Critical analysis of the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing.

Article by **Lucian Green**

That dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively is exposed through eight perspectival points of verificationalism (which is correct because of the connectionism present in texts), connectionism present in texts and communication, etc.

Abstract

That dao and being are correct as written about by Laozi and Heidegger respectively is exposed through eight perspectival points of verificationalism (which is correct because of the connectionism present in texts), connectionism present in texts, communication (which is correct because of the professional development of the other), professional development of the other, articulation (which is correct because of economic role-earning), accreditation, universalisation, and mimickry of nature. I aimed to model the verification of Heidegger's ontology with Laozi's nothingness on business, education and having children with humanist pedagogy. I will examine the magna opera Laozi's "Daodejing" and Heidegger's "Being and Time".

Chapter 1 of 4

1. Critical analysis of the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing.

Laozi (5th or 4th century BC) was an anti-authoritarian Chinese philosopher who supposedly wrote the Daodejing (the key text of Daoism). Heidegger (1889-1976) was a German hermeneutic phenomenologist who was influenced by Daoism. Daoism's dao (the way) 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. The myriad things also contain the Daoist/Heideggerian being, which is connected with humanist pedagogy/the Thing via the Lacanian signifier. I will argue for the verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing. I will first examine and then discuss this claim.

Initially, I will examine the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing. I will describe how the Thing, like the self and being is beyond the signified, like the other and dao. Chai agrees with Lacan that Das Ding (the Thing) is called the beyond-of-the-signified.[1] [2] The subject stays a certain distance away and is composed of a type of relationship characterised by primary affect, before any repression, as a function of this beyond-the-signified and of an emotional relationship to it. Lacan writes that the initial articulation of the Entwurf (draft) occurs around it. In addition, repression posed a problem for Freud. Everything that he said about repression could only be understood as responding to the requirement to understand repression compared with the other forms of defense. The original Ding that is the first orientation, the first selection, and that is called Neuronenwahl, the choice of neurosis, is the first grinding and will regulate the function of the pleasure principle. It is organised in the same way as something that is the opposite, the reverse and the same combined, is also organised, and that finally substitutes itself for the inconsequential reality, das Ding, which controls, regulates, and emerges in the philosophy of Kant, who predicted the function of das Ding, although he only approached it by the idea of philosophy of science. A focal point is found here, with Kant, of intention and convergence, where an action that we determine as moral will be considered. This focal point is presented paradoxically as the rule of the Gut or good. I have described how Lacan writes how the signified, like the dao, relates to the individual.

Also, I will describe how the entire movement of representation turns around the Thing, like the self. The realm of the signified, which Lacan argued beyond which lies the Thing, contains a thing that represents that which is located in the beyondness of nothingness, where the Thing shows and separates itself as the unusual feature around which the entire movement of representation turns.[3] Das Ding is something that presents and isolates itself as the strange feature, around which the whole movement of the Vorstellung (idea) turns at the start of the organisation of the world logically and chronologically in the mind, where the Vorstellung that Freud shows us is governed by a regulatory principle, the so-called pleasure principle, which is tied to the functioning of the neuronic apparatus.[4] And it is around das Ding that the whole adaptive development revolves, a development that is so specific to man insofar as the symbolic process reveals itself to be inextricably woven into it. This is how the whole movement of the Vorstellung, like the self or Thing turns.

I will further describe how the Thing, like the self, is resolved into a series of effects. The Thing plays with (is interdependent with) the Dao, similar to harmony between earth and heaven, whereas the signifier's dependence on the discriminating mind of the subject prevents it doing this.[5] As we shift into the discourse das Ding, the Thing, is resolved into a series of effects, in the sense that one can say meine Sache.[6] Meine Sache means "all my kit and caboodle", differentiating it from das Ding. At the level of the Vorstellungen, the Thing is not nothing, but literally means "not". It is likened by its absence, its strangeness. I have described how the Thing, like the self, is resolved into a series of effects, in the sense that one can say meine Sache (my thing).

The Thing, like the self, may be infinitely divided into many things. Merleau-Ponty's argument that the oneness of the Thing and people who perceive it bringing together the signifiers shows that the Thing is a singularity, the generative ability of which is determined by its capacity to be infinitely divided into many things.[7] Merleau-Ponty writes that life is indivisible, and by placing himself at the point from which it flows, there is a movement to observe.[8] In this way, when the subjects thinks, he makes himself his own point of support, taking a position beyond his representations, in a kind of oneness which is the principle of all recognition land is not there to be recognised, and he becomes the absolute because he is that eternally. In answer to the question of whether there are several absolutes and how he could recognise other selves, the only experience of the subject is one which he gains by intersecting with it, and if his mind escapes the external spectator and can be recognised only from inside it, then his *cogito* is unique and unable to be 'shared in' by any other. It may be determined to be

