

Heideggerian Thinking and the Eastern Mind

Rolf von Eckartsberg and Ronald S. Valle

From: *Metaphors of Consciousness*

Edited by Ronald S. Valle and Rolf von Eckartsberg

(New York and London: Plenum Press, 1981)

Chapter 14, pp. 287-311

Psychologists look to philosophers for a clarification of their work. Philosophers ask the more fundamental questions regarding the nature of man—philosophical anthropology, the nature of being—metaphysics and ontology, the nature of truth—epistemology, and the nature of values and the good life—ethics.

Most psychologists are content to work within an established framework of thinking (philosophy) and do not usually question the presuppositions of their work. But sometimes the very meaning of the activities of a scientific discipline becomes questionable, a crisis of identity of a whole science sets in, and, in such a situation of doubting and questioning, the dialogue opens up, and other world-views, other anthropologies, metaphysics, and religions, even, become interesting and important. A search for a new paradigm (Kuhn, 1962) begins. Not that established paradigms really ever die, certainly not in the social sciences. In the social sciences, which include political science, paradigms co-exist much like political parties. As long as they co-exist, we have the fertile ground of democratic freedom of exchange, and the growth of knowledge in all directions.

As it is in political life, in the politics of science we also sometimes run into ideological dictatorships, when one way of thinking predominates in

the profession and begins to drive out all conflicting views. It can also happen that a certain mind-set develops and becomes accepted without much awareness of it on the part of the participants. In such a situation, it will take a radical alternative view to make us aware of our implicit assumptions and silently operative precomprehensions and prejudices, and summon us to reflect on the meaning of our doing and on the adequacy of our concepts.

In psychology we seem to be ready for radical questions and the critical examination of our ruling paradigm at this time. Both Western existentialism (particularly the work of Martin Heidegger) and Eastern philosophico-religious thinking (in the form of Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, and Zen) have in recent years vigorously entered into the debate of American psychology and have had a liberating and opening-up effect on our discipline, forcing us to consider enlarging and refounding our paradigm.

There are many reasons for this. As the external-historical reasons, we cite the rapidly advancing military, political, economic and industrial development, travel and communication, and our increasing awareness of our global interconnectedness and interdependence during the post-World War II period.

As the more subtle reasons, we point to the development that a grossly materialistic view of the nature of reality and man has led to an incipient bankruptcy of meaning and values, a loss of the meaningfulness of life, a sense of root- and homelessness, a lack of direction, an increasing crisis of confidence in technology and the scientific establishment, a creeping kind of apathetic nihilism in the realms of politics and governance, and a growing sense of helplessness with respect to economic realities.

The reasons listed have psychological consequences in that they contribute to the meanings experienced and perceived by everybody trying to cope with the unfolding conditions of their lives, many of which seem to be beyond the control of the individual. Is psychology, the way it is today as an academic and research discipline, capable of dealing with the psychological impact of modern-day living?

A numerically significant faction of psychologists, those variously described as humanistic, transpersonal, and existential-phenomenological psychologists, has decided that the ruling majority paradigm in contemporary psychology, behaviorism, and its attendant methods of research and therapy, behavior modification, is deficient in significant ways and has become part of the problem, because its underlying paradigm provides us with a reductionistic, mechanistic, and uninspiring conceptualization of the nature of man and human reality, with a robot-understanding of human interaction, and a caricature-vision of who we are.

The double turn within psychology, toward Western existential philosophical thinking on the one hand, and toward Eastern philosophico-religious wisdom on the other, should be seen as the healthy attempt to revitalize and reform the stifling natural scientific approach to psychology conceived as the science of behavior by reintroducing the realities of experience and consciousness, by insisting on the importance of personal agency, the sense of self, and of values and meaning, and by emphasizing ultimate depth- and height-dimensions of human experience: peak experiences, mystical-ecstatic self-transcendence, and the experience of transpersonal powers or "theo-realities."

There has been emerging among consciousness-oriented psychologists an increasing recognition that our personal and collective relationship to the world (man-world-relationships) has to be lived under the inspiration and auspices of some higher, transpersonal power of divinity, of ultimate Being, as the source of legitimation and validation of our activities.

This higher, transpersonal God- or theo-dimension is variously spoken of and conceptualized in different traditions. We want to select and compare Heidegger's work on the Western philosophical tradition of metaphysics and ontology with the major Eastern spiritual traditions, because they bear some striking similarities in their emphasis on a transcendent dimension, the theo-dimension, in human consciousness. In this shared emphasis, they both offer to psychology a new and more adequate view of man in his potential and a new view of the nature of reality in its luminous depths. Both traditions can provide the foundation for an expanded and deepened conceptualization of psychology as the study of personally meaningful events and personal life-way creation, a vision which is essentially ecological and process- or network-oriented, conceiving of man as a network of interdependent relationships. This basic outlook unites Heidegger and the Eastern spiritual traditions and integrates them in an emergent "theo-psychology" which grounds its inquiries in the specifically human spiritual realities: the mystery of divine calling, creativity, inspiration, meaning, values, wonder, bliss, and ecstasy, and places these self-transcendent experiences at the heart of its philosophical anthropology and paradigm.

The Vision of Martin Heidegger

Heidegger is the most radical Western philosophical thinker who has made our contemporary situation and dilemma visible to us. His thinking about the nature of man and the nature of beings and things, and the nature of the ground of beings—Being which makes everything

possible—provides us with a radically new starting point in philosophy and psychology.

Heidegger recognized that our very way of thinking as scientists, as psychologists, as modern rational men, is part of the problem. We are thinking about ourselves, others, and our world in the wrong way. We have the wrong starting point. Heidegger introduces into philosophical discourse a radical distinction. He speaks of two modes of thinking: *rational, calculative thinking* and *intuitive, meditative thinking*. Our world and reality as a whole reveals itself in a totally different way to each of these modes. The calculative mode predominates in modern secular and technological man. It is based on willfulness and the desire both to objectify everything and to dominate the objects of thought. It is concerned with the *ontic* level of the being of man and the being of worldly things. The meditative mode of thinking, which Heidegger also calls "thanking thinking," is based on a completely different attitude which is respectful, open, loving, and in awe of the mystery of what is, the Being of beings. This way of thinking is *ontological*, concerned with the essential dimensions of Being; it questions things in their grounding, and it expresses a basic reverential and religious, a theodimensional stance toward reality. Meditative thinking is a "thinking" that overcomes the limits of willful ego-consciousness and the separation inherent in the subject-object split.

In Heidegger's ultimate vision, we modern Western people have lost our original wholeness and holy embeddedness in Being, and have become lost in the material world of things, of human projects, of human willfulness, what he calls "fallenness." We have given up our relatedness and awareness of the ground of Being, we have lost the experience of the truth of Being as an event of primordial wonder, as an experience of gratitude for the revelation of the "splendor of the simple."

We are suffering the dues and consequences for the hubris initiated in human thinking by and since Descartes, who made the world, as matter, as *res extensa*, an object for the calculative view-arid thinking of the rational ego-consciousness of the subject. We have fallen into an understanding of reality as an objective world subjected to the will of man, into a conquest mentality of Promethean scope nurtured by the projection of self-world distance, the subject-object split.

