

Shamelessness Shouldn't Be Anyone's Nature

—An Open Letter to *Nature* (Part VII)

Xin Ge, Ph. D.

Columbia, SC, USA

A fraudulent fighter's fight for fraud

The debate between Mr. Ke and Fang was watched closely by the “scientific intellectuals,” probably because they were eager to know exactly how knowledgeable this pretentious American Ph. D. was. By the time Fang declared “I will ignore his further response,” their curiosity had been virtually satisfied. On December 26, 2001, two days after Fang’s declaration of victory, Prof. Liu Bing sent an email to Fang from Cambridge, UK., proclaiming his full support to Mr. Ke, and denouncing Fang’s unfair treatment to Mr. Ke. Hence came Fang’s famous statement:

“[The *New Threads* is not an academic journal, and it has never flaunts its ‘neutrality.’ I have never published any articles which I oppose without comments \[on it\].](#)”^[1]

Besides Liu Bing, Dr. Tian Song, a post-doc fellow at Peking University and one of Fang’s “scientific intellectual” friends, also sent a letter to Fang on the same day to break off their relationship. So, by debating Mr. Ke, Fang blocked his entry path into the Chinese community of history and philosophy of science, the subjects Fang loved so much that he had to quit his scientist career in 1998 just for that love, according his own words^[2]. Also, Fang’s academic credibility and reputation among the “scientific intellectuals” was forever lost^[3].

Prof. Liu Bing’s letter to Fang immediately made himself the top enemy of Fang’s, because both his attitude to Dr. Ho’s book and his relationship with Mr. Ke had made Fang suspect that he was behind Mr. Ke, and Liu’s letter did nothing but confirmed Fang’s suspicion, and enhanced Fang’s hatred toward him. So, Fang’s retaliation against Liu Bing started almost instantly.

From “anti-scientism professional” to “anti-science rodent”: the foreplay

On December 29, 2001, three days after receiving Liu Bing’s “goodbye” letter, Fang published an article on the *New Threads* entitled “*The nightmare of the anti-scientism professionals*” (《[庙堂反科学主义者的噩梦](#)》), claiming that Liu Bing “has expelled me out of ‘community of the philosophical, social, and cultural discussions of science’,” scolding that “Liu Bing might consider himself as someone in Chinese philosophical circle, but in the world philosophical circle, he is no one but a small dog.”^[4] This was the very first time that Liu Bing’s name appeared in Fang’s article.

One might wonder why did Fang label Liu Bing as an “anti-scientism professional”? The reason for that was, at that time, both Fang and his backer He Zuoxiu were proudly claiming that they believed in scientism. According to them, scientism is equal or equivalent to science, so anti-scientism is equal or equivalent to anti-science.

On January 5, 2002, Fang attacked Liu Bing again. In his Parthian shot against Mr. Ke, Fang ended his article by shooting at Liu Bing directly:

“From the way in which a student conducts his academic research, one can see the shadow of his teacher. Since Ke Zhiyang is so ignorant and incompetent, and so brazen and shameless, then you can imagine what kind of person his advisor Liu Bing is, who praised Ke ‘did a good job,’ proclaiming his full support to Ke. I previously knew nothing about the academic background of Liu Bing, since I heard his announcement of driving me out of the ‘community of the philosophical, social, and cultural discussions of science,’ I could not help but have interested in the achievements of this overlord of Chinese academia, so I went to Tsinghua’s website to look for his information: <http://www.tsinghua.edu.cn/docsn/jwc/renwen/liubing.htm> [,] I cannot help but disappointed. The webpage lists 77 so called papers, all of them are the introductions to certain scientists, certain periods of the history of science, or certain ideological trends abroad, anyone who reads a few references could have written them. I could not find a single paper with a little bit of academic content and quality. His publications do not match his numerous titles. Therefore I understand why he wants to act like a tyrant behind a closed door. The thing is, I want to burst through the door, how could that Jack-of-all-trades stop me?”^[5]

Fang was obviously lying when he said “I previously knew nothing about the academic background of Liu Bing,” because he had published Liu Bing’s articles at least twice on his *New Threads* before^[6]. Moreover, in November, 2000, Fang posted a photo of Liu Bing and himself on the *New Threads*. So, Fang did know Liu Bing and his “academic background,” but because they were friends, or Liu Bing had some value in use, Fang was not “disappointed” with Dr. Liu at that time^[7]. Fang would play the same trick on Dr. Tian Song six months later^[8].



Fang Zhouzi showed off his connection to Prof. Liu Bing before they became enemies

On November 22, 2000, Fang published on his *New Threads* “A bunch of silhouettes of Fang Zhouzi’s activities in Beijing in October and November, 2000,” (“方舟子 2000 年 10、11 月间在北京活动的剪影一束”), among the “silhouettes” was “A photo with Liu Bing (a professor at Tsinghua University) in China Hall of Science and Technology” (“[在中国科技会堂与刘兵（清华大学教授）合影](#)”).

