BestThinking.com

Article in Society / Philosophy / Philosophy of Religion

Critical analysis of the philosophical conception of dao in Laozi's Daodejing and being in Heidegger's "Being and Time"

Article by **Lucian Green**

That dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively is exposed through eight focal points of reasoning, noumenonisation, narration, authentication, abducingness, epistemology, emptiness, and technologisation of nature.

Laozi (5th or 4th century BC) was an anti-authoritarian ancient Chinese philosopher who wrote the Daodejing (the key text of Daoism). Heidegger (1889-1976) was a German existential phenomenologist who was influenced by Daoism. Daoism's dao (the world-conscious doctrine) is connected with Heidegger's being in "Being and Time", in a chain by, in turn, wu (the root), which dao influences, and the myriad things, which originate from the root, and which contain the Daoist/Heideggerian being. I will argue that dao and being are correct as discussed by Laozi and Heidegger respectively. I will first examine and then discuss this claim.

This part will discuss whether dao and being are correct as discussed by Laozi and Heidegger respectively. This paragraph will describe how the dao shapes the root originating from nothingness. The Daoist doctrine argues for ontological nothingness, including wu (the root) and the myriad things. Dao (the world-conscious discourse), is connected to Heidegger's being, which is translated as doctrine, where a doctrine should be followed carefully, and is represented by knowledge of competency being required to follow the Dao. The transformation of Daoism's idea from Hegel's idea is similar to the process of Hegel's concept of the self-alienated spirit rising upwards, where Hegel's idea is represented by the competency required by self-alienated spirit to rise upwards and Daoism's idea is represented by knowledge of competency being required to follow the Dao (the doctrine), and should be needed to create a University experience. Daoism is represented by knowledge of competency being required to follow the Dao, which allows generations to be produced by the mother. This paragraph has described how the dao shapes the root originating from nothingness.

This paragraph will describe how the ancient Daoist sages Wang Bi and He Yan argued that ontological nothingness was the root of reality in the Xuanxue school, which means, "study of the mysterious". The ancient Daoist sages Wang Bi and He Yan argued that ontological nothingness was the root of reality in the Xuanxue school, about which David Chai later argued for meontological generativity[1] (how generations are produced by the mother), and that ideas stemming from the root should be safe. The meontological generativity that David Chai argued for included a mother-like complement of ontology, where meontological generativity should be protected by medicine. The central tenet of the set of beliefs in the Daoist religion is the metaphor of a mother-like complement of ontology (meontology), where the mother should regenerate life. The mother aids the continuation of the cosmogony, or the coming about of the universe, by planning the spatial layout of her house. The mother aids the coming about of the universe, which is described in terms of being, nonbeing and nothingness, and where the health of one's being should be maintained. The term "ontological nothingness" (wu) ideally describes the universe in terms of the Being/being (ni) and nonbeing/nothingness (wu) dyad. Nonbeing/nothingness (wu) is the root, as agreed by Wang Bi and He Yan. Daoism takes the philosophical concept of wu as its root, as agreed by Wang Bi and He Yan. The term wu means both nonbeing and nothingness, where nonbeing is the a priori form of being. Being and being in ontological nothingness are represented as interdependent in Daoism and not dependent in Heidegger. In Daoism, you represents Being and being, which are dependent on each other, unlike Being and being in Heidegger's Being and Time, which are not dependent on each other. The interdependent Being and being transition from epistemology to ontology in Daoism. The development of Daoism is the result of this transition of being/nonbeing from epistemology to ontology. This paragraph has described how the ancient Daoist sages Wang Bi and He Yan argued that ontological nothingness was the root of reality in the Xuanxue school, which means, "study of the mysterious".

This paragraph will describe how the ontological nothingness is the root of reality in further detail. Wang Bi and He Yan both contributed to xuanxue ("study of the mysterious"), in which they agreed that nothingness formed the root of philosophy. Wang and He agreed that nothingness formed the root of philosophy, where the name given to this nothingness was wu, where the root was labelled as being utilised differently by He (who is not interested in how the yin and yang manifest into the myriad things, but what it is that yin and yang are based on) and Wang. The name given to this nothingness is wu, where He and Wang label the root as being utilised differently. This nothingness is not to be confused with absolute nothingness, which was associated with a questionable movement in ancient China. The name given to this nothingness is wu, from which stem the myriad things. From wu stem the myriad things, from the smallest things in the world to the largest things in the universe. From wu stem the myriad things, including ontic nonbeings. Ontic nonbeings are another part of the myriad things, where ontic nonbeings are a priori or planned living beings. The name given to this nothingness is wu, including you, which means being, or living beings. You, which means being, includes noumena, the workings of the things. Part of being and nonbeings are noumena, which are things-in-themselves, or the workings of the things, examples of which are yin and yang. Yin and yang, noumenal parts of Daoist theory, represent interdependent forces, among which are the examples female and male respectively. The Daoist study of the mysterious, about which Wang Bi and He Yan hypothesised that the nothingness formed the root of philosophy, is different from a variant which gives rise to both the myriad and the system of epistemology. This paragraph has described how the ontological nothingness is the root of reality in further detail.