For Heidegger, coming out of the Husserlian phenomenological tradition, the self-world relationship is one of intentionality, of meaningful interdependent interrelatedness. Heidegger wanted to overcome the subject-object split and dualism of Western thinking since Descartes which has placed consciousness in opposition to the objects of nature and led to a fateful separation of man from his world. Heidegger avoids even the traditional terminology of subject and object of consciousness. He

chose a multihyphenated term, being-in-the-world (or *Dasein*) to characterize the essential two-way, person-world interrelationship in his seminal work. *Being and Time*, which first appeared (in German) in 1927.

For Heidegger, *Dasein* is that being among beings that is aware of and concerned about the meaning of its own being. *Dasein* is aware, is questioning, is concerned, is philosophical. *Dasein* asks even more deeply: "Why is there something rather than nothing at all?" It asks about 'the nothing,' the ground of all beings. Being itself, that is, that which is beyond all form, names, distinctions, determinations: the very condition of possibilities. Thus *Dasein* (man's existence) is not only concerned about the meaning of its own being, but it also has a primordial under-handing of the nature of Being. Heidegger says that any great thinker has but one central thought during all of his life, one essential intuition; Heidegger's is "What is Being (*Sein*)?"

In his work over four decades, Heidegger moved from the concern about the human way of being—*Dasein* and its essential ontological constituents as a structure of *care*, embodied, spatialized, in and through time as lifetime and historicity, relating through attunement, understanding, and speech—to the concern of what is thinking, what is truth, what is a thing, and what is dwelling. Heidegger sees the world and the things of the world as standing in a relevant meaning- and action-contexts relationship to a projecting *Dasein*. The world-design or world-project that *Dasein* is, became one of the most fruitful integrative and ecological constructs for the existential psychiatry of Binswanger (1942), Boss (1963), and Frankl (1959).

For Heidegger, there are *inauthentic* ways of relating, when one acts in the anonymous modes of "Das Man"—the one—and is lost to the world and forgetful of the mystery of Being, in the modes of prattle and gossip; and there are moments—only moments, for Heidegger—of *authentic* being-in-the-world, of relating with the awareness of one's own being toward death, of finitude, that awakens us to true discourse, of recognition of the "event of Being," the "event of appropriation" as the happening of the truth of Being.

Using key metaphors, Heidegger considers man to be an *openness* into which others and the things of the world appear, and considers *Dasein* to be the *luminating realm*, the light, the *lumen naturale*, into which the things of the world make their appearance and *reveal* themselves as what they are in their self-giveness, as themselves in their unconcealed-ness, in their Being. Heidegger comes to understand truth and Being as becoming revealed to man from the hidden ground of concealedness, or "no-thing-ness." Heidegger's emphasis on luminating, on revelation, on the "clearing" (*Lichtung*) of Being puts him close to the illumination tradition of the East.

The other major metaphor in Heidegger's thinking and writing is that of the *path*, which brings him into close proximity to the tradition of Taoism, of which he is himself aware when he says:

The word "way" probably is an ancient primary word that speaks to the reflective mind of man. The key word in Laotse's poetic thinking is Tao, which "properly speaking" means way. (1959, p. 198)

On the general importance of the metaphor of the path in Heidegger's thinking Gray (1970) comments in his discussion of Heidegger's (1954a) famous invocation of the essence-meaning of the fieldpath (*Der Feldweg*):

The path itself spoke to him, as he writes, encouraged him to decipher the thoughts in the books he found too hard to comprehend. The field path taught him to conceive of thinking itself as a path, and of man's brief career in time likewise as a path. . . . the field path spoke to him, not he to the field path. (pp. 227-228)

Heidegger came to reject all of Western metaphysics since Plato as leading to a distance from Being by conceiving of the truth in terms of a correspondence theory of truth, that is, the notion that something is true according to and by comparison with a pre-established idea or category. What appears is tested against a criterion, as in the natural scientific method. Heidegger challenges this approach and returns to the early thinkers of Greece, the pre-Socratics—Parmenides and Heraclitus—who thought of Being, for the first time in Western philosophy, in its dynamic, elemental, and mysterious nature and power as revealing and concealing itself, as eluding the will and grasp of the intellect of man. For Heidegger, truth is the self-revelation of Being in the right attitude of meditative thinking. Being presences itself as event, as advent, that addresses man, that calls man into service "to tell" (*die Sage*), to name it primordially as in poetry, to think it essentially thankfully, as in meditative thinking which lets the things reveal themselves in their essential being.

In all metaphysics since Plato, including natural science as a materialistic monism, we create a conceptual map of reality which gets to be taken for the territory mapped. So we always fall short of Being itself which does not lend itself to be categorized but reveals itself, on its own terms, to the openness of Dasein.

The fruits of the later work of Heidegger reveal him to be a thinker of dazzling originality and of great profundity. As a creator of many neologisms, Heidegger is engaged in presenting his work in manifold linguistic forms—as meditations, as dialogue, as argument, as poetry. After *Being and Time*, he became intrigued with and entangled by the problem of language and speech and its wisdom and demand character. In his much heralded turn (*Kehre*), he shifted the focus of his concern away from the being of man as Dasein to a concern with Being itself and

the world- and thing-pole of the being-in-the-world correlation. As he moved his emphasis from Dasein to Being, from the thinker to the thought, so he shifted his concern in his later work from "man having speech" to "speech having and addressing man," and he came to speak of language as the "house of Being." Heidegger marveled at the gift and power of the poet to speak and name the unnamed Being.

For the philosopher, who is now called simply "the thinker," it is the primordial, the un-thought, the nothing, that has to be thought. The reality of being-in-the-world is now called *dwelling*—a dwelling amidst things, a dwelling as building. The reality of a thing becomes for Heidegger the event and occasion of a dynamic and holy assembly of living powers and relationships: the *fourfold* (*das Geviert*). He comes to this insight through the etymology of "thing" (*das Ding*), which originally meant "assembly" in German.

The fourfold are the double polarities of the *Earth*, the *Sky*, the *Mortals*, and the *Divinities*, which constitute the fourfold field of tension within which man dwells and has his being. The fourfold also assembles as the dynamic interplay which constitutes the reality of a thing for us. Heidegger describes the essence of some everyday things for us. The jug, for instance, which pours wine from within its form, its emptiness, as the gift of the Gods to mortal man, wine as the fruit of the vine growing from the marriage of Earth and Sky. As Hirsch (1970) comments in this context:

It is possible, for instance, to regard a pitcher as a man-made thing (Ding) designed to hold so much of a liquid; the empty space inside the pitcher is then what counts. However, in this way we have abstracted from the concrete situation which makes a pitcher a pitcher. In the context of a concrete situation the pouring out of the liquid from the pitcher expresses a more important aspect of its essence than its emptiness or size. . . . The pitcher cannot be separated from the wine or water that it may contain; wine and water, on the other hand, form part of a world where heaven and earth are joined together. (P. 252)

Heidegger says of the pitcher:

In the water of the spring the marriage of heaven and earth is present. This marriage is present in the wine which is the gift of the fruit of the vine; in the fruit the nourishing earth and the sun in the sky are joined together in marriage. . . . The gift of that which flows from it is the essence of a pitcher. In the essence of the pitcher are present heaven and earth. (1954b, p. 171)

Such an openness to what reveals itself as the essence of a utensil, of a thing, is done in a particular mode of thinking which is a meditative, recalling, and responsive thinking, rather than one of rational, utilitarian, grasping thinking. It is an evocation not of the thing for man, but the thing in itself, in its essential being. Heidegger gives voice back to nature, to the elemental, to things, so that they may call us out into the openness

of a deeper and more authentic relationship, more grounded in and no longer forgetful of Being. This involves a renunciation of our metaphysical and technological willfulness. It involves a turning to an awareness that man dwells poetically on earth.