Fang has never honored his promise that he would “burst through the door” of history of science and “bust” Liu Bing academically. However, his attack on Dr. Liu has never stopped either. On January 20, 2003, Fang wrote in an article:

“Someone said that Fang Zhouzi had public enemies, but he had no private enmity. That’s not accurate. Of course I have private enmity. It is just that the private enmity was usually evolved from public enemies, and without exceptions, these public enemies had a grudge against me first, framed me by playing tricks behind my back. These anti-scientific intellectuals, from Wu Guosheng (who spread the rumor two years ago that Fang Zhouzi was a bad person, one

shouldn't deal with him,) Liu Bing (who instigated his graduate student Ke Zhiyang to dig my dirty secret,) Tian Song (I need to say no more about this scoundrel), to coconut [Note: Fang meant Liu Huajie], no exceptions, they all tried to revenge me by improper means because they were unable to refute my criticism. So, if someone talks about tolerance, about 'harmony of difference and sameness,' he should talk to them first. However, since they have corrupted to the extent that they could only hide in a sewer ditch to fabricate rumors, to smear and scold me, I'm afraid they could not understand human language. Because of this, I was actually complimenting by calling them anti-scientific intellectuals, the fact is, they are nothing but a group of anti-science rodents."^[9]

The important thing in this paragraph is that Fang admitted voluntarily that the "scientific intellectuals" are his private and personal enemies, but he blamed them for the enmity. As mentioned before, Fang's sudden rise in China was hyped by the "scientific intellectuals," and many of them gave their personal resources, time, money, and influence, to help him. However, Fang falsely accused these people of framing him first.

What even more important is Fang's accusation that Liu Bing instigated Ke Zhiyang to dig his dirty secret. The Chinese word "整黑材料" literally means using illegal or improper means to dig someone's secret, and then using the secret to smear or destroy that person politically or publically. As we already knew, the debate between Mr. Ke and Fang was about science, and about science only, at least on Mr. Ke's part it was so. Therefore, even if Prof. Liu Bing had indeed instigated Mr. Ke, why would, or how could, Fang link Mr. Ke's actions to digging his dirty secret? The only reasonable answers to the question are, first, Fang did have dirt secret, so he was subconsciously afraid of its revelation; second, he tried to use the false accusation as a weapon to destroy Liu Bing; and third, he is a paranoia with persecutory delusions.

Another question is, why did Fang use the label of "anti-science rodents" to tag Liu Bing or the other scientific intellectuals this time, instead of "anti-scientism professionals" he used more than one year ago? The answer is, in November, 2002, the scientific intellectuals held a Symposium on Science and Culture, and they issued an Academic Declaration (《[首届“科学文化研讨会”学术宣言](#)》), in which "anti-scientism" was one of the main themes. So, by January 2003, Fang finally realized that anti-scientism is really not a derogatory term as he intended to mean initially. Now, you understand why, 10 years after issuing the threat, Fang has not "burst through [Liu Bing's] door" yet. Obviously, he has no such ability.

Hoary-Headed Hag Hoax: the act

Fang's attack on Prof. Liu Bing weakened during late January to early June, 2003, when he was busy with attacking Dr. Wu Guosheng and other "scientific intellectuals." However, on June 26, 2003, Fang published an article by a "Hoary-Headed Hag," entitled *The translation of The Two Cultures and the scientific culture: Let's see Professor Liu Bing's English level* (《[两种文化和科学文化翻译——看刘兵教授的英文水平](#)》). The article criticized that the Chinese translation of C. P. Snow's *The Two Cultures* was "too bad to be read" ("不忍卒读"). The article listed three pieces of original English, a total of 105 words, and gave their corresponding Chinese translations, with a few comments. Fang inserted his own "correct translations" and comments after each piece. At the end of the article, the Hoary-Headed Hag wrote:

"The above English is not very difficult, but the translations by Liu Bing and Chen Hengliu were not very good. Does this mean that Liu Bing, the famous scholar in humanities and history of science, needs to learn English better?"^[10]

两种文化和科学文化翻译——看刘兵教授的英文水平

白发魔女

清华大学刘兵教授时常宣讲两种文化，最近在中华读书报评论上海科学技术出版社的《第三种文化》，以为作者是在“挖沟”不是“搭桥”有意否定第三种文化。这使我等想到他1987年与陈恒六合译斯诺的《两种文化》，见“走向未来丛书”。当年书名把《两种文化》改译为《对科学的傲慢与偏见》，可能是中国最早的就《两种文化》的译本。重新翻读译文，不忍卒读。列出对照，以饕读者学外语之福：

1. 英文: In every respect but one, in fact, the old Mathematical Tripos seemed perfect. The one exception, however, appeared to some to be rather important. It was simply--so the young creative mathematicians, such as Hardy and Littlewood, kept saying--that the training had no intellectual merit at all. (Cambridge University Press, Canto edition, 1993, pp. 20-21)

刘、陈译文：事实上，并不是每个人都能够意识到，旧的数学荣誉学位考试看起来都是完善的，只有一点例外。但是，这唯一的例外在有些人看来是非常重要的。它只是一些年轻的具有创造性的数学家，如哈代、里特沃特一直坚持说——这种训练完全没有智力上的价值。(第28页)

第一句确信是误读，翻译不认真。【方舟子按：此句应译成：事实上，旧的数学荣誉学位考试在每一个方面看来都是很完善的，只有一个例外。】

2. 英文: It would have meant breaking the pattern into which they have crystallised. They were fond of the pattern, just as we are fond of ours. They never found the will to break it. (p.40)