'transferable' to others, where this kind of transfer may eventuate and a particular kind of spectacle can logically allow him to position outside him that mode of existence, the significance of which is necessary to be understood from within. Unless he gains knowledge from himself to recognise the junction of the *for itself* and the *in itself,* no other bodies will ever become life forms – unless he has an exterior, he will have no inside. The plurality of consciousness is not possible unless he has an absolute consciousness of himself. Beyond the absolute of his thought, it is not possible to conjecture a divine absolute. If the interface of his thought with itself is perfect, it contains him in himself, preventing him from feeling that anything escapes him; there is no aim or demand of an Other for the self of his, which builds the universality of being and its own presence in the world, where this presence is described in the terms of 'self-possession', and which will never find anything but what it has placed there outside itself. This hermetically contained self is then not a finite self. A consciousness of the universe exists through the previous consciousness of organisation in the active sense of the word, and as per the recent analysis, only through an inner communion with the very working of the godhead. It is finally through God that the *cogito* brings him into coincidence. The intelligible and recognisable structure of my knowledge of the world, when identified by Merleau-Ponty in the *cogito,* draws from the event and institutes me in eternity, then liberates me from all limiting properties and from my own existence. I have described how the Thing, like the self, may be infinitely divided into many things.

Also, I will describe how Heidegger's notion of a self-originating thingness is similar to Daoism because it explains how the space between the Thing and the experienced thing is bridgeable via the meontological, generative nature of Dao.[9] There is no representation of a present thing, i.e., what stands forth and what stands over against as an object, will reach the thing *qua* (being a) thing.[10] The jug's thingness is determined by it being *qua* vessel. The vessel's holding ability is brought to our attention when we pour wine into the jug. The jug's sides and bottom evidently take the task of holding. However, when we pour wine into the jug, we are pouring the wine between the sides and over the bottom, which are obviously impermeable in the vessel, where the impermeable is not what does the holding. When we pour wine into the jug, it is filled by wine that flows into the empty jug. This emptiness holds the wine. The jug's void is what the jug is as the holding vessel. However, the jug indeed is constructed from sides and bottom. The jug stands because of what it is constructed from. There is no jug that would not stand. A jug manqué (a jug that has failed to become what it might have been), which would hold wine but would fall over and hence empty itself. This object would be a vessel because it can empty itself. The jug, consisting of sides and bottom, by which it stands, does not hold wine. If the holding is done by the jug's void, then the maker of the sides and bottom doesn't make the jug, but only shapes the clay and the void. For it, in it and out of it, he forms the clay into the form. The jug's thingness resides not in the material of which it consists but the void it holds. The question of whether the jug is empty is answered by physical science, which assures us that the jug contains air and with everything that goes to make up the air's mixture. We allowed ourselves to be misled by a semipoetic way of looking at things when we pointed to the void of the jug into order to define its acting as a container. I have described how Heidegger's idea of a self-originating thing is similar to Daoism because it explains how the space between the Thing and the experienced thing is bridgeable via the meontological, generative nature of Dao. In this part, I have examined the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing.

In this part I will analyse the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing. I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the verificationism of nature, which is correct because of the connectionism present in texts. In the same way that Hegel verifies the self against the other in the self's mind, the self helps the other's competency where help is planned in the self's mind by matching reasons in a document with parts of texts to connect them together. The subject requires pedagogy (reason) to go to (connect with) heaven or honoured competency (parts of texts) from earth, where das zwischen (betweenness) exists between earth and heaven. As Hegel verifies the self against the other in the self's mind, the self requires pedagogy to go to heaven or honoured competency from earth. The Thing plays with (is interdependent with) the Dao, similar to harmony between earth and heaven, whereas the signifier's dependence on the discriminating mind of the subject prevents it from doing this.[11] As reason connects with parts of texts, the Thing is interdependent with the Dao. Heidegger's notion of a self-originating thingness is similar to Daoism because it explains how the space between the Thing and the experienced thing is bridgeable via the meontological, generative nature of Dao.[12] As Hegel verifies the self against the other in the self's mind, Heidegger's notion of a self-originating thingness explains how the space between the Thing and the experienced thing is bridgeable via Dao. One should claim connectionism present in texts is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

I will also argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the connectionism of nature, which is correct because of the connectionism present between ideas. As Hegel verifies the self against the other in the self's mind, the subject should verify the self's connection between ideas against the other's connection between ideas. The subject should verify the self's connection between ideas, the connection between which has been thought of metacognitively, against the other's connection between ideas. The subject should verify five musical compositions (the nothingness which the Thing comes from), produced by the self, against a speaking role (space where the Thing is located), to help one to earn a speaking role, and improve the way one thinks of ideas. As the subject should verify the self's connection between ideas against the other's connection between ideas, the subject should verify five musical compositions against a speaking role. Things become answerable to the signifiers that name them because the space where the Thing is located is the connection to the nothingness that it comes from.[13] As the subject should verify five musical compositions against a speaking role, Things (like a speaking role) become answerable to the signifiers that name them (like five musical compositions). Lacan (whose ethical interpretation of the Thing contrasts with Heidegger's ontological interpretation of it) argues that the Thing continually regenerates itself or else disappears, by signification, where signifiers are empty reflections of it.[14] One should claim connectionism present between ideas is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