Out of this meditative and nonrepresentational thinking, attitude, and presence comes some of Heidegger's most poetic and profound writings on things; the temple (1961), the field path (1954a), Van Gogh's painting of the peasant shoes (1954b). In very simple language, he presents these things and lets them reveal themselves as what they are in their essence.

Gray (1970), in his study of the Heideggerian notion of "the splendor of the simple" which he finds to be intimately akin to the Tao-Zen attitude, says:

Things think. That is, they gather to themselves the permanent and the transient of our world, the animate and the inanimate, the near and the remote, the sacred and the secular. These phenomena are manifest in whatever particular thing we pay heed to by tending and sparing it. If one studies Heidegger, as opposed to reading him only, and if one seeks to link this thought of his, that a thing gathers together the world, to his philosophy as a whole, I believe it will lose much of its outlandish character and possibly count in the end as a genuine insight, (p. 239)

The recognition of the splendor of the simple is the fruit of a growth of the thinker into a new attitude. Its discovery requires "long experience and incessant practice" (Heidegger, 1954c) and it is, as Caputo (1978) reports, the setting out on "a high and dangerous game."

The discovery of the simple is a laying bare of the essential connections of things of the world and of our belonging to them. (Gray, 1970, p. 232)

The simple in thinking is thus identified with that which is basic or fundamental in reality. To get at these fundamental structures and interrelationships requires a stripping away of the concealments of historical development. Heidegger believes that if we can reach at the roots of a matter or, to employ his idiom, the sun and soil that nourish these roots, we shall discover that the true nature of things reveals itself. (Gray, 1970, p. 229)

There is a discipline involved in arriving at the recognition of the truth (t) of Being as advent, as the gathering of the powers of a cosmic context, the fourfold. An attitude of letting go of one's will, of releasement, is involved, letting the thing reveal itself as an event which calls us into its telling.

Again Gray:

This discipline of experience and practice implies two things: first, a capacity to get involved in and to stay with a matter to be thought and, second, the ability to let it be what it truly is. The first of these capacities demands a singlemindedness and persistence that goes against the grain of all but the most select minds. Getting involved in something to be thought means living with it,

making its pursuit a way of life rather than a problem to be solved. Thinking as he (Heidegger) puts it, is a way of dwelling and dwelling is in turn a kind of building. To build well we must first acquire the grace to be at home in our region, to live into it, one could say. (pp. 229-230)

Man, Dasein, is conceived by the later Heidegger as the servant and shepherd of Being in whose care is given the fate of the world and who has to live in the right attitude, rooted in the soil of a beloved region and history. There is a reactionary element in Heidegger's thinking. He is auspicious of progress while he considers man's problem to be the forgetfulness of Being. As regards technology, the most powerful, modern, life-transforming force in the "mittance of Being" (of which Heidegger speaks frequently), one has to live in the spirit of "releasement" (*Gelassenheit*) and in "openness to the mystery." The splendor of the simple became revealed to Heidegger in his Black Forest retreat hut where he thought and wrote in the utter simplicity of an ecological sage, standing firmly in the ground of Being and calling us into a new and, at the same time, ancient relationship of fullness of belonging.

Heidegger's emergent image of man is man as the "shepherd of Being," as the custodian of the earth and its accumulated culture in a particular life-way incarnation. Heidegger is a life-way philosopher who articulates the proper relationship of man as Dasein with the things of his world and Being as such. His thinking revealed to him the existence and dynamic power of "the fourfold," the interplay of earth and sky and the divinities and the mortals as the foundation on which our dwelling takes place. He understands the fourfold as emanating from the ground of Being, the condition of all possibilities. Being, "the process by which finite beings emerge from concealment" (Richardson, 1963). As Richardson (perhaps the most reliable guide for the English-speaking reader into the movement and path of Heidegger's thinking) comments when he examines the use of the concept of Being and the way in which a cluster of related terms constitutes an interrelated network of meanings, open enough to allow a glimmer and wink, but also to-let pass and reveal the luminous radiance and ineffability of Being itself:

As for Being itself, the "... " that is the mystery, what is to be said of it now? It is wealth, treasure a hidden fullness. It is inexhaustible wellspring, ineffable. The Simple, the All, the Only, the One. . . .

Reichtum, Schätze, Unerschöpfliche des Fragwürdigen, Unerschöpflicher Brunnen, Verborgene Schätze des Gewesenen, Vergorgene Fülle, Alles, Eine, Einzige, das Verborgene des Unerschöpflichen, etwas Unsagbares, Verborgener Reichtum der Sprache, Wesensreichtum des Seins, das Einfache, das Endlose, der grosse Anfang, die grosse Einfalt. (Richardson, 1963, p. 640)

Heidegger's thinking has been brought into connection and discussion with Eastern thought, Eastern philosophico-religious tradition. He

himself has made reference to the Tao as the thinking of the way or the path which he found very congenial to his approach. He is also said to have commented on Zen Buddhism, as reported by William Barret (1956) in his foreword to *Zen Buddhism*:

A German friend of Heidegger told me that one day when he visited Heidegger he found him reading one of Suzuki's books. "If I understand this man correctly," Heidegger remarked, "this is what I have been trying to say in all my writings." (p. xi)

Furthermore, there have been long-standing personal friendships between Heidegger and several Japanese philosophers; and his famous dialogue. *On the Way to Language* (1971a), is a dialogue with a Japanese on the mystery of language.

Heidegger thus had some documented cognizance of Eastern ways of thinking, especially of Taoism and Zen Buddhism, and he was aware of the compatibility of much of this thinking with his own. He also spoke explicitly of the East-West dialogue in philosophy that he considered imminent and overdue. In the dialogue with the Japanese, Heidegger says:

Therefore, I cannot yet see whether, what I try to think as the essence of speech also satisfies the essence of East Asian speech, whether at the end, which would also be a beginning, an essence of speech may become an experience of our thinking (effort) and grant us the assurance that European-Occidental and East Asian speaking entered into a dialogue which sings of that which springs from a single source. (1959, pp. 93-94)

Such a dialogue was held at the symposium on Heidegger and Eastern thought at the University of Hawaii (Department of Philosophy, 1969) on the occasion of Heidegger's 80th birthday, the presentations of which are reprinted in *Philosophy East and West* (Hirsch, 1970). Heidegger wrote a letter to the symposium which reads in part:

That you together with colleagues from Japan are planning a conference in honor of my eightieth birthday, deserves special thanks on my part. Again and again it has seemed urgent to me that a dialogue take place with the thinkers of 'what is to us the Eastern world. The greatest difficulty in this enterprise always lies, as far as I can see, in the fact that with few exceptions there is no command of the Eastern languages either in Europe or in the United States. A translation of Eastern thought into English, on the other hand, remains—as does every translation—an expedient. May your conference prove fruitful in spite of this unfortunate circumstance. (Nagley, 1970, p. 221)

There have been some such comparative studies on these particular topics (Boss, 1965; Caputo, 1978; Kreeft, 1971). In these studies, comparisons have been made between Heidegger's *Being and Time* and Hinduism

indirectly by Boss (1965), and with Buddhism, Taoism, and Zen (focusing more on Heidegger's later work).