刘、陈译文：它意味着打破了僵化的模式。他们发现了模式，正象我们发现了我们自己的模式。他们从来没有打碎这个模式的决心。(第50页)

把单词看错了。fond当成了found。【方舟子按：此句应译成：这会意味着打破他们已定型的模式。他们喜欢这种模式，就像我们喜欢我们的模式一样。他们从来没有感到要打破它的意愿。】

3. 英文: Isn't it time we begin? The danger is, we have been brought up to think as though we had all the time in the world. (p.51)

刘、陈译文：火候还没有到。危险是，我们站起来了，尽管我们认为在世界上时间全部属于我们。(第62页)

第一句，反问句没有译出来。“培养”不应当为“站起来”，后面的句子莫明其妙。【方舟子按：缺乏上下文，不过从字面意思上看，这句可翻译成：难道现在不正是我们应该开始行动的时候？危险的是，我们所受的教育已使我们倾向于认为我们似乎拥有世界上的全部时间。】

以上英文不是特别难，但刘兵与陈恒六却翻译得十分不妥当。

这些是否意味着刘兵这样的著名人文学者、科学史家，要好好学习英文？

(XYS20030626)

Hoary-Headed Hag on the New Threads

The above is the screen image of Hoary-Headed Hag's article on the *New Threads*. Fang inserted his supposed correct translations and comments into the article (in black square brackets).

Note: each piece of the original English contains at least one typo (red underlines and a red dot, which designates the missing comma).

The facts are, Snow's book was co-translated by Chen Hengliu and Liu Bing, in this particular order; and the two translators didn't specify who was responsible for which part of the book. So, why did Hoary-

Headed Hag reverse the sequence of the authorship? Why did Hoary-Headed Hag only name Liu Bing in her title? Another fact is, the translated book was published in 1987, when Liu Bing was a lecturer at the Graduate School of China's Academy of Social Sciences. (Liu Bing received his Master's degree in 1985, and he was promoted to professor in 1997). In other words, the article's title alone contained at least two major errors. But Fang didn't care. He published it, with his own comments, anyway.

The more astonishing secret was revealed about two weeks later. On July 11, 2003, *Science Times* published an article, *Academic fraud busting causes controversy, "anti-corruption hero" is called into question* (《学术打假起争议 “反腐英雄”遭质疑》). The article mainly reported Fang's lawsuit against Shanghai Federation of Social Sciences, the sponsor of journal *Exploration and Free Views*, which had published a series of 3 articles questioning Fang's credibility, his motivation, and his certain views^[11]; but at the end, the article told Hoary-Headed Hag's secret: the 3 pieces of translations were her fabrication.

Chen & Liu: 事实上, 旧的数学荣誉学位考试看起来在一切方面都是完善的, 只有一点例外。但是, 这唯一的例外在有些人看来是非常重要的。它只是——那些年轻的具有创造性的数学家, 如哈代、里特沃特一直坚持说——这种训练完全没有智力上的价值。

HHH: 事实上, 并不是每个人都能够意识到, 旧的数学荣誉学位考试看起来都是完善的, 只有一点例外。但是, 这唯一的例外在有些人看来是非常重要的。它只是——那些年轻的具有创造性的数学家, 如哈代、里特沃特一直坚持说——这种训练完全没有智力上的价值。 (p.28)

Chen & Liu: 本来就意味着应该去打碎他们的那种已经僵化了的模式。但是他们喜欢他们的旧模式, 正如我们喜欢我们自己的, 他们从来没有打碎这个旧模式的决心。

HHH: 它意味着打破了僵化的模式。他们发现了模式, 正如我们发现了我们自己的模式。他们从来没有打碎这个模式的决心。 (p.50)

Chen & Liu: 我们还不到开始的时候吗? 危险的是我们一直是这样成长起来的, 总认为我们在这世界上有的是时间。

HHH: 火候还没有到。危险是, 我们站起来了, 尽管我们认为在世界上时间全部属于我们。 (p.62)

Hoary-Headed Hag's scrambling

Hoary-Headed Hag (HHH) sent 3 pieces of fake translations to Fang, pretending they were copied from the book translated by Chen Hengliu and Liu Bing (Chen & Liu). The fake translations were made by scrambling the original to make them either senseless or ambiguous in meaning. The above coloration shows how the scheme worked: each box contains a piece of the translation, the upper portion is the translation made by Chen & Liu, the lower portion is fabricated by HHH by scrambling the original words. The same words in a box are highlighted in the same color, the words without highlight are those deleted from the original, or inserted into the fabricated text.

The real secret was revealed much later: the Hoary-Headed Hag incidence was a hoax similar to [Sokal hoax](#), the purpose was to test whether Fang's so called "fraud busting" is for truth, for honesty, for integrity, or for his personal gain^[12]. Because Fang had claimed:

"For each article I received, I would verify the credibility and reliability of the content and the source over and over again. I normally ignore the anonymous articles. I dislike anonymous complains very much. I require that the whistleblowers reveal their true identities to me, but I promise I will not reveal their identities to any other people without their consent. If the content

of an article involves knowledge outside of my specialty, and I am unable to tell whether it is reliable, then I will ask for the opinions of at least two specialists in that area before I decide whether to publish it.”^[13]

Obviously, Fang neither “verif[ied] the credibility and reliability of the content and the source,” nor “ask for the opinions of at least two specialists in that area” before he published Hoary-Headed Hag’s defamatory article, since both the original English and the Chinese translations contained obvious mistakes. It also appears that Fang didn’t verify the identity of Hoary-Headed Hag either, otherwise he would have made that information public long time ago.

