Dear Louise (and all),

I, together with my colleague Verner Worm, have written a paper submitted to Academy of Management 2015 conference, which includes some of the ideas about the difference between Bohr's philosophy and Yin-Yang.

Please find attached paper, if you are interested. Your comments are welcome.

Best, Xin

Xin Li (李鑫) Ph.D.
Assistant Professor in International Business
Dept of International Economics & Management,
Copenhagen Business School,
Porcelænshaven 24, Room 3.77,
2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark
Tel: (+45) 3815 3406, Email: xl.int@cbs.dk,
Web: www.cbs.dk/en/staff/xlint

Dear All,

I am resending Xin Li's paper in two formats, just to make sure you have no problem opening it.

I find the paper extremely interesting. Xin Li has mapped out nicely the structural differences in the logical systems across cultures. Looking at Xin Li's Figure 2, I would agree with Peter Li, if Peter is willing to change one word in his claim of superiority of yin-yang--"uniqueness" rather than "superiority."

Figure 2 suggests the uniqueness of yin-yang in that it is the only logical system which has both attributes of "involving a third element" and "embracing multidimensionality." Also, as suggested by Figure 2, yin-yang specializes neither in separation nor in integration, but does it own thing--neutralizing differences and diversity through its multi-dimensionality.

This paper facilitates cross cultural comparison of thought. A few observations along this line:

Aristotle's Either-Or logic and yin-yang's Both-And dialectic have one thing in
They seem to be the foundations of Western and Chinese thought, respectively. And probably because they are so basic to the structure of thought of a culture, they seem to be static in comparison to the rest of the logical systems as represented by Bohr, Hegel, and Hui-Neng.

A=Aristotle and yin-yang;

B=Bohr, Hegel, and Hui-Neng.

A does not show progression in thought in comparison to B in which the point of departure differs from the point of arrival. In A the point of arrival is the same as the point of departure. Thus A seems to be in the same conceptual space throughout--no progression to another conceptual space.

By contrast, the B logical systems all show movement in thought. In Bohr and Hegel, the point of arrival is a different conceptual space than the point of departure. In Zen (Hui Neng), the point of arrival is another level of consciousness--a totally different ball game than thinking in concepts.

That's my observation. What's yours?

Cheers,
Louise
louiselu@frontiernet.net
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