In addition, I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the communication of nature, which is correct because of the communication of arts scholars present in texts. As the subject should verify five musical compositions against a speaking role, the Thing (like a speaking role) continually regenerates itself or else disappears, where signifiers (like five musical compositions) are empty reflections of it. As the subject should verify five musical compositions against a speaking role, the self should verify a reason in a document against a part of a text to connect them together. As against transitivity, which shows that given A->B, and
B->C, A->C can be deduced; the self should verify a reason (A) in a document against a part of a text (B) to connect them together (A->B). The self should verify a reason in a document (the thing's existence as a thing-in-itself) against a part of a text (the thing's transformation into that which is signified). The self should verify a reason (that which is signified) in a document against a part of a text (like the thing) to connect them together. As Things are born from an unknowable, formless Dao, space is introduced between Things' conceptions and becoming, where the time before the thing's becoming is that of pre-signification and its existence as a thing-in-itself is characterized by a transformation into that which is signified.[15] The thing is transformed into that which is signified, where other Things are born from an unknowable, formless Dao. As a function of Das Ding and of an emotional relationship to Das Ding, where Das Ding is the beyond-of-the-signified, the subject is at a distance and is in a relationship characterized by primary affect, prior to any repression.[16] The thing is transformed into that which is signified, making it beyond the signified. One should claim communication of arts scholars present in texts is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

Moreover, I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the professionalism of nature, which is correct because of the professional development of the other. As the self should verify a reason in a document against a part of a text to connect them together, a manager should help the other with pedagogy. In the same way that Jesus argues that the self verifies itself against the other, a manager argues that the self should help the other with pedagogy. Epistemological knowledge about a pedagogical argument generated many sales in return for money (the Thing) because of news about one sale being spread by word of mouth because of the human value (signifier). As a manager should help the other with pedagogy, the Thing is verified against human value. Merleau-Ponty's argument that the oneness of the Thing and people who perceive it bringing together the

signifiers shows that the Thing is a singularity, the generative ability of which is determined by its capacity to be infinitely divided into many things.[17] As the Thing is verified against human value, the oneness of the Thing and people is verified against the signifiers. The Thing signifies the signifier, which becomes entangled in the world, where the signifier is unable to form an intimate connection with the Thing or nature, where this reasoning arises from the concept that poiesis (human creative action) excludes the Thing when vis-à-vis (face to face with) the One, and where the One occupies the meontological nothingness that supports the Dao.[18] As the Thing is verified against human value and signifies the signifier, the signifier becomes entangled in the world. One should claim professional development of the other is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

In conclusion, I have argued that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct, because of the connectionism present in texts, the connectionism present between ideas, the communication of arts scholars present in texts and the professional development of the other. I have argued that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct. This conclusion allows us to authenticate the self with the other as a text professional.

[1] Chai, "Meontological Generativity: A Daoist Reading of the Thing", *Philosophy East and West,* 64 (2014), 305.

[2] Lacan, Jacques. *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis,* 1959-1960, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. with notes Dennis Porter, Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VII (London: W. W. Norton, 1997), 54.

[3] Chai, Op Cit, 306.

[4] Lacan, Jacques. *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis,* 57.

[5] Chai, Op Cit, 306.

[6] Lacan, Jacques. Op Cit,63.

[7] Chai, Op Cit, 307.

[8] Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. Colin Smith (London: Routledge, 2003), 373.

[9] Chai, Op Cit, 307.

[10] Heidegger, Poetry, Language, Thought, trans. A. Hofstadter (New York: Harper Perennial, 2001), 166.

[11] Chai, Op Cit, 306.

[12] Chai, Op Cit, 307.

[13] Chai, Op Cit, 307.

[14] Chai, Op Cit, 307.

[15] Chai, Op Cit, 305.

[16] Chai, Op Cit, 305.

[17] Chai, Op Cit, 307.

[18] Chai, Op Cit, 306.

2. Critical analysis of the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing.

Laozi (5th or 4th century BC) was an anti-authoritarian Chinese philosopher who wrote the Daodejing (the key text of Daoism). Heidegger (1889-1976) was a German hermeneutic phenomenologist who was influenced by Daoism. Daoism's dao (the way) 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, which is connected with humanist pedagogy/the Thing via the Lacanian signifier. I will argue for the verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing. I will first examine and then discuss this claim.