The conclusions drawn from the Hoary-Headed Hag Hoax are concrete and undisputable: Fang has been shamelessly lying to the public from the very beginning; Fang’s so called “fraud busting” is nothing but personal revenge and personal attack.

So, by the mid of 2003, Fang’s camouflages of “scientist” and “fraud fighter” had been stripped off, first by the debate between Ke Zhiyang and Fang Zhouzi, and then by the Hoary-Headed Hag Hoax. However, the full revelation of Fang’s evilness occurred after the hoax.

“Plagiarizing professor”: the aftermath

On July 14, 2003, three days after the revelation of the Hoary-Headed Hag Hoax secret, Fang published an article on his *New Threads*, *Comments on Tsinghua Professor Liu Bing’s scolds at the New Threads* (《评清华大学刘兵教授对新语丝的漫骂》). How did Liu Bing scold the *New Threads*? Fang picked up 5 sentences by Liu Bing from the above mentioned newspaper article as examples:

“The basis of the criticism, i. e. the ‘translations’ cited in the article, were completely fabricated! Therefore, the act of the *New Threads* clearly constitutes framing and defamation against me and the other translator!” “The most puzzling thing is, to attack me, the *New Threads*, who has always been claiming that they fight against frauds, even fabricated evidence, made 3 pieces of fake translations.” “That demonstrates convincingly how irresponsible the so called ‘academic fraud busting’ by the *New Threads* is, they even corrupted to the extent of fabricating evidence.” “On the internet the *New Threads* website has long been called ‘the death of credibility station’”^[14]

Yes, Fang considered these statements “scolds,” even though they stated nothing but facts and truth. The fact is, it was Fang’s article which was full of scolds: it started by scolding the newspaper which published the secret-revealing article: “*Pseudoscience Times*” and “*Anti-science Times*” (《伪科学时报》和《反科学时报》); followed by scolding the reporters who wrote the article: “Yang Xujie is the reporter who gained her infamy from interviewing Tsung-Dao Lee recently” (“杨虚杰就是最近采访李政道而出了一回臭名的那位记者”), “Xiong Weimin is a student of ‘anti-science Master’ Wu Guosheng” (“熊卫民则是‘反科学大师’吴国盛的学生”); then followed by scolding Liu Bing and Ke Zhiyang: “the swaging and deceiving Master Liu Bing and his disciple” (“招摇撞骗的反倒是刘兵师徒”).

So, how did Fang explain the Hoary-Headed Hag Hoax? Fang wrote:

“Hoary-Headed Hag’s article was a mere submission by a reader, if talking about fabricating evidence, the fabricator was Hoary-Headed Hag, why in Liu Bing’s eyes, Hoary-Headed Hag is the incarnation of the *New Threads*?”^[15]

Yes, according to Fang, neither he, the “legal representative” and the “manager” of “his *New Threads* website,” nor the *New Threads Chinese Cultural Society*, is responsible for its false and defamatory

actions. If you are slandered by articles published by Fang on “his *New Threads* website,” you should chase after the anonymous authors. However, Fang either doesn’t know anything about his whistleblowers, or he won’t tell anybody, even a Chinese court, their identities^[16]. And yet, at the same time, Fang was preparing his lawsuit against a journal for its publishing articles criticizing him with solid evidence.

Fang’s counterattack didn’t stop at playing rogue. He then threatened Liu Bing again (the first threat was “to burst through the door” made about half a year ago):

“If I want to, or the *New Threads* solicits articles to, bust Liu Bing, we for sure won’t use an old book published in 1987, and a co-authored book without clearly defined responsibility. We will find the recent works solely authored by Liu Bing. As long as he not only offers his lip service in newspapers, but also publishes some kind of treatises or translations, I think we will have the chance, so be assured, Liu Bing.”^[15]

Yes, after making a fatal mistake, Fang won’t offer his apology, won’t take the responsibility, and he won’t provide any assurance that similar things will never happen again. All he did was scolding, counterattacking, and threatening. And this time, Fang did honor his words.

Less than 6 hours after Fang issued his threat, one of Fang’s followers, named Tian Niu, posted an article in the forum of the *New Threads*, picking up 11 supposed mistakes in the Chinese version of Stephen Hawking’s *Science in the Next Millennium*, translated by Liu Bing and another person named Fu Yingkai. Less than 4 hours after the appearance of Tian Niu’s article, Fang posted his own article in the forum, *Correcting Tsinghua University Professor Liu Bing’s English translation assignment* (《[也来给清华大学刘兵教授批改英译汉作业](#)》), accusing the same translation of “full of mistakes” (“错误百出”).