Heidegger and the Hindu Tradition

For this comparison, note that Heidegger questions the very meaning of "Being"; that is, he asks the basic question: "What does it mean to exist?" He then reasons that the best way to approach this question is to first inquire into the nature of the *individual's* Being. Also, note that since the individual finds him or herself "there" in the world among things and other individuals (through no choice of his or her own), Heidegger uses the term *Dasein* (literally "there-being") to describe the human person, and that, on the everyday level, *Dasein* is concerned with the meaning of its own existence (as discussed above). This concern is unique to *Dasein*, is an essential part of its Being, and demonstrates that it already has a latent understanding of existence.

The nature of human existence has been a subject of inquiry in Hindu thought for centuries, the application of Eastern philosophy leading to beliefs that seem, at first, quite foreign to Western thought. For example, in our everyday existence, most of us live with the implicit assumption that the physical world which we perceive is the *only* world. Many assume that there may in fact be other worlds or realities, but this is merely conjecture that is impossible to "prove" in any way. An essential position of Hindu thought is, however, that physical reality is only one of three and that each of us exists simultaneously on all levels. Paramahansa Yogananda (1969) described how each of us is "encased . . . successively in three bodies—the idea, or causal body, the subtle astral body, seat of man's mental and emotional nature, and the gross physical body" (p. 415).

Heidegger sees *Dasein* as implicitly apprehending something *beyond* its everyday, physical existence, but does this without preference to different levels of reality. Rather, he speaks of "existentiality" and "facticity" as two central constituents of the structure of *Dasein's* Being.

Existentiality refers to *Dasein's* existing in such a way that it directs itself toward and anticipates its possibilities (e.g., the possibility of becoming a teacher, a parent, etc.). These possibilities, however, do not exist apart from *Dasein* as something yet to be realized. Rather, *Dasein is* its possibilities. It cannot exist, however, as just any potentiality it chooses, as there are definite limits which are established through its facticity. *Facticity* is that structure which encompasses those aspects of *Dasein's* Being over which it has no control (e.g., eye color, emotionality,

sexual desire). In addition to this questioning of the nature of reality/existence, the way one perceives or "takes up" this reality is also important.

Eastern thinkers believe that we desire and are ultimately *attached to* "things" in the physical world.¹ This ranges from luxuries which we all want, to things about ourselves we desire (e.g., beauty and health), to a clinging to life itself. Moreover, the idea that one's attachments to things in the physical world quite literally make the physical world what it is (i.e., the only perceived reality) is a foundational one in Hindu thought. Thus, an individual who is so attached perceives the world to be only physical in nature, and the world is, to that extent, an illusion. To see the true nature of existence (i.e., all three planes) one must give up one's desires and become unattached. Only in this state, where one is free of desire, is "liberation" achieved and existence seen as it truly is.

The Hindu tradition describes the path of liberation leading to the experience of samadhi as the highest state of consciousness, a direct mystical experience of reality. In samadhi Brahman, the ultimate reality of pure essence, of illumination, of the Divine essence, is entered into. As H. Smith (1958) says:

The name the Hindus give to the supreme reality is Brahman, from the root "brih" meaning "to be great." The chief attributes to be linked with this name are sat, chit, and ananda; God is being, awareness, and bliss. Utter Reality, utterly conscious, and utterly beyond all possibility of frustration, this is the basic Hindu view of God. (p. 72)

Brahman is infinite, ineffable, and beyond all particular manifestations and concepts.

The individual soul, Atman, tries and can merge with the ground of its being: Brahman, and comes to the realization that the individual and the ultimate reality are One:

Never during its pilgrimage is the spirit of man completely adrift and alone. From start to finish its nucleus is the Atman. Underlying its whirlpool of transient feelings, emotions, and delusions, is the self-luminous, abiding point of God himself. Though he is buried too deep in the soul to be usually noticed, he is the sole ground of man's being and awareness. (Smith, 1958, p. 79)

Meditation, the systematic practice of attempting to calm the mind of undirected thought and emotion, is the primary way in which the path of liberation is pursued. The entering into samadhi-enlightenment makes us realize that the world of everyday life, of attachment and desire, is illusory (*maya*), and from the experience of samadhi it also becomes

¹See Levin's discussion in Chapter 12 of the ego's "attachment patterns" in Tibetan Buddhist thought.—Eds.

obvious that it is an "error" to believe in the reality of thought and concepts, to confuse the map with the territory. The samadhi experience of Atman—Brahman needs no other validation than its being experienced and it is a permanent realization.

Heidegger's dialectic of Dasein as man's being-in-the-world and Being as such parallels the Atman-Brahman distinction:

Brahman and Atman are the ground-words of the Indian tradition, not just words or concepts, but the very embodiment of that primordial unhiddenness in the light of which the Indian mind thenceforth breathed and thought, its very spiritual destiny. Not "metaphysics" which for Heidegger is concerned with the truth of beings (with beings as such or with the being of beings), but the inquiry into the truth of Being (Being itself or Being as such) would correspond with the paravidya, the higher knowledge, taught by the sage Angira to Saunaka. (Mehta, 1970, p. 305)

Although for the Hindu tradition the Brahman reality requires us to take into account an explicitly religious dimension of divinity, the transcendental or theo-dimension, in our understanding of human experience, Heidegger does not speak of God or give any theistic interpretation of the ultimate ground of Being, although the manner of thinking and the way of speaking of Heidegger has become increasingly identified with the mystical tradition, and particularly with Meister Eckhart (Caputo, 1978), who was speaking out of an explicitly Christian and theistic context.²

This notion that the nature of perceived reality can be quite different depending on one's perspective (e.g., being "attached-unattached") is discussed by Heidegger in somewhat different terms. For the most part, Dasein occupies itself with everyday concerns, and chooses its possibilities from out of these concerns. In their "everydayness," these preoccupations are average ones, and so they do not belong uniquely to Dasein. They have arisen out of the anonymous world of the "They," which is the world of the ubiquitous "One," as in "One should do this" and "One must not do that." It is actually the "They," and not Dasein, that chooses Dasein's possibilities. When Dasein allows its existence to be chosen for it, it exists as "falling." *Fallenness* (briefly discussed above) is always an "inauthentic" mode of Being. In order to overcome this inauthenticity, Dasein must face a possibility which it and not the "They" chooses to face—its death. Choosing in this way, Dasein exists authentically—a radically different manner of existing than when involved solely with the concerns of the "They."