This paragraph will describe a variant of the Daoist concept of nothingness that gives rise to both the myriad and the system of epistemology. The variant of the Daoist concept of nothingness gives rise to the myriad (non-man-made generations) containing the world of natural phenomena. The myriad contains the world of natural phenomena (which self-germinate or mate) including a seed, and hence another wu (root, or start of a new generation) which links to yin of the yin and yang pair and you (being). Wu (the root) links to yin (a mother) of the yin and yang pair, initiating the cycle. The variant of the Daoist concept of nothingness gives

rise to the system of epistemology (which verifies that the root has formed), containing being and nonbeing. The epistemological system contains nonbeing, containing yang (man, a starter of man-made generations), starting another cycle. Nonbeing (the house) contains yang (the man), starting another cycle. This paragraph has described a variant of the Daoist concept of nothingness that gives rise to both the myriad and the system of epistemology. Wang Bi and He Yan's ontological nothingness, from which the root of philosophy originated, is akin to humbleness and unassumingness. This part has discussed whether dao and being are correct as discussed by Laozi and Heidegger respectively.

This part will evaluate whether dao and being are correct as discussed by Laozi and Heidegger respectively. I will argue that dao and being as discussed by Laozi and Heidegger respectively are correct because of the reasoning of nature, which is correct because of the ontological nothingness present in their texts. Laozi's Daodejing is well known for encouraging humbleness and unassumingness. As humbleness and unassumingness are what Laozi's Daodejing is well known for, powerlessness and nothingness are described in Adorno's Jargon of Authenticity, a critique of Heidegger's Being and Time. Adorno argues against Heidegger's person of authenticity (Eigentlichkeit) by characterising him as powerless and nothingness-like (where powerlessness and nothingness are necessary attributes of an authentic person, detracting the authentic of the ability to object to a state of affairs prevented by the divine rights of the soul). The nothingness that Adorno writes about is a necessary attribute of an authentic person and is the source of an essence from which reason is derived. Reason, similar to Laozi's Daodejing, the nothingness that Adorno characterises the authentic person as originating from an essence, in which the nothingness is similar to reason, is verified to be good when matched with experience because of the same reason being matched with experience elsewhere. The nothing-like reason's experience being matched with another good reason's experience (where these duplicates of the experience are recorded in an tautological structure e-e). Where Adorno argues that the authentic Being is the possibility of taking the whole Dasein in advance in an existentiell (ontic or thing-like) manner I argue that the authentic Being (self) becomes what it wants to be by a tautology containing the experience and experience, of the other, being verified to be identical parts of this tautology of the self. The tautology that Adorno utters should be used to verify Heidegger's and Laozi's nothing-like reason to be good. Adorno writes, the authentic Being unto death, the 'possibility of taking the whole of Dasein, in advance, ... in an existentiell manner; that is to say, it includes the possibility of existing as a whole potentiality-for-Being,'[2] becomes what it wants to be by a tautology being uttered. Heidegger is defended by Adorno by the nothing-like reason's experience's place being matched with another good reason's experience's place (which require an additional p-p tautology, in that it is satisfiable, to be satisfied to the e-e tautology). Where Adorno argues nothingness-like death determines Heidegger's conception of Dasein and coincides in the course of projecting the conception with the principle of abstract selfhood, I argue that the authentic selfhood reasons out the good reason (of the self) that is verified to coincide with the same experience in the same place (of the other). As the places and experiences for good reasons reasoned out by the authentic selfhood coincide, the reasons are proved to be good. Adorno also writes, as a limit [death] not only determines Heidegger's conception of Dasein, but it coincides, in the course of the projecting of the conception, with the principle of abstract selfhood, which withdraws absolutely into itself, persevering in itself[3]. The Prolog program sameexp.pl shows that places and experiences for good reasons coincide in good reasons, similar to those reasoned out by the authentic selfhood. Reasons

$r1$

(of the self) and

$r2$

(of the other) are authenticated to have the common experience

e

when they are at the same place

p

, as shown by the program

. In sameexp.pl, reasons

$r1$

and

$r2$

are shown to match experience lines 1 and 2, because of having the same Experience and Place atoms (

e

and

p

, respectively), however lines 3 and 4 do not because these have differing Experience and Place atoms.

```
?-sameexperience(r1, r2).
sameexperience(R1, R2) :- experience(R1, E, P), experience(R2, E, P).
experience(r1, e, p). %% Line 1
experience(r2, e, p). %% Line 2
experience(r1, ez, p). %% Line 3
experience(r2, e, pz). %% Line 4
```

The humbleness and unassumingness that Laozi's Daodejing is well known for encouraging fosters a primary aged personal growth argument. One should claim that an ontological nothingness being present in the texts of Laozi and Heidegger is correct, which shows that dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively.