Initially, I will examine the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing. I will describe how the Thing, like the self and being, is found again after being lost on the way to becoming a signifier, like the other and dao. Lacan writes that the nothingness occupied by the One refers to the field of the projected something beyond, where the Thing is found again after being lost on the way to signification, whereas the Thing and signifiers appeared from Dao's point of view.[1] Thought should be made to emerge from the evolution of matter, while one identifies thought with consciousness.[2] Homo faber, production and the producer emerge from the evolution of matter. Production is a domain coming from the origin, a creation ex nihilo, as it introduces into the natural world the system of the signifier. Therefore we locate thought, not in an imaginary sense, but thought in the world in the periods given by the signifier. The field of the Thing, onto which is projected something that is beyond, something at the origin of the signification chain, the location where being is uncertain, where sublimation occurs, and concerning which Freud gives us an important example. The location is also where man strangely courts work, explaining Lacan's example of courtly love. Placing in this beyond a woman is incredible. By doing this, Lacan is not placing a derogatory judgment on such beings. Given our culture, we are not in any danger by being positioned as an object in the beyond of the pleasure principle. Lacan suggests letting others return to their problems, which are similar to ours, and equally difficult. The incredible notion of positioning a woman in the place of being is not relevant to her as a woman but as an object of desire. Paradoxes arise from the famous courtly love because those involved relate it to the demands of a form of love that is unrelated to the historically specific sublimation in question. The writers who have answered the question fail to answer how the fever that is so manifestly simultaneously extensive with an existing desire, which is not Platonic and is beyond doubt brought out in courtly poetry, the consistence of which can be verified with the fact that the being to whom it is given is being as signifier. The inhuman character of the object of courtly love is visible from this. I have described how the Thing, is found again after being lost on the way to becoming a signifier, like thought emerging from the evolution of matter.

Also, I will describe how both trace and the relation between the Thing, like the self, and the signifier, like the other, are dependent on recollection.[3] It is in this field that we should locate something that Freud makes a presentation about, possibly as relating to the discovery itself, as being the wiedergefundene or refound object.[4] For Freud, the definition of the object in its ushering function, and which is paradoxical, because it is not stated that this object was lost. The object is a refound object. Its lostness is a result of that but after the fact. It is, therefore, refound without us knowing, except through the refinding, that it was lost. What is found is searched for, but searched for in the pathways of the signifier. Now this search is an anti-psychic search that by its function is beyond the pleasure principle. According to the pleasure principle, the signifier projects into this beyond equality, homeostasis, and the tendency to the interest in the system of the

self; it prompts its failure. The aim of the pleasure principle is to lead the subject from signifier to signifier, by generativity of as many signifiers as are needed to maintain the tension that maintains the function of the psychic apparatus at as low a level as possible. This leads to the relationship between man and this signifier, that will allow another step forward to be taken by us. When the pleasure maintains human theorisation with the law of temptation throughout the large discourse that is not only constituted of what it articulates but also of its action, as it is overborne by that search which concludes with finding ideas in signs, this leads to the question of how the relationship of man to the signifier, as far as he can handle it, put him in relation with the Thing, represented by an object. We, therefore, arrive at the question of what a person does when he or she makes a signifier. This is how the Thing and the signifier are discovered to be dependent on recollection.

Further, I will describe whether the thing that shows itself to the one who observes it to be a thing-in-itself is a genuine in-itself for us. Merleau-Ponty wrote that the thing shows itself to the one who observes it to be a thing-in-itself, and thus results in the problem of a genuine in-itself for us.[5] The definition of 'the thing' is our body and our life.[6] The union of our body is only in the union of the thing, by understanding ideas that we sense as so many interchangeable instruments. The body and the body at rest are merely an unclear mass, which we see as an exact and recognisable being when it approaches a thing, and as it is purposefully projected from the centre, where this perception is related to and bordering on consciousness, the centre of which is occupied with the world and things. One cannot understand a perceived thing with no one to perceive it. But the thing presents itself to the one who perceives it as a thing in itself, and, therefore, results in the problem of an authentic in-itself-for-us. Usually, our perception prevents us from noticing this, because it alights on ideas attentively enough to discover their familiar presence in them, but not enough to show the non-human element that is hidden in them. I have described how our perception prevents us from noticing the problem of an authentic in-itself-for-us.