Another difference in the two approaches seems to be that Heidegger considers this authentic mode as a very momentary state of privileged presence to Being which cannot be a permanent state or achievement, in

²See Moss's discussion in Chapter 17 of the mysticism of Johannes Tauler and Meister Eckhart.—Eds.

contrast to the teachings of both Hinduism and Buddhism, in which permanent transformations, that is, samadhi and satori, are entered into. Also, the Heideggerian way of revelation is via reflective-meditative thinking characteristic of an ontological philosopher, rather than via meditation in the religious and yogic sense which tries to find merger in the undifferentiated unity of pure being as Brahman in a regular meditative practice under the guidance of a teacher. However, the later Heidegger, who is very much concerned with distinguishing the habitual Western mode of calculative thinking from that of a deepened, more intuitive and meditative thinking, comes much closer to a form of meditative practice in the context of walking in nature as in the field path, or in the wandering of a discourse, or in the essence-contemplation of a thing.

Another unexamined belief we hold is that "things" change over a linear time sequence. Eastern writers have challenged this notion, saying that a belief in time as a past, a present, and a future is just another conceptual illusion which is a result of physical attachment, and instead propose an *ever-present*.³ Paramahansa Yogananda (1969) has stated:

Evolution is a suggestion . . . everything is taking place in the present . . . there is no evolution, just as there is no change in the beam of light through which all the developing scenes of cinema pictures are manifested. (p. 57)

Samadhi, thus, reveals even time as illusory and aims for the eternal now, beyond space and time. In Heidegger, as in Western tradition generally, man has to awaken to an authentic mode of historical existence, to an awareness and acceptance of his essential facticity and mortality. Man remains the mortal man of finitude. There is no complete surrender and merger, or even loss of self, in Heidegger's thinking. More specifically, there is Heidegger's discussion of *temporality*.⁴ Temporality is the foundational structure of Dasein's Being (i.e., of existentiality, facticity, and fallenness) and does not consist of the linear passing of discrete "now-points." The past, the present, and the future do not follow one another in sequence. Rather, they exist simultaneously in a dynamic process in which each gives rise to the other. Consider, for example how a patient in psychotherapy "lives" both his or her past and future *in* the present.

Lastly, consider the Hindu belief that consciousness transcends the individual. Consciousness is generally believed to be a relatively private matter; that is, each one of us is "conscious," but each consciousness is unique to that person and is in no way shared by others. In Hindu thought, however, individualized ego consciousness is considered to be only a partial manifestation of a more global condition. The universe and

³ Compare this idea to R. von Eckartsberg's description in Chapter 2 of the "Here-and-Now" level, and Weber's, Chapter 5, "living moment-by-moment."—Eds.

⁴ See Moss and Keen, Chapter 4, for another discussion of *temporality*.—Eds.

all that comprises it is made up of consciousness, not a personal *consciousness of*, but *pure consciousness*.

At first glance, Heidegger's notion of consciousness appears to be very similar to the Eastern conceptualization. Dasein's consciousness (Being) does not rest simply within but reaches out beyond itself and toward the world and other beings. For Heidegger as a phenomenologist, however, consciousness is always a consciousness *of something*; that is, consciousness is *intentional*.⁵ It always has an object. Dasein, however, not only reaches out and transcends itself in this fashion, it is also conscious *of Being*, since it is Being that allows Dasein to exist, or to be as it is.

Even though Heidegger seems to be constantly dwelling in the vicinity of the mystical and of self-transcendence, he does not speak explicitly of the mystical union as an experiential moment of eternity. Rather, for Heidegger, there is a mystical openness possible in authentic Dasein for the calling and depth of Being manifesting in things as an experience of meditative thinking, of reflective quietude, still ontologically conceived rather than exponentially and existentially described. Heidegger conceives of the task as one of bringing revealed Being into language, of saying the unsaid, of thinking the unthought, of bringing the event of Being into language. His own meditative thinking discourse is done in terms of concrete universals, a marriage of poetic and philosophical diction.

Heidegger and the Tao-Zen Tradition

The Tao of Lao Tsu's (1972) *Tao Te Ching* and its integration with elements of Buddhism⁶ into Zen Buddhism allows an integrated treatment in relation to Martin Heidegger. Heidegger says himself that the

Tao could be the path along which everything may move; that which may make it possible for us to think the primordial means of reason, spirit, mind, and logos, that is what these (terms) say according to their true essence.

Tao, this leading word in the poetic thinking (*dichtendes Denken*) of Laotse, perhaps hides within itself the mystery of all mysteries relating to a thinking utterance. (1959, p. 198)

And Lao Tsu (1972) says about the Tao:

The Tao that can be told is not the eternal Tao.
The name that can be named is not the eternal name.

⁵ It seems that what the existential-phenomenologists mean by "consciousness" is what the Hindu philosophers mean by "mind." See Moss, Chapter 7, and de Silva, Chapter 13, for other discussions of *intentionality*.—Eds.

⁶ See Levin, Chapter 12, and de Silva, Chapter 13, for other discussions of Buddhism.—Eds.

The nameless is the beginning of heaven and earth.
 The named is the mother of ten thousand things.
 Ever desireless, one can see the mystery.
 Ever desiring, one can see the manifestations.
 These two spring from the same source but differ in name; this appears as
 darkness.
 Darkness within darkness.
 The gate to all mystery. (Chapter 1)

The Tao has a natural connection to the flow of organic life, to the elementals, especially water, to the observation of nature, to the cyclical movement of all organic events, and to the complementarity of the natural and cosmic polarities—Yin/Yang. The Tao is the dynamic cosmic process that is constantly changing and flowing through all, a surprising spontaneity and wonder at what is, given without effort, without thought, in the attitude of effortless effort, of creative quietude, of openness and surrender, always in and with the flow. Taoism generates an ecological attitude of organic interdependence, the unity of a web and flow of life, and an awareness of man's humble position within the cosmic-global nexus. The Tao's ethic is simplicity, humility, moderation.

Heidegger's notion of Being and the Tao are kindred terms. Both give rise to the "ten thousand things," the beings that arise from Being. Both are the primordial realms, the "theo-dimensions," beyond easy verbalization: "Where words fail." The edges of our reality and the edges of our languaging are forever expanding frontiers with a receding horizon into infinity.

The problems and dangers of languaging are well expressed in the book of Tao:

The Tao is nameless
 like uncarved wood.
 As soon as it is carved
 then there are names.
 Carve carefully
 and along the grain. (Leary, 1966, chap. 32)

Heidegger is also forever wrestling with the mystery of articulation and naming, how to say the event of Being, without representational thinking, but through some kind of thanksgiving evocation which says the essence of the thing, in its own terms, as the poet says, as the thinker thinks:

The thinker says Being,
 The poet names the Holy.

[Der Denker sagt das Sein,
 der Dichter nennt das Heilige.] (Heidegger, 1949, p. 51)

The mystery of language is most intimately approached in the imaginative creation (*Dichten*) of the poet, and the later Heidegger turned to the

poets, Hölderlin, Trakl, Rilke, to listen to the voice of Being as it moves out of concealment and reveals itself. And he finds great kinship with what is expressed by Lao Tsu regarding the Tao.