Also, dao and being as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively are correct because of the noumenonisation of nature, which is correct because of answering what a thing in itself is. To answer the question of what a thing in itself is, it is a personal growth argument, similar to that used in primary school. A thing "in" itself, similar to a personal growth argument, is revealed by aletheia to undo concealing the acupuncture needle. By aletheia (revealing), the undoing of concealing is shown to work well by inserting the acupuncture needle to bridge the gap between outside and inside and help the patient return to normal. The thing in itself as primary aged personal growth argument must adapt to and deal with the constantly changing inside and outside the body. Zhan writes, a traditional Chinese doctor stated that the human contains constantly changing environs inside and outside the body, e.g. how a disease develops, tension at work and during life in general, feelings, food, the weather and climate.[4] As the acupuncture needle helps the patient return to normal, he is part of the event (in Ereignis) when he makes the transformation from weak to strong. Ereignis is that in which the subject-patient is part of the event, which occurs as he makes the

transformation from weak to strong. As the acupuncture needle bridges the gap between outside and inside, Chinese medicine should be a course that interprets and involves the human as a succession of transformations and observable events and as a group of permeable and realistic relationships. Zhan also writes about the story of Bernie, a traditional Chinese doctor, which shows that an entire process of diagnosis and treatment in traditional Chinese medicine should be a course that interprets and involves the human as a succession of transformations and observable events and as a group of permeable and realistic relationships.[5] A thing in itself which is a personal growth argument which manifests a chain of people with government that assists and advances students and develops student programs is exemplified by assisting with writing a human pedagogical argument to help accomplish a student's goal of the Daoist conception of oneness with optimum academic achievement. For example, the schoolmaster may employ Heidegger's conception of concealment to conceal a part of physis (nature) such as the humanist pedagogical argument to help accomplish a student's goal of the Daoist conception of oneness with optimum academic achievement. Zhan analyses the Daoist concept of oneness through its parallels with Western philosophies, particularly the German philosopher Heidegger's ontology.[6] A humanist pedagogical argument concealed in a file by a schoolmaster who employed Heidegger's conception of concealment may be unconcealed by a student. A student would unconceal a humanist pedagogy argument with traces of Daoist thought to attain heart, beauty and bliss. A reflection on translocal academic associations, which unconceals the rhizomic traces of Daoist thinking enable us to debate the gap between the analytical and the analysed, and by doing so to think of other ideas and ethnographic possibilities, including the possibility of understanding and being human.[7] Daoist traces of rhizomicity (a subbranch in a hierarchical argument, a property of a human pedagogical argument) are present in a humanist pedagogical argument that is concealed by a schoolmaster. The heart, beauty and bliss attained by unconcealing the humanist pedagogical argument with traces of Daoist thought is akin to heaven in Tianrenheyi ("heaven and human are one"). Tianrenheyi, meaning "heaven and a human are one" contains a trace of the opposition between healthiness and unhealthiness revealing happiness transcending sadness and unhappiness. The heart attained by unconcealing the humanist pedagogical argument with traces of Daoist thought is what the process, the treatment of which is upheld by translocal discourses of tianrenheyi, is achieved with. Zhan writes about how translocal discourses of Tianrenheyi enliven groundbreaking knowledge and treatment of the human that uphold enmeshment, process, and creativity over divide, opposition, and hierarchy.[8] The answers to solved medical questions that are ready to hand are concealed using Heidegger's conception of concealment as humanist pedagogical arguments to help accomplish a student's goal of the Daoist conception of oneness with optimum academic achievement. The zuhandenheit or "readiness-to-hand" of answers to solved medical questions is contrasted with the "presentness-at-hand" of new medical questions in traditional Chinese medicine. The pedagogical arguments that the schoolmaster conceals may be the knots that are Tianrenheyi that are worked from inside by traditional Chinese medicine doctors with medical science and modernity. Zhan continues, instead of thinking of the human and the world in a pre-existing harmonious whole, or fully endorsing the modernist anatomico-pathological perspective of the body, traditional Chinese medicine doctors work and think through Tianrenheyi from inside difficult knots with medicine, science and modernity.[9] One should claim that an answering what a thing in itself is is correct, which shows that dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively.