I will describe how nothingness and entireness are brought to the world. Lacan stated that nothingness and entireness are brought to the world through the signifier, even though the world lacked such qualities.[7] Merleau-Ponty states that the world is unable to be conceived as a sum of objects, and time cannot be conceived as a sum of instantaneous present moments because each object can allow itself to be fully determinately offered only in the case that other objects disappear into the fogginess of a far-away place, where each instant can broach its existence only by leaving out the existence of sooner and later on instants at the same time, and in this way a conjunction of objects or instants makes no sense.[8] Objects and presents may connect with one other to create a macrocosm only by the way of that bivalent being subjectivity, which turn to being attentive to one other only from a particular perspective and in aim. Time of an objective nature that moves and is, section by section is not thought to be likely, even though it is included in a time from history that is moved from the present of living to laterness and soonness. The seeming abundance of the entity and of the time is projected only before the blemishedness of the intentional being. An instant with no soonness, or an instant that lasts forever, is exactly the definition of death; the instant of the living is pulled apart between a laterness that it broaches and a soonness that it throws. Therefore, it is of the essence of the object and of the macrocosm to show themselves as 'open', to place us ahead of their precise appearances, to undertake to us each time 'another thing to observe'. In some cases, this is represented by stating that the object and the macrocosm are unknown. These are so when we are not limited to their thing-like aspect, but return them to the setting of subjectivity. I have described how nothingness (like the past) and entireness (like the future) are brought to the world (macrocosm) through the signifier, even though the world lacked such qualities. In this part, I have examined the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing.

In this part, I will analyse the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing. I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the articulation of nature, which is correct because of economic role-earning. As the self articulates himself, he verifies himself against (unconceals) an economic significant thing. The self conceals himself (where the Thing is lost on the way to signification) in order to unconceal an economic significant thing (where the Thing is re-found). The Thing is re-found where the self articulates himself. Lacan refers to the nothingness occupied by the One as the field of the projected something beyond, where the Thing is re-found after being lost on the way to signification, whereas from the point of view of Dao, both the Thing and signifiers continually appeared.[9] Lacan refers to the nothingness occupied by the One (Thing) as the field of the projected something beyond, where the Thing is re-found (where the self articulates himself). Both trace and the relationship between the Thing and the signifier are dependent on recollection.[10] The Thing is re-found where both trace and the relationship between the Thing and the signifier are dependent on recollection. The self articulates himself from nonbeing in dasein to determinate humanitas. One should claim economic role-earning is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

I will also argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the accreditation of nature, which is correct because of checks and balances adhered to when hiring employees. The self should verify the economic significant thing against agreed standards, from nonbeing in dasein to determinate humanitas. The self should verify a reason in a document (the thing's existence as a thing-in-itself) against a part of a text (the thing's transformation into that which is signified). Nonbeing in dasein should be increased to determinate humanitas, showing the thing's transformation into that which is signified. Zhuangzi uses the term xing to refer to the Thing, where xing expanded the cosmogonist model initiated by Laozi, and was different from Plato's theory of forms.[11] Daoism claims that the Thing is a complex part of the pre-development of things and human reality. The realm of the signified, which Lacan argued beyond which lies the Thing, contains a thing that represents that which is located in the beyondness of nothingness, where the Thing shows and separates itself as the unusual feature around which the entire movement of representation turns. The thing transforms into that which is signified, where the realm of the signified contains a thing that represents that which is located in the beyondness of nothingness. To answer the question about how we can conceive of that has yet to come into being (i.e. the pre-signified), Lacan searches for the Thing using a method allowing us to engage in a pre-symbolic inquiry into the Thing when it has no visible representation, where this method takes us to the time of its origin, its absolute beginning.[12] This investigation is similar to Hegel's, but only seeks out the beginning of historical or cultural time. However, Daoism doesn't perceive time as abstract or hypothetical, but tied to the eternity of nothingness, excepting it from the question of whether it has a past, present or future. As things are at one with the Dao when in harmony with it, Daoist temporality is, therefore, a time-beyond-time, a non-temporal time as Zhuangzi stated. Nonbeing in dasein should be increased to determinate humanitas, because as things are at one with the Dao when in harmony with it, Daoist temporality is therefore a time-beyond-time, a non-temporal time. Nonbeing in dasein should be increased to determinate humanitas by reading 50 pedagogical texts before conceiving a child. One should claim checks and balances adhered to when hiring employees is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

I will also argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the universalisation of nature, which is correct because of connecting a text to 50 texts. The subject should read 50 pedagogical texts before writing for/conceiving a child, to connect the self's pedagogical text things with the other's 50 pedagogical texts, transforming the self's text into an intelligent text. As the self reads the other's 50 pedagogical texts about physis (nature, e.g. harmony of cooking food when it powers genes to bear beings), it receives intelligence and the gift of nothingness from Dao. The subject should transform the self's text into an intelligent text by reading about physis. This essay will, therefore, explore the bond between the One, the Thing, and its signifier before moving on to discuss how the Thing unveils itself to the world and receives the gift of nothingness from Dao.[13] The subject should read about physis to show how the thing unveils itself to the world. The Thing emerges and then mysteriously vanishes.[14] The Thing contains nothingness as its root and distributes nothingness throughout its world using its branches. The Thing has no inhibitor, therefore its growth is unbounded. Therefore, the Thing forms a structure of being that is neither opposed to nor only containing being, allowing the existence of the real (object) and non-real (sign). However, the signifier's existence beyond the realm of the Thing is a source of tension. The subject should transform the self's text into an intelligent text, where the Thing forms a structure of being that is neither opposed to nor only contains being. The subject should transform the self's text into an intelligent text, where

the self should verify the Pedagogy Professor Algorithm and Pedagogy God Algorithm against the other's screen of results. One should claim connecting a text to 50 texts is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