However, the inherent anonymity of Lao Tsu and the Tao, the timelessness of a rhythmical and cyclical life, stands in some opposition to the temporal and historical understanding of Heidegger for whom all exists in time. There is no "beyond time" in Heidegger.

Another comparison of Heidegger and Taoism concerns the notion of nothing. The commentator Chung-yuan Chang (1970) states:

The task of Chinese Taoism and Ch'an Buddhism is to lead man to see his original self, that is, the I, which is nonconceptual, nontraditional, nonrepresentational. This genuine, nonconceptual, nonrepresentational self is reached through releasement. In chapter 48 of the *Tao-te-Ching* we have: "the student of knowledge gains day by day; the student of Tao loses day by day." . . . What will be the outcome of the process of losing or releasement? The goal of releasement is to reach wu, or Nonbeing, or Nothing. Therefore, according to Taoist philosophy. Nothing is the root of everything. It is in the Nothingness that the Taoist "builds," "dwells," and "thinks." (p. 241)

Heidegger's notion of nothing is similarly positive, creative, nonnihilistic. He says:

Only on the basis of the original manifestness of Nothing can our human Dasein advance towards and enter into what is. (1949, p. 339)

When the totality of what-is—beings—falls away, we come face to face with Nothing, which then becomes the ground for the experience of the revelation of Being.

According to both Heidegger and Chinese Taoists, this Nothing, or Nonbeing, must be experienced in the sense of a pure finding. It cannot be reached through any process of rational or objective thought, which would only dichotomize subjectivity and objectivity into polarities. (Chang, 1970, p. 242)

For Heidegger, instead of establishing Being as the ground Nothing is conceived as the source, and Being is its manifestation. In the work of Chuang Tzu we have: In the very beginning there was wu, or Nonbeing, which is Nothing and nameless. It is that from which the One is produced. The One is inherent in it, and yet it is formless. The One that is produced by Nonbeing and is inherent in it is Being. (Chang, 1970, p. 245)

The openness to Nothing and Being involves a change in thinking and in attitude. It involves a "leap." The way of thinking is long and arduous, full of logging-roads (*Holzwege*) that lose themselves suddenly in the forest as in nothing. The path of thinking

will take us places which we must explore to reach the point where only the leap will help further. The leap alone takes us into the neighborhood where thought resides. (Heidegger, 1968, p. 12)

The leap is away from the attitude of representational thinking into a new way of thinking: meditative thinking.

Huston Smith (1958) says that the essence of Zen is that it cannot be encompassed in words; that it must be a living experience in a specific state of mind—satori—which is the state of being enlightened, the state of the Buddha-mind itself which is transmitted, mind to mind, through rigorous Zen practice.

Zen Buddhism is most bewildering to the Western mind, because it wants to go beyond mind, beyond concepts, beyond categories, into the void and nothingness, into pure spontaneity of the here-and-now. It is a long path and movement of preparation, of supervised practice. The fullness of the path toward satori, the enlightenment experience, is described in a Zen story as a progression:

Before a man studies Zen, for him the mountains are mountains and the waters are waters; when, thanks to the teaching of a good master, he has achieved a certain inner vision of the truth of Zen, for him the mountains are no longer mountains and the waters are no longer waters; but later, when he has really arrived at the asylum of rest, once more the mountains are mountains and the waters are waters. (Benoit, 1959, p. 89)

Zen accomplishes a transformation of self into no-mind which opens up a new relationship to the world beyond representational and objectifying thinking.

Heidegger's emphasis in his work to overcome our inheritance of metaphysical thinking (Biemel, 1977), and its legacy of the subject-object split and calculative thinking in epistemology through a reconceptualization of man's relationship to his world as Dasein, being-in-the-world, and its relationship to the ground of Being, finds a parallel in the Zen doctrine of no-mind and the Zen practices of koan, zazen, sesshin, and sanzen which are designed to lead the aspirant beyond the limits of his own mind, conventional thinking, and "ego-consciousness" into the state of satori, as no-mind wakefulness and enlightened presence in the here-and-now. The emptying of mind aims at the transcending of representations, concepts, and intellectual categories:

The heart of Zen training lies in introducing the eternal into the now, in widening the doors of perception to the point where the delight and wonder that characterize the satori experience can carry over to the ordinary events of man's day-to-day life. (Smith, 1958, p. 150)

Just as the Zen discipline requires a letting go of oneself to let "it" take over, so Heidegger, in discussing the need for a different kind of thinking, meditative-thinking, calls for the attitude of releasement (*Gelassenheit*) which leads beyond self-will and rational, calculative intentions. The questions "why?" and "how?" are to be overcome if we are to find the truth of Being.

Caputo (1978), who makes a comparison between Heidegger, Meister Eckhart, and Zen, states:

In Zen, when the self has become entirely egoless and will-less, it is admitted into "satori." In Heidegger, Dasein is admitted into the truth of Being, the "event of appropriation." Thus, to satori, the state of "enlightenment," we relate the "lighting" (lichten) process of the "clearing" (Lichtung) which is made in Dasein for the event of truth. In and through this "event," Dasein enters into its own most essential being (Wesen), even as the soul enters into its innermost ground (Seelengrund; Eckhart) and the self in Zen is awakened to its "Buddha-nature" or "self-nature." (p. 214)

In the emphasis on the way of life and on the opening-up and revelation of the Being-enlightenment experience in, and yet beyond, what is given in bodily presence, there is much kinship of spirit between Heidegger and Zen. There is also a shared love for the rural, craft-oriented way of being in the world, for peasant simplicity and steadfastness, solidity of presence, ontological weight. But our image of Heidegger is not that of a monastic guru living with disciples, but that of the solitary wanderer on the path of thinking along the logging roads (*Holzwege*) of the Black Forest at a slow plodding pace, in search of the clearing of Being, the advent of an illumination of Being.

There are some specific but brief studies on Heidegger's relation to Zen (Caputo, 1978; Hirsch, 1970; Kreeft, 1971).

Caputo dialogues the Herrigel (1953) book, *Zen in the Art of Archery*, with Heidegger's notion of releasement (*Gelassenheit*) and also with Meister Eckhart who uses the term *Gelassenheit* and whose philosophy has been compared with Buddhism:

The master tells Herrigel he must learn to "wait" for the moment when the arrow should be released, even as Heidegger tells us in *Gelassenheit* to wait on the regioning of the region. But how can he "wait"? (Caputo, 1978, p. 207)

By letting go of yourself, leaving yourself and everything yours behind so decisively that nothing more is left of you but purposeless tension. (Herrigel, 1953, p. 52)

The discipline of Zen requires of the aspirant an overcoming of his ego-involved mindfulness in order to arrive at a state of no-mind (*wunien*) which is detachment from all images, thoughts, and cravings so that a merger with the unconditioned ground is possible. This ground is called "sunyata," the Void, Emptiness, in Zen:

This unconditioned, formless, and consequently unattainable is Emptiness (sunyata). Emptiness is not a negative idea, nor does it mean a mere privation, but as it is not in the realm of names and forms, it is called emptiness, or nothingness, or the void. (Suzuki, in Caputo, 1978, p. 190)

Since we cannot grasp sunyata, we need a kind of thinking which is itself nongrasping. This spiritual state of mind is called "no mind," "no thought":

In other words, "no mind" is a clearing away of all thoughts and desires in order to "let" the unconscious base of our existence exert itself through us—just as Herrigel let "It" shoot the arrow. (Caputo, 1978, p. 210)

Heidegger's notion of "the Nothing" (*das Nichts*) can be related to sunyata. Being is totally other than particular beings, it is not any particular entity. In the discourse on the way to language with the Japanese, Heidegger states:

INQUIRER: That emptiness then is the same as nothingness, that essential being which we attempt to add in our thinking, as the other, to all that is present or absent.