In addition, dao and being as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively are correct because of the narration of nature, which is correct because the grand narrative of society progresses, develops and improves. Significances of things in themselves that are personal growth arguments in which the self is authenticated against the other are the ways in which the grand narrative of society develops, are added to by the transformation of the unnamable dao in the selfhood of authenticity (Eigentlichkeit) to the namable dao of the they, the betweenness of which is termed "das Zwischen". Significances of things in themselves that are personal growth arguments in which the self is authenticated against the other are the ways in which the grand narrative of society progresses, develops and improves by making the transformation between the self and the they. Il-Joon writes that betweenness (das Zwischen) is contained in Heidegger's notion of authenticity (Eigentlichkeit) of being-t/here[10]. Where the grand narrative of society is added to, as the unnamable dao of the self transforms into the namable dao of the they, empirical evidence is what a conclusion is based on in deductive reasoning, in which the self is authenticated, therefore the other is authenticated too. Deductive reasoning bases a conclusion on empirical evidence, where the self is authenticated, therefore the other is authenticated as well. As the transformation is made from the self to the they in the grand narrative of society, one explores one's self in the same way as in an observatory, which is a building, with the other similar to the universe. An inhabitant may explore the self similar to in an observatory, which is a building, then the other similar to the universe in an architecturally designed building. Deductive reasoning bases a conclusion on empirical evidence in the same way that the object is transformed into being from nonbeing and the self is authenticated, therefore the other is authenticated. In the same way that Confucius stated food may be the object that is transformed from nonbeing to being, which is eaten as the change of setting, the setting of the transformation from non-being/non-existence to being/existence may change. As deductive reasoning bases a conclusion on empirical evidence, the self is authenticated, therefore the other is authenticated and souls travel from earth to heaven. Burik writes that the harmony of this place for which he wants to take the gateway as a metaphor should not, however, be understood as a permanently fixed place; it shifts according to the situation and brings out a harmony that is itself a blending of differences, so that they come together with mutual benefit and enhancement without losing their separate and particular identities.[11] Ames and Rosemont write that he (和) is conventionally translated "harmony," and we follow that rendering and the etymology of the term is culinary: harmony is the art of combining and blending two or more foodstuffs so that they come together with mutual benefit and enhancement without losing their separate and particular identities.[12] Zhan writes that instead of being mutually opposed, worlding leads to unworlding and unfolds through the latter.[13] Burik writes that the moment between existing and not yet existing can also be conceived as going through a gateway, and if we understand this moment in a non-metaphysical way, that gateway is the final thing we can say about the whole process: the convergence of the myriad things goes through a single aperture; the roots of the various happenings; all issue forth from a single gateway.[14] As food makes the transformation from nonbeing into being, men and women inhabiting buildings make the transformation from plans for these buildings. The paronomastically close (a pun, a joke exploiting the close distance between Chinese characters) tiananmen/gateway to heaven (the energy of the person who has eaten food) and jian/earth (the use of this energy to architecturally design buildings) represent being (men and women inhabiting these buildings) being brought out of nonbeing (plans for these buildings). Food making the transformation from nonbeing into being is termed worlding in Heidegger. Zhan states that worlding allows being to be brought out of nonbeing according to Heidegger.[15] Burik focuses on these characters and especially on the space between (jian) character as characters that are paronomastically close to the gateway character.[16] Deductive reasoning and the self being authenticated, therefore the other being authenticated are done by basing a conclusion on empirical evidence. One should claim that the grand narrative of society progressing, developing and improving is correct, which shows that dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively.

In addition, dao and being as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively are correct because of the authentication of nature, which is correct because of authenticating the self's conclusion with the other's evidence. Acting on the self's authority or authenticating the self with the other (authenticity) is done by basing a conclusion on empirical evidence. Il-Joon states that "be-ing and being-t/here are the betweenizing of no/thingness."[17] In other words, there is a betweenness between the nothingness/self and the thingness/they. Acting on the self's authority or authenticating the self with the other (authenticity) is done by basing a conclusion on empirical evidence from the they (where there is a betweenness between the nothingness/self and the thingness/they). The realism of the nothing/self is confirmed to be superior to the thing/they, where there is a betweenness between the nothingness/self and the thingness/they. The realism of the nothing/self is confirmed to be superior to the thing/they because of having space for more objects according to an algorithm in Lucian Green's chapter on Breathsonings about Pedagogy, used to measure the objects in the nothing/self, which stipulates that a computational marking scheme should award a maximum grade of very good to a paper with 130 objects that have measurements within range of pre-specified answers. There is a meaning-ray antonymousness distinction between the nothingness/self and the thingness/they. The algorithm to make the distinction between beings and non-beings follows from that from Lucian Green's paper on Computational English synonyms in which he argues that words can be replaceable with a chain of synonyms along one ray of meaning, therefore the algorithm would find the antonymous being and nonbeing pair, where being possesses the meaning "alive" and the nonbeing possesses the meaning "not alive". One should claim that authenticating the self's conclusion with the other's evidence is correct, which shows that dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively.

Moreover, dao and being as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively are correct because of the abducingness of nature, which is correct because of abducing rules for conclusions, authenticating the self because of the other. A conclusion is abduced into a rule, which is evidence for this conclusion. Inductive reasoning abduces rules for conclusions, authenticating the self because of the other. Inductive reasoning that abduces rules for conclusions about synonyms (authenticating the self because of the other) is predicted by Kant's analytic (self-explanatory sentence subjects as against those that need explanation). In the same way that Kant's analytic (self-explanatory sentence subjects as against those that need explanation) predicts a synonym induction algorithm (in which a property of a synonym about the other, which the self is because of, is authenticated) based on the same structure and function in Heidegger's ontology, the unnamable dao becomes known when containing true for following a successful synonym rule. Inductive reasoning, which authenticates the self because of the other, abduces rules for conclusions about mathematical relationality. Zhan writes that Heidegger's ontological thought, which strongly emphasises relationality, event and process, makes important departures from the main philosophies in Western thought, including from what Bruno Latour calls the Modern Constitution, which is based on divides and hybridizations that lead to the invention of humanism, the sciences' emergence, the secularisation of society and mechanisation of the world.[18] The verb "be" in to be acting on the self's authority or authenticating the self with the other (authenticity) means inductively abducing (authenticating the self because of the other) rules for being inside a three-dimensional region described by mathematical relationality. The verb "be" in to be acting on the self's authority or authenticating the self with the other (authenticity) means inductively abducing rules based on our nature's individual emotions. Through identifying who the self authentically is by devising rules based on one's nature and avoiding who one inauthentically isn't, one is both thinking and in touch with who one existentially, authentically is. The verb "be" in to be acting on the self's authority (authenticity) means inductively abducing rules for who we existentially, authentically are. Zhan writes that Heidegger shouted that "most thought-provoking in our thought-provoking time is that we are still not thinking" in "What Is Called Thinking?", which was the first series of lectures he presented after going through the de-Nazification process after the war, which was his last before he retired from the University of Freiburg.[19] Burik writes that in Heidegger's earlier work, the notions of authenticity and inauthenticity play an important role; In the *Verfallen* of *das Man*, in our modern societies, we have lost touch with what we really, existentially, authentically are.[20] Inductive reasoning abduces rules for conclusions, where conclusions are written before rules, in the same way that Heideggerian ontological nothingness forming reality is known a posteriori, in order from conclusions to rules. One should claim that abducing rules for conclusions, authenticating the self because of the other is correct, which shows that dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively.