The funny things are, first, in Fang’s threat issued about 9 hours ago, he clearly stated that he would “find the recent works solely authored by Liu Bing” to bust Liu Bing, but what he found was again a co-translated article “without clearly defined responsibility.” So you can tell how eager he was to launch his counterattack. Second, Fang didn’t realize that the translated article was stolen by him from somewhere and published by him on his *New Threads* as one of “The Newly Arrived” about two years ago. So, why did Fang steal an article “full of mistakes,” and waited for two years to expose its mistakes? Third, in his article, Fang, like Tian Niu, also pointed out 11 supposed mistakes made by Liu Bing, but as I pointed out in 2009, 6 of them were the same as the ones picked up by Tian Niu, and the rest 5 were nothing but carping, so what Fang did was essentially revenging on Liu Bing by plagiarizing Tian Niu^[17].

On July 23, 2003, Fang attacked Liu Bing again by publishing an article entitled *How could you assemble an article with translations* (《[岂能拿翻译凑文章](#)》). In the article, Fang alleged that Liu Bing, in an article introducing The Science Museum in London, plagiarized the museum’s website, and made translational mistakes. Fang has been calling Liu Bing “plagiarizing professor” ever since^[18].

The fact is, Liu Bing’s article was about 6,000 Chinese characters long, but Fang only “found” less than 400 Chinese characters with their corresponding English. Furthermore, Liu Bing repeatedly mentioned in his article that he had referenced the museum’s brochure. Another fact is, Fang wrote this article by plagiarizing yet another one of his followers, this time, the person was called Plain Boiled Water (“白开水”)^[19]. The thing is, Plain Boiled Water admitted in his article that his article was “basically looking for a bone in an egg” (“基本属于鸡蛋里面挑骨头”), he was not sure the cases he brought about were plagiarism, so he asked his reader: “whether they are suspects of plagiarism?” Obviously intending to convict Liu Bing as a plagiarizer, Fang ended his article by these words:

“Sure, one needs not be as strict as writing a journal paper when he writes popular articles, he is allowed to reference, to cite other materials. He even needs not to note his every source. However, he should use his own words to summarize, to iterate; he should not conduct verbatim copying or verbatim translation. If it is a translation, he not only should cite the source, he also should put the translated portion in quotation marks. It is the same as plagiarism if a person uses paragraphs of translated words as his own article.”^[20]

Sounds reasonable, right? However, about 20 months earlier, Fang defended himself against an allegation that he plagiarized a paper published in *Science* by saying:

“The reason I didn’t cite references in my article was because that it was a popular article published in a popular newspaper, therefore it was unnecessary to cite the sources. Sure, except for a few comments, there were not many my own views in my article. As long as I uses my own language, my own words, my own way of writing to introduce [other people’s work], that is my article. If Bian Jianchao is not able to demonstrate that I have plagiarized the words, my article is a verbatim translation, but denies that the article belongs to me, claims it ‘absolutely should be counted as translation and edition,’ even wants to strip my right of authorship, it is the same as defamation.”^[21]

That article, *Solving moral dilemmas scientifically* (《[科学地解决道德难题?](#)》), contains about 1,500 Chinese characters, among them, nearly 800 characters were derived by verbatim translation of *An fMRI investigation of emotional engagement in moral judgment* by J. D. Greene et al. of Princeton University. The plagiarism has been demonstrated by [Dr. Zhao Jijun](#), a then post-doc at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; by Dr. Xiao Chuanguo, then an associate professor at New York University; and later by Dr. Liu Huajie of Peking University. But till today, Fang is still not admitting his guilty.

Yes, to Fang, an article with 5% questionable words is more than enough to convict a plagiarizer, if that person happens to be his enemy; however, more than 50%, even 90%, verbatim copying without any attribution is not enough to convict a plagiarizer, if that person happens to be himself, or his wife.

Have *Nature*, Kohn Foundation, and Sense About Science, the sponsors and the organizer of John Maddox Prize, ever witnessed a person who is more shameless and more evil than the inaugural winner of the John Maddox Prize? If so, I believe that you have an obligation to tell the world who they are, and what they have done, because sometime, somewhere, they might be the candidates for some kind of prizes.

Notes

^[1] Fang’s original Chinese: “新语丝不是个学术刊物，也从来不标榜自己的‘中立’。我从来就没有不加评论地刊登过我所反对的文章。” Fang Zhouzi. *Tian Song and Liu Bing’s “Goodbyes” and Fang Zhouzi’s replies*. 《[田松、刘兵的“就此别过”和方舟子的答复](#)》). Fang’s unfair treatment to Ke Zhiyang included the following facts: Fang refused to publish Ke’s *The beautiful dream of an amateur rationalist* (《[江湖理性主义者的美梦](#)》 on the *New Threads* in its original form. He later published the article with Mr. Zhao Nanyuan’s comments, *Zhao Nanyuan comments on Wulongcha’s The beautiful dream of an amateur rationalist* (《[赵南元点评乌龙茶〈江湖理性主义者的美梦〉](#)》). Ke wanted to comment on Zhao’s comments, but Fang refused to publish it. Ke requested the retraction of *Zhao Nanyuan comments on Wulongcha’s The beautiful dream of an amateur rationalist*, but Fang responded by saying that was Zhao’s article, Ke had no rights for such a request. (Zhang Yan. *We just don’t play with Fang Zhouzi*. 《[我们就是不和方舟子玩](#)》).