In addition, I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the mimicry of nature, which is correct because of mimicking a performance on a screen. The self should verify the Pedagogy Professor Algorithm and Pedagogy God Algorithm against the other's screen of results. As the screen (like the Thing) regulates the viewer (like the signifier), the harmonic music is placed between the edges of the space in the ear, like nonbeing verifying knowledge. The self should verify the Pedagogy Professor Algorithm and Pedagogy God Algorithm things against the other's screen of results, like nonbeing verifying knowledge. The signifier is a particular distance from the Thing and is regulated by the Thing which is beyond it.[15] The harmonic music is placed between the space in the ear, where the signifier is a particular distance from the Thing, and is regulated by the Thing, which is beyond it. The Thing is untouched by the opposition facing ordinary objects because Being is beyond the realm of signifiers, as Lacan argues.[16] The signifier is a particular distance from the Thing, and is regulated by the Thing, which is beyond it, where the Thing is untouched by the opposition facing ordinary objects. The signifier is a particular distance from the Thing, and is regulated by the Thing, which is beyond it, where the signifier is checked to be a good argument. One should claim mimicking a performance on a screen is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

Also, I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the argument checking of nature, which is correct because of checking that an argument is good. As the self writes an argument, the other should check that it is a good argument. As the self writes a good argument, she conceals its meaning, to the other who perceives it as a thing-in-itself. The other should check an argument is good by perceiving the thing-in-itself. Merleau-Ponty wrote that the thing presents itself to the person who perceives it as a thing-in-itself, and, therefore, poses the question arising from an authentic in-itself for us.[17] As the self writes a good argument, this poses the problem of a genuine in-itself to the other. Lacan declared that nothingness and things are presented to the world through the signifier even though the world lacks these qualities.[18] Nothingness and fullness are introduced to the world by way of the signifier (argument), where the self writes a good argument. The self writes a good argument, where the subject should write using confidence as power of the self. One should claim that checking that an argument is good is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

Further, I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the verificationism-with-self of nature, which is correct because of verifying itself against the other. The subject should use confidence as power of the self to verify itself against the other. Heidegger leaps into be-ing, which is no/thing, where there is das zwischen (betweenness) in being, containing nothing and the self (being) verifies itself against the other (nothing). The subject should use confidence as power of the self to show that Heidegger leaps into be-ing, which is no/thing. Heidegger jumps into be-ing, which is no/thing, by facing the most isolated point of its death through the dread lure of anxiety (Ereignis; enownment).[19] Heidegger leaps into be-ing, where there is a dread lure of anxiety. Chai disagrees with Lynn's phrase "derive life from the Dao" and disagrees with Wagner stating, "are generated on the basis of the Way."[20] Lynn's expression presupposes a link between Dao and the things it creates and does not provide an indication of the spontaneous transformational power inherent in each thing created from Dao. The self (being) verifies itself against the other (nothing), where there is a spontaneous transformational power inherent in each thing (being) born of Dao. The self (being) verifies itself against the other (nothing), where the reason for a premise is verified. One should claim that verifying the self against the other is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

In conclusion, I have argued that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct, because of economic role-earning, checks and balances adhered to when hiring employees, connecting a text to 50 texts, mimicking a performance on a screen, checking that an argument is correct and verifying itself against the other. I have argued that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct. This conclusion allows us to authenticate the self with the other as a pedagogy professional.

1Chai, "Meontological Generativity: A Daoist Reading of the Thing", *Philosophy East and West,* 64 (2014), 308.

2Lacan, *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis,* 1959-1960, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. with notes Dennis Porter, Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VII (London: W. W. Norton, 1997), 214.

3Chai, Op Cit, 308.

4Lacan, Op Cit,118-9.

5 Chai, Op Cit, 309.

6 Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. Phenomenology of Perception, 375.

7 Chai, Op Cit, 309.

8 Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. Phenomenology of Perception, 388.

9Chai, Op Cit, 308.

10Ibid.

11Ibid. 306.

12Ibid.306-307.

13Ibid.304.

14Ibid.308-309.

15Ibid., 309.

16Ibid.

17 Merleau-Ponty, Op Cit, 309.

18Ibid.