As well as this, dao and being as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively are correct because of the epistemology of nature, which is correct because the Heideggerian ontological nothingness forming reality is known a posteriori. That Heideggerian ontological nothingness forms reality is known a posteriori, then performed more strongly a priori than a posteriori. As Heideggerian ontological nothingness forms reality is known a posteriori, scientific experiment should be planned a posteriori, examined in a safe position instead of using a priori techniques. While unconcealing one saying conceals another, science in contrast shouldn't be reconcealed in the safe position that would conceal further mysteries. Scientific experiment should be planned a posteriori to solve mysteries. Zhan writes that Heidegger claims that the sciences have denied their states of being and travelled so far down the path of bifurcations that they have lost the ability to "make the leap back into the source from whence they have sprung."[21] Burik writes that Heidegger writes of Daoism that "Perhaps there lies concealed in the word "way," dao, the mystery of all mysteries of thoughtful saying, as long as we let this name return to its unspokenness and are able to accomplish this letting. [22] As scientific experiment should be planned a posteriori, the same (as a posteriori) and different (a priori) should be linked a posteriori so that the scientific experiment is planned at the time to have the advantages of hindsight. The undividedness necessary to solve science's non-thinkingness was also that of the sameness (qi) of the different and Auseinandersetzung (jointure) of Heidegger's logos as polemos, in other words, science would return to a successful state by comparing the different types of difference and jointure. Heidegger's logos (the way of the universe) as polemos (diplomacy in the face of war) is achieved by an a posteriori method, similar to that in scientific planning. Heidegger's way of solving the problem of "not thinking" of bifurcation was to immerse it again in pure philosophy, or in fact, philosophy that would reinitiate an Ancient Greek genealogy extending from a time of undividedness.[23] Burik writes that in Heidegger, difference and jointure are connected as Auseinandersetzung (jointure) of Heidegger's logos as polemos.[24] In the same way that the scientific experiment should be planned a posteriori, the Heideggerian ontological nothingness forms reality in an a posteriori manner. The Heideggerian ontological nothingness forming reality in an a posteriori manner is shown by the example in ancient India, where the art of humanist pedagogy was known a posteriori before a priori by observing that writing a humanist pedagogical argument was the only way of earning a high distinction. In the same way that the scientific experiment should be planned a posteriori, Daoism and Heidegger's arguments are parallel because ontologically nothingness is known a posteriori. Daoism and Heidegger's arguments are parallel because ontologically nothingness (humanist pedagogy) is known nontranscendentally (not transforming a posteriori to a priori), nonmetaphysically (a posteriori as critiquing, not exposing) a posteriori. Where scientific experiment is conducted a posteriori and ontologically nothingness (humanist pedagogy) is known a posteriori in Daoism and Heidegger, Daoism's and Heidegger's ideas through their oneness are parallel. Oneness in each of Daoism and Heidegger's arguments, as shown, seem to be part of a pair of differing academic genealogies even though their ideas are parallel.[25] The natural facilitator of forming reality with ontological nothingness that is done a posteriori is God. One should claim that Heideggerian ontological nothingness forming reality being known a posteriori is correct, which shows that dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively.

