inertia based on the viewpoint of dualism, let's change a perspective and explore how inertia produces continuity [7, 8].

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 [9]. 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 called 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.

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. 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 presented are either oppositional or complementary, but the premise is that there must be qualitative opposites between the two. Such as spear and shield, opposition and unity, good and bad, matter and spirit, yin and yang, male and female, etc.

And the 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, or called absolute consensus, of the same kind as truth, 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, in fact we use it every day, just not deliberately reflected upon.

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 you use actual means to confirm, no matter how accurately to approach 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 they 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.

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. While as the "background," every absolute point position forms the qualitative opposites to its adjacent point positions. Based on this, which can not only clearly distinguish any two adjacent point positions on the number axis based on the existence and non-existence in reality, and reach a unanimous consensus, but also form a continuity between them, thus achieving unity.

The qualitative opposites, this concept please refer to Mr. Pang Pu's self-selected collection, "Three Begets All Things" [4]. Discussions related to it were the trichotomy, that was, one divided into three, which was a new philosophical term first proposed by him in the late last century, based on the concept of "three begets all things" in "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 [10]. Strictly speaking, Mr. Pang Pu's trichotomy cannot yet be called 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 certain contents in metaphysics have neither divorced from practice, nor just observed objective things with 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 the trialism [11].

Brief Explanation of the Key Points

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, 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, thing, limit 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 is just like the process of seeking 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 according to the fact that inertia is a necessary condition for generating continuity and continuity is a necessary condition for reasoning in reality as well as 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 contents 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", 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 refers 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 [7].

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 of the trialism, as ambiguity disappears, war can hardly begin. 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. 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. This social system, 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

1. Feng, Q., & Xu, X. T. (2008). A comprehensive dictionary of foreign philosophy (p. 393). Shanghai: Shanghai Lexicographical Publishing House. (in Chinese)
2. Ding, J. (2025). The theory on thing's limits. Part 4: The definition of philosophy. *Journal of Materials Science Engineering and Technology*, 3(3), 1–6.
3. Ding, J. (2024). The theory on thing's limits. Part 3: The root cause of modern physics' century-long wandering. *Open Access Journal of Physics*, 6(1), 1–9.
4. Pang, P. (2011). SANSHENG WANWU (The three begets all things of the world). Beijing: Capital Normal University Press. (in Chinese)
5. Ding, J. (2023). 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*, 5(1), 10–19.
6. Sakyamuni, & Zhu, F. (2013). Dirghagama-sutra (Vol. 19, p. 609–610). Beijing: Sino-Culture Press. (in Chinese)
7. Wang, B., & Lou, Y. L. (2008). The collation and explanation of Tao Te Ching by Lao Tzu (pp. 110, 117). Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company. (in Chinese)
8. Lenz, H. F. E. (1834). Ueber die Bestimmung der Richtung der durch elektrodynamische Vertheilung erregten galvanischen Ströme. *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, 107(31), 483–494.
9. Baidu Encyclopedia. (n.d.). Principle of inertia. <https://baike.baidu.com/item/%E6%83%AF%E6%80%A7%E5%8E%9F%E5%88%99/2653012> (in Chinese)
10. Suo, Q. Y. (2024). Confucius' doctrine of the mean and its modern value. *Advances in Philosophy*, 13(6), 1147–1153. (in Chinese)
11. Ding, J. (2022). The theory on thing's limits. Part 1: The norm of identifying truth. *EAS Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Science*, 4(4), 101–104.