19Il-Joon, Park. "Betweenness and the Authentic Selfhood".

20 Chai, David. "Meontology In Early Xuanxue Thought," 100.

Critical analysis of the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing.

Laozi (5th or 4th century BC) was an anti-authoritarian Chinese philosopher who wrote the Daodejing (the key text of Daoism). Heidegger (1889-1976) was a German hermeneutic phenomenologist who was influenced by Daoism. Daoism's dao (the way) 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, which is connected with humanist pedagogy/the Thing via the Lacanian signifier. I will argue for the verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing. I will first examine and then discuss this claim.

Initially, I will examine the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing. I will describe whether Heidegger and Leibniz examined nothingness or things in metaphysics, or vice versa. Hahn asks, "Why is there Nothing rather than things which exist?" [1] Leibniz also enquired "Why are there things which exist rather than Nothing?" when he raised the question of primary importance for Metaphysics. Leibniz treated the "Rather than Nothing" only as an appendage, and underlined the importance of the expression "Why are there things which exist?" In doing this, the importance of the Being of things, the *Being of beings* is identified as the main object of Metaphysics. When Heidegger adopted Leibniz's formulation, he attempted to demonstrate that the way and location of the things which exist relied on the "rather than Nothing?". In giving this view, Heidegger gives a semi-primary role to *Nothing* or *Non-Being*, however not completely so. This is because the "rather than Nothing?" lights the main issue in Heidegger's view, in other words, the Being of beings, or the Being of existent things. Leibniz placed the emphasis on being while Heidegger placed it on non-being. However, the unusual and unusually inverted formulation introduced here provides a new point of view with which to re-ask a recurring question in philosophy, "What main contention's side is right in Metaphysics?" - a point of view in which *Western* ideology is remodelled in the form of an *Eastern* way. I have described how Leibniz placed the emphasis in Metaphysics on being while Heidegger placed it on non-being.

I will describe how the little and great labelled the Dao. Wang Bi writes, "The way the great Dao floods, oh it can go left or right."[2] Lynn writes this means that the Dao floods in such a way that there is nowhere that it doesn't go, and functions [yong] with the ability of functioning everywhere, left, right, up, or down, therefore there is no place it does not go. Wang Bi writes, "The myriad folk rely on it for life, but it does not tell them to do so. It achieves success but enjoys no reputation for doing so. It clothes and feeds the myriad folk but does not become their master. It is always without desire and so can be named among the small." Lynn writes that the myriad things all gain life from the Dao, but while they have life, they do not know where it came from. In this way, when all the myriad things under Heaven do not have desire, each member of the myriad people will reach his or her correct position, as if the Dao hadn't done anything for them. Therefore, it is labelled among the little. Wang Bi writes that "The myriad things return to it, but it does not become their master, so it can be named among the great." Lynn writes that all the myriad things go back to it for life, however, it diligently ensures that they have no thought of where they originate from, which is not a little matter. So, the great may also label it. Wang Bi writes, "Therefore it is because he himself never tries to be great that he fulfils his greatness." Lynn writes, "Plan for the difficult while it is still easy; work at the great while it is still small." I have described how the little and great labelled the Dao.

I will describe how it is possible to make use of the dao given all the places it goes. Wang Bi writes that "The Way overflows! Thus it is possible [to make use of it all around] to the right as well as to the left."[3] Wagner agrees that this means that the way overflows so much that there is no place that it doesn't reach. Because it is possible to use it all around, to the right and to the left, above and below, there is nowhere that it doesn't go. I have described that it is possible to make use of the dao given all the places it goes.

I will describe how the continual natural flow of entities is expressed. Jung writes that Jullien is a French sinologist cum philosopher and is a worthy successor of Marcel Granet and Henri Maspero.[4] He is knowledgable about Chinese philosophers, in particular, those who are concerned with comparative philosophy between East and West. His work being considered, Vital Nourishment: Departing from Happiness (Nourir sa Vie: À l'Écart du Bonheur), follows others in comparative philosophy. One of Jullien's early books, The Propensity of Things (1995), with it's French original in 1992 came first to Jung's attention. Jung was most interested in the word "propensity" (propension), which was able to be taken as meaning the essential element of Sinology, the synonyms of which are "inclination," "proclivity," and "tendency," or that which has no ontological or teleological finality. This refers to the continual natural flow of entities (i.e. a waterway) or the eternal process of phenomena. This is expressed in the reviewed book as "The nature of water is such that when it is not troubled, it is clear, and when it is not moving, it is flat; but when it is held back and does not flow, it can no longer be clear" by Jullien. I have described that the continual natural flow of entities is expressed is clear or unclear.