Also, dao and being as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively are correct because of the emptiness of nature, which is correct because there should be a natural facilitator of power. There should be a natural facilitator of power, a God that is Being of beings, for example, who creates radiating roads that are not too close to each other in a city. That Heideggerian ontological nothingness forms reality is known a posteriori, then performed more strongly a priori than a posteriori, where reality is formed by the ontological nothingness by God and the obliviousness to 'Being' and interest in 'beings' and their 'beingness' led metaphysicians to crown the hierarchy of beings with a supreme being, God.[26] A natural facilitator of power, a God that is Being of beings, for example, where the Being of beings (God) should trace a doctrine of truth along the way, leading to power and the source of things is not shown but its actions and expression can be traced, and this is known as the way (the road) and the form of principle is known as Being. Chai writes that the source of things is not shown but its actions and expression can be traced, and this is known as doctrine and the form of principle is known as Being.[27] Beings of beings should trace a doctrine of truth along the way, leading to power, where will to power's aim towards power through achievement is enabled through achieving goals with a Heideggerian way of being objective. Heidegger characterises Western thought as metaphysical, starting with Plato and finishing with Nietzsche, a tradition in which Beings of beings should trace a doctrine of truth along the way, leading to technology as a means of will to power, involving objectifying and calculative thinking, which is not practised in Hindu thought.[28] Will to power's aim towards power through achievement is enabled through achieving goals with a Heideggerian means of being objective, where Dasein explains and predicts an objective universe and being here is a form of power, which Dasein enowns during its self-thrownness into authenticity of being. Being here is a form of power, which Dasein enowns during its self-thrownness into authenticity of being. The aim of will to power's towards power through achievement is enabled through achieving goals with a Heideggerian means of being objective, where Dasein comments on an objective universe and being here is a form of power. The Moment is the authentic moment of "enowning" (Ereignis) in which Dasein (being) throws itself into its foremost authenticity of be-ing out of Angst through realizing the nullity and groundlessness of being-t/here with the 'they.'[29] There should be a natural facilitator of power, a God that is Being of beings, for example the facilitator of Lucianic Meditation who provides humanist pedagogical arguments for creating ways in a city, similar to a meditation religion. The obliviousness to 'Being' and interest in 'beings' and their 'beingness' led metaphysicians to crown the hierarchy of beings with a supreme being, God, who forms reality from ontological nothingness, which is known a posteriori, then performed more strongly a priori than a posteriori. Heidegger argued that if theology is possible, the word "Being" can have no place in it, because recovering a sense of being and recovering a sense of religious behaviour cannot be separated.[30] The religion Lucianic Meditation's power lies in the fact that its God provides humanist pedagogical arguments for emptiness that can create meditation religions, where being subjugated by God is the source of authentication of ourselves. Emptiness is a gift from the Gods, where being subjugated by God is the source of authentication of ourselves.[31] The mind returns to the primal emptiness (太虛) by emptying it-self, where the primal emptiness in which the human mind/body and dao of the self-so-ing nature becomes one, into which the "primal spirit" (神 or "daemonic") comes and stays, and the person becomes the authentic being-human who completely embraces its emptiness into its 'own' selfhood.[32] Derrida's theory of deconstruction derived from Heidegger's Being and

Time overcomes logocentrism by inverting the hierarchy of power by accepting emptiness as a gift from God, where being subjugated by God which is in the self, is the source of authentication of ourselves (with God, the They). Derrida's theory of deconstruction derived from Heidegger's Being and Time overcomes logocentrism by inverting the hierarchy of power. Emptiness (the absence of necessity) is a gift from the Gods, where being subjugated by God is the source of authentication of the self with the pseudo-logics of the they. Derrida turned Heidegger's phenomenological destruction of philosophical texts into a deconstruction, which aimed to prove the absence of necessity and the pseudo-logic of what had been written.[33] Given that the nothingness of be-ing is not an emptiness but "a source of being," Sein (be-ing) is analogous to the unnamable dao, as the power of the religion Lucianic Meditation lies in the fact that its God, a Being of beings, provides humanist pedagogical arguments that can create meditation religions. The nothingness of be-ing is not an emptiness but "a source of being," Sein (be-ing) is very analogous to the unnamable dao.[34] Dasein, or God, absorbs itself in the superior power of being, 'confronting', or 'setting-itself-apart' (Auseinandersetzung) from and determining its own manner of dealing with other beings as it provides humanist pedagogy arguments that can create meditation religions. Not merely absorbed in the superior power of being, Dasein 'confronts', or 'sets-itself-apart' (Auseinandersetzung) from and determines its own manner of dealing with other beings.[35] One should claim that there being a natural facilitator of power is correct, which shows that dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively.