[2] Fang's affection to the history and philosophy in his own words: In 2000, Fang told Liu Huajie: "The thing I want to do most is to reflect on the history, methods, and thoughts of biological sciences. I have always been interested in the history of science and philosophy of science, however, works in these areas are mainly based on the physical sciences, hence the widespread prejudice against biological sciences in the community of philosophy of science." (Original Chinese: "我最想做的, 是对生物学的历史、方法和思想做点思考。我一向对科学史和科学哲学感兴趣, 但目前这方面的工作主要是在物理科学方面, 因此科学哲学界对生物科学普遍存在偏见。") (Liu Huajie. 2000. *Biochemist, poet, netizen 《生物化学家·诗人·网民》*). In 2001, Fang told his future wife Liu Juhua: "Academically, I prefer to explore the questions in philosophy of science and history of science, especially those concerning biological sciences. However, at present, there are few people criticizing pseudoscience theoretically, and daring to expose academic corruption, so I have to come out and do the jobs." (Original Chinese: "在学术上, 我更喜欢探讨科学哲学和科学史的问题, 特别是生物学方面的。但是现在从理论上批判伪科学和敢于揭露学术腐败的人很少, 我就只好出来代劳一下。") (Liu Juhua. 2001. *The internet phenomenal Fang Zhouzi 《网络奇才方舟子》*).

[3] Dr. Tian Song revealed in 2005 that before the debate, he trusted Fang's judgment in biology, mainly because of his American Ph. D. credential in biology; after the debate, he would trust Fang no more. (Original Chinese: "在美梦恶梦事件之前, 我对于方舟子在生物学上的判断还是相信的, 好歹也是个博士, 算得上是前生物学工作者。但是这次事件之后, 我对于他在生物学上的判断也不再相信了。柯志阳作了一个不错的科学史工作, 方舟子批评别人冒充专家, 自居主流, 把自己打扮成主流的代言人, 而柯志阳给一些方舟子视为主流的生物学家们发了一些电子邮件, 询问他们对某某问题究竟是怎么看的, 根据那些人的答覆, 柯志阳发现, 方舟子常常歪曲或者修改人家的本意。这样一来, 连方舟子的科普文章我也不敢相信了, 因为他会根据自己的喜欢, 对他所普及的东西进行选择, 甚至删改。") (Zhang Yan. *We just don't play with Fang Zhouzi. 《我们就是不和方舟子玩》*).

[4] Fang's original Chinese: "把我驱逐出‘对科学的哲学、社会、文化讨论的共同体。……刘兵也许自认为在中国的哲学界是个人物, 但到了世界哲学界, 也不过是条小狗。’"

[5] Fang's original Chinese: "从学生的治学方式也就可以看到其老师的影子。柯志阳如此不学无术而又厚颜无耻, 那么称赞他‘干得好’、宣布全力支持他的导师刘兵是何等样人物, 也就可想而知了。我以前对刘兵的学术背景一无所知, 自从听到他宣布将我驱除出‘对科学的哲学、社会、文化讨论的共同体’, 不禁对这位中国学界霸主有何德何能感兴趣, 于是去清华大学的网站看了他的介绍: <http://www.tsinghua.edu.cn/docsn/jwc/renwen/liubing.htm> 不禁大失所望。其中列的 77 篇所谓论文, 全部都是对某位科学家、某段科学史或国外某种思潮的介绍, 任谁找几篇参考文章都写得出来。竟找不到一篇哪怕有点学术份量的文章, 与其一大堆头衔很不相称。于是也就很理解为什么要关起门来作威作福了。只是我要破门而入, 靠那点三脚猫的手艺, 又如何能挡得住我?" (Fang Zhouzi. "Humanities scientist" fabricates Mendel literatures: New example of academic corruption 《“文史哲科学家”伪造孟德尔文献——学术腐败新例子》).

[6] On August 12, 2001, Fang published [Liu Bing and Fu Yingkai's translation](#) of Stephen Hawking's *Science in the Next Millennium* on his *New Threads*. On October 24, 2001, Fang published [Liu Bing's another article](#). Also, during that time frame, Fang pirated from newspapers at least two articles eulogizing Liu Bing and "scientific intellectuals," and posted them on his *New Threads*. They were *A lifestyle of drifting at common boundary: China's scientific intellectuals quietly unveil* (《“漂移”在“交界”上的“生活方式”——中国科学文化人悄然亮相》), originally published in *China Reading Weekly*, Sept. 26, 2001; *Under the shining of two beams of lights: Scientific intellectuals talk*

about science and culture 《在两束光辉照耀下——科学文化人漫谈科学与文化》), originally published in *Guangming Daily* on Oct. 11, 2001. According to Liu Bing, one of Fang's books was entitled by Liu Bing. (See: Fang Zhouzi. *Tian Song and Liu Bing's "Goodbyes" and Fang Zhouzi's replys* 《田松、刘兵的“就此别过”和方舟子的答复》).

[7] Before 2002, Dr. Liu Bing had authored at least 12 books, translated or co-translated 6 books, and published more than 60 journal papers or book chapters.