JAPANESE: Surely. For this reason we in Japan understood at once your lecture "What is Metaphysics?" when it became available to us in 1930 through a translation which a Japanese student, then attending your lectures, had ventured. . . . We marvel to this day how the Europeans could lapse into interpreting as nihilistic the nothingness of which you speak in that lecture. To us, emptiness is the loftiest name for what you mean to say with the world "Being." (1959, pp. 108-109)

Elizabeth Hirsch (1970) in her discussion of Martin Heidegger and the East uses the Zen story of the oxherd to illustrate Heidegger's kinship with Zen. She reports that Heidegger was very fond of this story, and she gives the following rendering:

In the first picture we see a landscape enveloped in the mist and the oxherd standing "discouraged under the trees at the bank of the waters." Lost in the high grass, the oxherd engages in a long search for his ox, whom he finally discovers after hearing his voice first. When the oxherd captures the animal, he is unruly and wants to return to the wilderness. After the oxherd has succeeded in taming the ox, he is seen riding on his back for the trip home. Once at home, the ox disappears and the oxherd kneels in the grass before his hut with his hands folded in a praying gesture, while his eyes behold a mountain peak in the distance and behind it a golden moon just breaking through the clouds. At this moment the oxherd and nature lose their separate existences and merge. At such heights of achievement the oxherd finds "access to the deepest secret." The deepest secret is the Void or Nothingness (Being). The next drawing, therefore, symbolizes the fact that the world is empty of things: A large circle is sprinkled with dark spots and bordered at the periphery by a black band. Because the oxherd has grasped the true Being of things, nature will never be the same. A tree which appeared in previous drawings only now discloses its treeness: in the drawing that follows, the oxherd's enlightenment, the inner pulse of a tree-trunk, its true being, has come to the surface; a branch winds its way through space like lightning speeding toward the earth, and the blossoms have never looked as tender as now. The meaning, of course, is that he who has experienced the Void or Being has gained insight into the "isness" or "suchness" of the world. Being in turn shines after beings have vanished into nothingness. (p. 253)

There is a primordial contact with nature expressed in this story in which nature is experienced as a "Thou" rather than an "It," in which the

splendor of the simple illuminates us and calls us into a new way of being. Hirsch argues that the void in the Zen story is inspired by Buddha's concept of "Nirvana." Nirvana, like the void, lacks all attributes, all particulars. Like Tao and Being, Nirvana is a matrix-concept, a "divine-ground-concept," a theo-dimension.

Toward an Integration

These brief comparisons highlight the spiritual kinship that exists between Heidegger and two of the Eastern traditions. There is a shared calling forth of man into a more originary and authentic relationship to Being. There is a shared "striving" to transcend the world of opposites and subject-object separation and to encounter and make contact with true Being and reality. Whereas in the Eastern tradition this involves a rigorous working on oneself in the social context of a school of meditational practice under the guidance of a master, for Heidegger it is the articulation of a personal path of thinking that can show the way.

There are, of course, also a number of differences between the world of Heidegger and that of Eastern, especially Hindu, thinking. The doctrines of *reincarnation* and *karma* find no correspondence in Heidegger's thinking, and the experience of personal enlightenment in meditation is not entered into explicitly by Heidegger. But there is sufficient similarity in the radicality of both traditions to warrant continuing comparison and dialogue. There is the shared vision and effort to break the self-limiting boundaries of human rational intelligence, the vision of metaphysics, and a mindfulness as a whole in order to establish once again a more vital, inspired, and primordial relationship with all beings and the ground of Being in the form of the awareness of one's involvement in the "cosmotheandric network of relationships" (Fittipaldi, 1978; Panikkar, 1977) which Dasein is.

Both Heidegger and the Eastern traditions also transcend a secular-materialistic point of view, and insist on the reality of height/depth, or "theo-dimension," which lies beyond the boundaries of ordinary everyday existence, and yet carries more weight, significance, power, and value. Umehara (1970), in his discussion of Heidegger and Buddhism, begins with the observation:

The modern world has seemingly undertaken a serious experiment with regard to whether or not a man can live without any god or religion, (p. 271)

But he finds in the work of Heidegger the attempt to provide a new spiritual foundation in trans-denominational terms:

Heidegger proposes a new philosophical problem to the entire world in two ways. It is in one sense an inquiry into the foundation of the novel spiritual

situation where nihilism is latent within the European scientific civilization, a civilization which nonetheless has succeeded in unifying the whole world. But this civilization lacks a spiritual foundation. In exposing European scientific civilization to total criticism, Heidegger is perhaps one of the first thinkers of the West to provide a place of dialogue and confrontation between the European principle and the non-European principle, (p. 280)

For psychology, this new and emergent philosophico-religious anthropology, the result of an East-West integration, that reveals that man is the being concerned about the meaning of his own being and the meaning of Being, offers us a new starting point. We realize that man lives out his ontic/ontological concerns in the way in which he dwells and shapes his life and world into a harmonious, ecological balancing of the powers of earth and sky and the interplay of the mortals and the divinities.

In the discussion of "the thing," Heidegger elaborates a little on these powers, but their evocation and circumscription remain suggestive and groping for expression carried by a deep mystical intuition:

Earth is the building bearer, nourishing with its fruits, tending water and rock, plant and animal. When we say earth, we are already thinking of the other three along with it by way of the simple oneness of the four.

The sky is the sun's path, the course of the moon, the glitter of the stars, the year's seasons, the light and dusk of day, the gloom and glow of night, the clemency and inclemency of the weather, the drifting clouds and blue depth of the ether. When we say sky, we are already thinking of the other three along with it by way of the simple oneness of the four.

The divinities are the beckoning messengers of the godhead. Out of the hidden sway of the divinities the god emerges as what he is, which removes him from any comparison with beings that are present. When we speak of the divinities, we are already thinking of the other three along with them by way of the simple oneness of the four.

The mortals are human beings. They are called mortals because they can die. To die means to be capable of death as death. Only man dies. The animal perishes. It has death neither ahead of itself nor behind it. Death is the shrine of Nothing, that is, of that which in every respect is never something that merely exists, but which nevertheless presences, even as the mystery of Being itself. As the shrine of Nothing, death harbors within itself the presencing of Being. As the shrine of Nothing, death is the shelter of Being. . . . When we say mortals, we are then thinking of the other three along with them by way of the simple oneness of the four. (1971b, pp. 178-179)

Heidegger's style and rhythm, four times repeating the unity of the four: "When we say . . .," feels like a hymn or even a prayer to the quaternion, the fourfold field of tensions that constitutes our sacred openness, our world.