As well, dao and being as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively are correct because of the technologisation of nature, which is correct because of authentication by rolling a ball from the other (input) to the self (output). There should be a natural facilitator of power, a God that is Being of beings, who will introduce a technology that is assessable in educational institutions that should include the green computer programming language Ball Prolog, which literally computes algorithms through a ball and tunnel model. There should be a natural facilitator of power, a God that is Being of beings, a new god which only Heidegger states can save us. Scientific revolutions require something similar to a Gestalt Switch that enables a scientist to move to a new paradigm, through which one resists efficiency through friendship, backpacking in the wilderness and drinking local wine, and about which Heidegger states that only a new god can save us in doing.[36] The unnamable dao is the way for the ontological nothingness to form a new god. A form of technology (computer's application) that should be used, blesses (protects) the child before conception is humanist pedagogy, originating from the unnamable dao in a dream of reason. The technology introduced by a new god similar to that called for by Heidegger, a technology that is assessable in educational institutions should include the green computer programming language Ball Prolog, which literally computes algorithms using a unnamable (valued) ball which goes through a tunnel, following the Way of nature's self-so-ing, and lands in the namable (variable) result hole. Il-Joon writes that Laozi and Chuangzi state that even though human beings live between the unnamable and the namable, between dreaming and awakening, everything tends to fulfil the Way of nature's self-so-ing.[37] A form of technology that blesses the child before conception, humanist pedagogy is both an ends and not a means and a technology that can only point beyond treating senses about the child as measurable, calculable means by operating with wonder in the face of beings as a great art. Contra the theory of Aristotle and Marx of the humanisation of senses, defined as scientifically treating senses as means, not ends, Heidegger claims that technology can only point beyond treating senses as measurable, calculable means by operating with wonder in the face of beings as a great art.[38] A reflection of pre-existing sensibility (humanist pedagogy, a form of technology) is analogically represented and a positive agent in the making (conception of a child) and sustaining of sensibility (his or her livelihood). Quartets, still life paintings and cockfights are not only reflections of a pre-existing sensibility analogically represented, they are positive agents in the forming and sustaining of sensibility.[39] The artificial distinction, similar to artificial technology is between heaven and earth, which dao lies between, which is at the "end" of a line reaching the midpoint, not the means, contra the theory of Aristotle and Marx of the humanisation of senses (treating senses as means, not ends). Dao (the way) should be determined to be the ends, not the means, between earth and heaven, where technology treats the senses as means, not ends. Burik writes that Dao should have been spoken about before human beings made the distinction between heaven and earth and followed by placing themselves in the middle, where dao is not earlier than what is natural or self-so of the world.[40] A technology that leads to salvation is the green computer language Ball Prolog, which literally computes algorithms through a ball and tunnel model. Heidegger claims that the salvation separate from technology of the current state of human being is not necessarily likely to occur.[41] The green computer programming language, introduced by a god called for by Heidegger, Ball Prolog, is a language that brings salvation (safety through calculation) using a ball and tunnel model. Heidegger reads the West as having lost touch with the saving practices excluded by totalizing technology, including practices that are all around us.[42] Salvation from technology occurs because of the shifting process of the world, similar to dao (doctrine). Instead of being read as heaven, tian can be read as a technology-like shifting process of the world, similar to dao (doctrine). Salvation will occur because of technology, which is similar to the ever-shifting-process of the world (nature), while tian can be translated as instead of heaven in the Daodejing. In the Daodejing, the space between the heaven and earth characters, representing man's abode, is closely related to the gateway character where tian can be read as the ever-shifting process of the world (nature) rather than heaven.[43] Nietzsche's eternally returning will to power, where technology is metaphysics when it completes itself is akin to the ever-shifting-process of the world (nature), while tian can be translated as the ever-shifting process of the world instead of heaven in the Daodejing. The histories of metaphysics and Western philosophy where Being has been excluded which, for Heidegger, end in the nihilism of The philosopher Nietzsche's eternally returning will to power, where technology is metaphysics when it completes itself. Instead of being read as heaven, tian can be read as a technology-like shifting process of the world, similar to dao (doctrine), similar to the Heideggerian concept that there is a goal that the forces of the history of people can make sense of and develop in a particular direction. Heidegger agrees with Nietzsche that there is no longer a goal that the forces of the history of people can make sense of and develop in a particular direction.[44] There should be a natural facilitator of power, a God that is Being of beings who creates technologies containing the ontological material from which things are created and epistemological agency which is used to latch onto the Thing when it needs to be re-found. These are a book and medical and/or photographic records, respectively. Chai writes that the nothingness can serve two purposes, first as the ontological material from which things are created and second, as an epistemological agent which is used to latch onto the Thing when it needs to be re-found.[45] One should claim that authentication by rolling a ball from the other (input) to the self (output) is correct, which shows that dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively.

In conclusion, I have argued that dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively because ontological nothingness is present in their texts, because of answering what a thing in itself is, because the grand narrative of society progresses, develops and improves, because of authenticating the self's conclusion with the other's evidence, because of abducing rules for conclusions, authenticating the self because of the other, because Heideggerian ontological nothingness forming reality is known a posteriori, because there should be a natural facilitator of power, and because of authentication by rolling a ball from the other (input) to the self (output). I have argued that dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively. This conclusion allows us to authenticate the self with the other.

[1] David Chai, "Meontological Generativity: A Daoist Reading of the Thing", *Philosophy East and West,* 64 (2014).

[2] Theodor Adorno, *The Jargon of Authenticity* (Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, 2013), 130.

[3] Adorno, *The Jargon of Authenticity*, 137.

[4] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," *Social Text* 29 (2012): 108, DOI: 10.1215/01642472-1416109.

[5] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," 108.

[6] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," 109.

[7] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," 109.

[8] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," 110.

[9] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," 110.

[10] Park Il-Joon, "Betweenness and the Authentic Selfhood - A comparison of Daoist thoughts with Heidegger within the context of living with an authentic selfhood," *Madang: Journal of Contextual Theology* 11 (2009), http://www.dbpia.co.kr/Article/3119179.

[11] Steven Burik, "Thinking On The Edge: Heidegger, Derrida, And The Daoist Gateway (Men)", *Philosophy East & West* 60 (2010): 501.

[12] Roger T. Ames and Henry Rosemont, Jr., *The Analects of Confucius: A Philosophical Translation* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1998), p. 56.

[13] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," 112.

[14] Steven Burik, "Thinking On The Edge: Heidegger, Derrida, And The Daoist Gateway (Men)", 503.

[15] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," 110.

[16] Steven Burik, "Thinking On The Edge: Heidegger, Derrida, And The Daoist Gateway (Men)", 503.