[8] On July 21, 2002, Fang published an article on the *New Threads* entitled *Such a "friend" with unrequited love* (《如此自作多情的“朋友”》), denying he and Tian Song were friends, claiming he had never sent a private email to Dr. Tian. Dr. Tian immediately posted the screen image of a private email Fang sent to him on May 21, 2000, on the internet, in which Fang asked Dr. Tian to attend a symposium on his book *Fangzhou Online*, to “boost” (“捧场”). Fang also asked Tian to bring other people to the symposium. (Tian Song. *A lot of barks, a lot of old stories* 《听得吠声一片翻出陈谷一石》).

[9] Fang's original Chinese: “有人说方舟子有公敌无私仇，并不准确。私仇当然是有的，只不过往往是从公敌演化而来，而且毫无例外全都是对方先有了恶意，起了歹心，在背后搞小动作诬陷我。这些反科学文化人，从吴国盛（两年前即散布‘方舟子人品不好，不可和他打交道’的谣言）、刘兵（指使其研究生柯志阳整我的黑材料）、田松（对这位泼皮就不必多说了）到 coconut，无不如此，都是因为受到我的批评无力反驳而想要通过不正当手段进行报复。所以如果有人要讲宽容、‘君子而和而不同’，还是先和这些人讲去。他们既然已堕落到只会钻阴沟里匿名造谣、污蔑、骂大街的地步，恐怕连人言也听不懂的。所以，说他们是反科学文化人还是抬举他们了，其实不过是一群反科学鼠辈而已。” (Fang Zhouzi. *The speech power of anti-science rodents* 《反科学鼠辈的话语权》).

[10] The original Chinese: “以上英文不是特别难，但刘兵与陈恒六却翻译得十分不妥当。这些是否意味着刘兵这样的著名人文学者、科学史家，要好好学习英文？” (Hoary-Headed Hag. *The translation of The Two Cultures and the scientific culture: Let's see Professor Liu Bing's English level* (《两种文化和科学文化翻译——看刘兵教授的英文水平》).

[11] From March to June, 2003, 3 consecutive issues of *Exploration and Free Views* published 3 serial articles written by an author under the penname “Wild Crane” (“野鹤”), the titles of these articles are: *Reflection and Opinions on Fang Zhouzi Phenomenon (Part One)——A Hero Liable to Raise Suspicious*; *Reflection and Opinions on Fang Zhouzi Phenomenon (Part Two)——A Conception of Absolute Truth with Blind Worship of Everything Foreign*; *Reflections and Opinions on Fang Zhouzi Phenomenon (Part Three)——A Monomaniacal Man Debating in Order to Debate*. Fang threatened the journal with a lawsuit, but refused the journal's offer of publishing his self-defense articles. The journal stopped the series, but Fang sued Shanghai Federation of Social Sciences anyway. He lost in the primary court, but the appellate court ordered the defendant to apologize to Fang for using improper words in the articles. “Wild Crane” would post 6 more articles of the series on the internet. For detail about the case, see Yi Ming. *The Wild Crane case* (《打架斗士方舟子之野鹤篇》).

[12] The secret of Hoary-Headed Hag Hoax was so obvious that Fang knew he had been punked almost immediately after the publication of *Science Times* article. Also, several Fang's followers have deciphered the secret. (See: Yi Ming. *The complete story about Fang Zhouzi's attacks on Liu Bing* 《方舟子刘兵恩怨始末(3)》). On September 19, 2009, someone left a message on my blog, saying:

“Yi Ming, you might not know that the *New Threads* published an article attacking Liu Bing’s translation of *The Two Cultures*. That was hoax like Alan Sokal Affair, done by one of Liu Bing’s buddies, and Liu Bing was informed in advance. It was unexpected that such a fictitious complaint about ‘erroneous translation’ was immediately published on the *New Threads*. Fang claims that he examines every submission he received, it is a complete lie. When he saw a criticism against his hated person like Liu Bing, he published it without a little bit caring about its authenticity.” (“亦明：有件事你可能不知道。新语丝曾贴出攻击刘兵《两种文化》的译文的稿子。这是一个类似 Alan Sokal 的诈文，是刘兵的一个哥们做的，事先已经告诉了刘兵。没想到这篇子虚乌有的举报‘错误翻译’，竟然立即被方舟子收在新语丝上。方舟子声称他对来稿都审查，完全无扯。他看到对自己痛恨之人刘兵的批评，完全不顾及那篇稿子的真实性就贴出来了。”)

Note: my blogs on sina.com and netease.com were closed in the early of 2010 by the authorities of the respective websites, apparently at the request of Fang and his lawyer. [The original link to the message](#) thus has expired.

[13] Fang’s original Chinese: “对每一篇文章，我都会反复查证文章内容和消息来源的可信度。对匿名的来稿，我一般不予理会。我很讨厌匿名告状。我要求揭发者能向我提供真实身份，但是我保证不经他的允许不会向任何人透露其身份。如果揭发文章涉及的不是我的专业，我自己无法鉴别其可信度，那么我会征求至少两位那个专业的专家的意见，再决定是否发表。” (Fang Zhouzi. *Postscript of Ulcers: Facing academic corruption in China—Reply to a reporter’s questions about academic fraud busting* 《〈溃疡：直面中国学术腐败〉代跋——就“学术打假”答记者问》). Note: the book was published in 2001.