Heidegger's new image of man as the shepherd of Being, the steward of the earth, the builder and custodian of culture, gives us a calling, a vision, a task. It is in our hands to create a way of living which might truly be called dwelling.

Both Heidegger and the Eastern traditions are concerned with the liberation of man from the restrictive and self-limiting habits of his own cultural mind, from inauthentic modes of being and thinking. Both agree that we need a transhuman theo-dimension in the region beyond depth and beyond height, beyond human willfulness, which is the source of illumination, fulfillment, and truth for man—the transpersonal.

Both traditions develop paths toward liberation. For the Eastern ways, this is a peak-experience in consciousness that completely transforms one's relationship to the world and reality as a whole. For Heidegger, the path is one of thinking oneself through into a great simplicity of openness to the revelation of Being. Heidegger makes a double move—for all of us—and thus radically changes our perception of and our participation in reality. First, he jumps into the gap, the in-between of the subject-object split, and bridges the rift with his understanding of Dasein as being-in-the-world, as unfolding relationship, as event. Second, Heidegger makes a figure-ground gestalt-switch by saying: Let the figures go (the beings, the ten thousand things), attend to the ground (Being); go beyond theory and metaphysics, beyond concepts and representations, beyond story and ordinary myth, beyond names, into the splendid openness and fullness of Being, into a new presence to the real. Heidegger calls this new mode of presence *meditative thinking*. Is it also embodied poetic presence?

We believe it was an important part of his life when Heidegger returned to his simple hut in his mountains, forests, and high meadows and the life of elemental nature which found such eloquent voice in his later works. There he found the splendor of the simple still present, far from the madding crowd, in the participation in a holistic way of life in the flow of the seasons and the processes of nature, within the precincts of the Zen monastery or in the temple of self-regenerative nature.

His advice on how to deal with technology was *releasement* (*Gelassenheit*) and *openness to the mystery* (*Offenheit für das Geheimnis*), a change in attitude, but basically a noninterfering observance. But we also live in the urban modernity powered by the calculative thinking of technology and its overpowering success. Both Heidegger and the Eastern attitudes are somewhat nostalgic and reactionary in their call for quiet, for a return to the simple and essential. Their vision and practice for modern man has to remain a counterpoint, a counterfoil, perhaps, a coexisting alternative. Just as work and celebration are rhythmically organized in the calendar in weekdays and sabbath, so we can institute a new day for the working-recreating-celebrating presence to nature—*Country Day*—if we are drawn into this way so akin to Heidegger and the East. Everybody can institute this in his own calendar, as an act of freedom of choice, as a space of time in which dwelling in the fullness of Being, the foursome giving rise to the teeming of life in ecological prolif-

eration and wonder, can be easily actualized. We are and live and dwell between Earth and Heaven in the tension between Mortality and Divinity, and this living realization still flourishes easily in the environs of our heartlands, in the play of the elements in the wild.

May this be the secret and unspoken spiritual practice of Martin Heidegger; be the path that is available to almost everybody? And is this practice, born from the marriage of Zen and Western fundamental-ontological thinking, not ongoing in many places? We found one embodiment not far from Heidegger's hut in the Black Forest in Count Dürckheim who has written *Daily Life as Spiritual Exercise* (1971). There are more to be met.

Heidegger and the Eastern traditions offer Western psychology a new and ancient value-orientation, a new and ancient posture of gratefulness, of thanksgiving to Being and the powers in which we find ourselves. They offer us liberation through an expanded vision of human life including the spiritual dimensions beyond ordinary rationality. Heidegger and the Eastern sages offer us a vision for a psychology of Being, for a psychology of higher life, for a psychology of genius, of creation, of vision, of inspiration, of revelation, of "theo-psychology," which lies close to the heart of man's life.

References

- Barret, W. (Ed.) *Zen Buddhism*. New York: Doubleday, 1956.
 Benoit, H. *The supreme doctrine*. New York: Viking, 1959.
 Biemel, W. Heidegger and metaphysics. *Listening*, 1977, 12(3), 50-60.
 Binswanger, L. *Grundformen und Erkenntnis Menschlichen Daseins*. Zurich: Verlag Max Neihans, 1942.
 Boss, M. *Psychoanalysis and daseinsanalysis*. New York: Basic Books, 1963.
 Boss, M. *A psychiatrist discovers India*. London: Oswald Wolff, 1965.
 Caputo, J. *The mystical element in Heidegger's thought*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1978.
 Chang, C. Commentary. *Philosophy East and West*, 1970, 20(3), 241-246.
 Dürckheim, K. *Daily life as spiritual exercise*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
 Fittipaldi, S. *How to pray always without always praying*. Notre Dame, Ind.: Fides-Claretian, 1978.
 Frankl, V. *Man's search for meaning*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959.
 Gray, J. Splendor of the simple. *Philosophy East and West*. 1970, 20(3), 227-240.
 Heidegger, M. *What is metaphysics?* Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1949.
 Heidegger, M. *Der Feldweg*. Pfullingen: Gunther Neske, 1954. (a)
 Heidegger, M. *Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Pfullingen: Gunther Neske, 1954. (b)
 Heidegger, M. *Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens*. Pfullingen: Gunther Neske, 1954. (c)
 Heidegger, M. *Unterwegs zur Sprache*. Pfullingen: Gunther Neske, 1959.
 Heidegger, M. *Was heisst Denken?* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1961.
 Heidegger, M. *Being and time*. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

- Heidegger, M. *What is called thinking?* New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Heidegger, M. *On the way to language*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971. (a)
- Heidegger, M. *Poetry, language, thought*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971. (b)
- Herrigel, E. *Zen in the art of archery*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1953.
- Hirsch, E. Martin Heidegger and the East. *Philosophy East and West*, 1970, 20(3), 247-264.
- Kreeft, P. Zen in Heidegger's Gelassenheit. *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 1971, 11, 521-545.
- Kuhn, T. *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Lao Tsu. *Tao te ching*. New York: Random House, 1972.
- Leary, T. *Psychedelic prayers after the Tao te ching*. Kerhonkson, New York: Poets Press, 1966.
- Mehta, J. Heidegger and the comparison of Indian and Western philosophy. *Philosophy East and West*, 1970, 20(3), 303-318.
- Nagley, W. Introduction to the symposium and reading of a letter from Martin Heidegger. *Philosophy East and West*, 1970, 20(3), 221.
- Panikkar, R. Colligite fragmenta: For an integration of reality. In F. Eigo (Ed.), *From alienation to atoneness*. Villanova, Penn. Villanova University Press, 1977.
- Paramahansa Yogananda. *Autobiography of a yogi*. Los Angeles: Self-Realization Fellowship, 1969.
- Richardson, W. *Heidegger: Through phenomenology to thought*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1963.
- Smith, H. *The religions of man*. New York: Harper, 1958.
- Umehara, T. Heidegger and Buddhism. *Philosophy East and West*, 1970, 20(3), 271-282.