[17] Park Il-Joon, "Betweenness and the Authentic Selfhood - A comparison of Daoist thoughts with Heidegger within the context of living with an authentic selfhood".

[18] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," 111.

[19] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," 111.

[20] Steven Burik, *The End Of Comparative Philosophy And The Task Of Comparative Thinking Heidegger, Derrida, And Daoism,* (Albany : State University of New York Press, c2009), p, 150.

[21] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," 111.

[22] Steven Burik, *The End Of Comparative Philosophy And The Task Of Comparative Thinking Heidegger, Derrida, And Daoism*, p, 149.

[23] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," 111.

[24] Steven Burik, *The End Of Comparative Philosophy And The Task Of Comparative Thinking Heidegger, Derrida, And Daoism*, p, 154.

[25] Mei Zhan, "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human," 111.

[26] Paul Copan and Chad V. Meister, *Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Religion,* (Routledge, 2012), 727.

[27] David Chai, "Meontology In Early Xuanxue Thought", *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 37 (2010): 97.

[28] Paul Copan and Chad V. Meister, *Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Religion,*7.

[29] Park Il-Joon, "Betweenness and the Authentic Selfhood - A comparison of Daoist thoughts with Heidegger within the context of living with an authentic selfhood".

[30] Paul Copan and Chad V. Meister, *Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Religion,*727.

[31] Rolf von Eckartsberg and Ronald S. Valle, "Heideggerian Thinking and the Eastern Mind," *Metaphors of Consciousness* (New York and London: Plenum Press, 1981) 289, 293.

[32] Park Il-Joon, "Betweenness and the Authentic Selfhood - A comparison of Daoist thoughts with Heidegger within the context of living with an authentic selfhood".

[33] Paul Copan and Chad V. Meister, *Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Religion,*729.

[34] Park Il-Joon, "Betweenness and the Authentic Selfhood - A comparison of Daoist thoughts with Heidegger within the context of living with an authentic selfhood".

[35] Michael Ehrmantraut, *Heidegger's Philosophic Pedagogy*, (A&C Black 2010), 175.

[36] Charles B. Guignon, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, (Cambridge University Press, 1993), 310.

[37] Park Il-Joon, "Betweenness and the Authentic Selfhood - A comparison of Daoist thoughts with Heidegger within the context of living with an authentic selfhood".

[38] "Martin Heidegger," accessed November 6, 2014, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/heidegger/ .

[39] Charles B. Guignon, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, 298.

[40] Steven Burik, "Thinking On The Edge: Heidegger, Derrida, And The Daoist Gateway (Men)", 504.

[41] "Martin Heidegger"

[42] Charles B. Guignon, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, 315.

[43] Steven Burik, "Thinking On The Edge: Heidegger, Derrida, And The Daoist Gateway (Men)", 503.

[44] Charles B. Guignon, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, 290.

[45] David Chai, "Meontological Generativity: A Daoist Reading of the Thing", 309.

Citations

Adorno, Theodor. *The Jargon of Authenticity*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, 2013.

Ames, Roger T. and Rosemont, Jr., Henry. *The Analects of Confucius: A Philosophical Translation*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1998.

Burik, Steven. *The End Of Comparative Philosophy And The Task Of Comparative Thinking Heidegger, Derrida, And Daoism*. Albany : State University of New York Press, c2009.

Burik, Steven. "Thinking On The Edge: Heidegger, Derrida, And The Daoist Gateway (Men)." *Philosophy East & West.* 60 (2010): 499-p+.

Chai, David. "Meontology In Early Xuanxue Thought." *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 37 (2010).

Chai, David. "Meontological Generativity: A Daoist Reading of the Thing." *Philosophy East and West*, 64 (2014).

Copan, Paul and Chad V. Meister. *Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Religion*. Routledge, 2012.

von Eckartsberg, Rolf and Valle, Ronald S. "Heideggerian Thinking and the Eastern Mind," *Metaphors of Consciousness.* New York and London: Plenum Press, 1981.

Ehrmantraut, Michael. *Heidegger's Philosophic Pedagogy.* A&C Black 2010.

Guignon, Charles B., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger.* Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Il-Joon, Park. "Betweenness and the Authentic Selfhood - A comparison of Daoist thoughts with Heidegger within the context of living with an authentic selfhood." *Madang: Journal of Contextual Theology* 11 (2009). http://www.dbpia.co.kr/Article/3119179 .

Laozi and Ivanhoe, Philip J. *The Daodejing of Laozi.* Hackett Publishing: 2003.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. "Martin Heidegger." Accessed November 6, 2014. http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/heidegger/.

Zhan, Mei. "Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human." *Social Text* 29 (2012): 107-128. DOI: 10.1215/01642472-1416109

present in texts), connectionism present in texts and communication, etc.

Critical analysis of the philosophical conception of dao in Laozi's Daodejing and being in Heidegger's "Being and Time"
That dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively is exposed through eight focal points of reasoning, noumenonisation, narration, authentication, abducingness, epistemology, emptiness, and technologisation of nature.

Overturning Hegel's experience of alienation through five-fold humanities lenses
Hegel's claim that the social world is included in consciousness is exposed through five-fold humanities lenses.