[14] Liu Bing’s original Chinese, as cited by Fang Zhouzi: “批评的依据，即短文中所引用的‘译文’，完全是捏造出来的！因此，新语丝的这种做法，明确地构成了对刘兵我与另一译者的诬陷与诽谤！”“尤其令人不解的是，一向声称打假的新语丝为了对我进行攻击，竟然捏造事实，替我造了三段假的译文！”“这也确切地表明：新语丝的‘学术打假’是如何的不负责任，甚至堕落到捏造事实的地步。”“网上早有人称‘新语丝网站’为‘信誉死亡站’了。” (Fang Zhouzi. *Comments on Tsinghua Professor Liu Bing’s scold at the New Threads* (《评清华大学刘兵教授对新语丝的漫骂》)).

[15] Fang’s original Chinese: “白发魔女的文章只是一篇读者来稿而已，如果‘捏造事实’，也是白发魔女‘捏造事实’，不知为何在刘兵的眼中，白发魔女竟然成了新语丝的化身了，竟然成了新语丝在捏造事实了。如果我本人，或新语丝要组织写稿揭露刘兵，肯定不会去找一本 1987 年出版的旧著，而且还是分不清谁该承担责任的合著，而会找刘兵新近的个人著作。只要以后他不只是在报纸上耍嘴皮，还要出什么专著、译著，我想是会有这样的机会的，这一点也请刘兵放心。” *Ibid.*

[16] Fang’s statement to Beijing Xicheng District Court, made in 2005, is a perfect example. See [Part IV of this Open Letter](#), or Fang Zhouzi. *A statement on Beijing Xicheng District Court’s accepting the lawsuit against Fang Zhouzi by the agent of “Jindi deposits.”* 《关于北京西城区法院受理“金娣存款”代理人告方舟子一案的说明》).

[17] [Tian Niu’s article](#) was posted at 01:23:12 on July 15, 2003, a follow-up to Fang’s [Comments on Tsinghua Professor Liu Bing’s scold at the New Threads](#), which was posted at 19:57:03 on July 14, 2003. Fang’s [Correcting Tsinghua University Professor Liu Bing’s English translation assignment](#) was posted at 04:55:23 on July 15, 2003. For analysis of Fang’s plagiarizing Tian Niu, see Yi Ming. *The complete story about Fang Zhouzi’s attacks on Liu Bing* (《方舟子刘兵恩怨始末 (4)》).

^[18] Fang has called Liu Bing “plagiarizing professor” at least four times in his articles: On March 25, 2005, in *Who have played with you: Comments on Tian Song’s Why we don’t play with Fang Zhouzi* (《[谁和你玩了？——评田松〈我们为什么不和方舟子玩〉](#)》); On April 6, 2006, in *Tsinghua’s plagiarizing professor Liu Bing fabricates rumors again* (《[清华剽窃教授刘兵又造谣了](#)》); On Sept. 2, 2007, in *Tsinghua University’s plagiarizing professor Liu Bing is looking for being beaten up again* (《[清华大学剽窃教授刘兵又来打人了](#)》); On Jan. 8, 2010, in *The chief rumor fabricating fellow in the Botany Institute is fabricating rumors together with scientific intellectuals* (《[植物所首席造谣员和反科学文化人联手造谣](#)》).

^[19] Plain Boiled Water’s article was published on July 18, 2003, its title was *Is it a description of impression or plagiarism* (《[这是印象记述还是抄袭?](#)》). For analysis of Fang’s plagiarizing Plain Boiled Water, see Yi Ming. *The complete story about Fang Zhouzi’s attacks on Liu Bing* (《[方舟子刘兵恩怨始末 \(4\)](#)》).

^[20] Fang’s original Chinese: “诚然，写普及性文章，不必像学术论文那么严格，可以参考、引用别人的资料，甚至也不必一一注明资料的出处。但是应该用自己的话加以归纳、复述，而不能够照抄、照翻。如果是翻译，不仅应该说明出处，而且应该把翻译的部分用引号括起来。把整段整段的翻译当成自己的创作，与抄袭无异。”

^[21] Fang’s original Chinese: “我的文章没有注明参考文献，因为那是大众报纸上的通俗文章，无须注明出处。我的文章除了个别的评论，在观点上的确没有多少是我自己想出来的。……只要是用自己的语言、用自己的文字、用自己的写法做的介绍，就是我的文章。如果边建超不能证明我在文字方面有抄袭，不能证明我是在对原文做逐字的翻译，而否认那是‘我的文章’，声称‘绝对应该算是编译’，甚至要剥夺我署名的权利，也同样是诽谤。” (Fang Zhouzi. *Resolving the “translation and edition” problem with normal IQ: A reply to associate professor Bian Jianchao in the School of Public Health the Medical school of Fudan University* 《[智力正常地解决“编译”问题——答复复旦大学医学院公共卫生学院副教授边建超](#)》.)

Previous parts of my *Open Letter to Nature*:

[Part I: *Shameless cover-up*](#)

[Part II: *Shameless “standing-up”*](#)

[Part III: *Shameless make-up*](#)

[Part IV: *Fact distortion and mess-up*](#)

[Part V: *A shameless, fraudulent, and malicious fighter*](#)

[Part VI: *A fake scientist’s fight against science*](#)