I will describe how God/the dao creates entities. Latour locates the power of the moderns in a threefold transcendence and a threefold immanence in a schema with a crossed grid that locks in every possibility[5]. The moderns haven't created Nature, however, they have created Society, they have created Nature, they have not created Society, yet God has created everything, God has created nothing, they have created everything. We cannot fathom the moderns if we don't see that these four guarantees act as checks and balances for each other. The first two guarantees allow us to change the power sources by moving straight from clear natural force to clear political force, and likewise. The third guarantee eliminates any conflict between that which belongs to Nature, and that which belongs to politics, even while the first two guarantees allow fast changeover between the two. In answer to the question about whether the conflict between the third that divides and the first two that change over is too obvious, the answer is no because the fourth constitutional guarantee initiates as mediator an infinitely far-away God who is utterly impotent and the crown judge at the same time. I have described how God/the dao creates Nature, Society, everything and nothing.

I will describe what the Tao becomes when it is occupied by individual things. This will be done with reference to the chapter entitled "The Natural Way of Lao Tzu".[6] Chinese society and the character of China would have been profoundly different if "Lao Tzu" had not been written. Further, Confucianism, which is the main system in Chinese history and thinking, and Buddhism, wouldn't have been the same if they had not been inspired by Daoism. Even Chinese religion, art, cooking, philosophy, government and medicine can't be fathomed without an understanding of the knowledge in this book. Even though Confucianism emphasises an active life and social order, Daoism stresses peacefulness and an individual life, suggesting that Daoism fulfils a less important role. However, Daoism is strongly critical of Confucianism because it offers non-conformity instead of Confucian conformity and a transcendental spirit instead of Confucian worldliness. In fact, Daoism is the equal of Confucianism. In some ways, Daoism delves deeper into the Way of life than Confucianism, to the extent that Daoism is known by that name while every ancient Chinese school taught its own Way (Dao). In fact, the name "Daoist School" was not used until the first century BC, however, this name became unavoidable because the teachings of Lao Tzu and Chuang Tzu had become so impressive and inspirational before then. In other schools, Tao means a system or moral truth, whereas in Daoist schools it means the One, which is last forever, is nameless, natural, spontaneous and indescribable. The One is the start of all things and the way that all things follow their course. The Tao becomes its virtue or character (te) when the Tao is occupied by individual things. The perfect life for the individual, the perfect order for civilisation, and the perfect type of government are each based on and guided by the One. Oneness as the way of life means spontaneity, weakness, simplicity, peacefulness and of most importance, non-action (*wu-wei*). Non-action does not literally mean "inactivity", but instead means "taking no action that is contrary to Nature"—i.e. letting Nature take its own course. I have described how The Tao (Dao) becomes its character (te) when the Tao (Dao) is taken up by individual things.

I will describe how to take things as things. To take things as things is to remain unlimited by them.[7] Things have their limits, what is known as the limit of things. That which is unlimited moves to the limited and that which is limited moves to the unlimited. . . . [T]hings take Dao as their root and branch yet Dao knows not of root and branch; things take Dao as their accumulation and loss yet Dao knows not of accumulation and loss. I have described how things that are unlimited move to the limited and things that are limited move to the unlimited. In this part, I have examined the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing.

In this part, I will analyse the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing. I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the reason-verification of nature, which is correct because of the verification of the reason for a premise. The reason for a premise is verified. One should authenticate the reason against the foundational principle at rest beyond ever-changing things. Reasons are comparable with transcendental principles. It is fair to say that many philosophical interpretations of the Daoist classics have proceeded or continue to proceed, to read into these works the quest for a transcendental, foundational principle, a permanent moment of rest beyond the turmoil of ever-changing things.[8] Verification of a reason is enabled by comparison with a transcendental principle. The metaphysics I understand to be at work in such interpretations is what Heidegger and Derrida have called philosophy as ontotheology. It is defined by the search for a transcendent Being or principle, which would at the same time be the transcendental condition of possibility for everything in this world. Authentication occurs between a transcendent Being or principle and the transcendental condition of possibility for everything in this world. A transcendent Being or principle is the transcendental condition of possibility for everything in this world, a significant thing and a crown person. One should claim that the verification of the reason for a premise is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the crowning of nature, which is correct because a crown person should be created. A significant thing, a crown person should be created. One unnameable significant thing should be created from which all things are engendered. One unnameable crown person should be created from which all things originate. Relationality, multiplicity, contingency, and creativity are central to Daoist thinking and especially its conceptualisation of the oneness of all things.[9] The "Dao" in Daoism, often translated as "the way," "the path," or "the method," is the ineffable and unknowable nonbeing from which all beings are engendered. A significant thing, a crown person should be created that creates the oneness of all things. For Heidegger, worlding brings being out of nonbeing. It is a set of events and processes through which certain ideas, people, things, and actions come into being, in particular, worldly forms and are brought into the folds of history; or they are concealed, unthinkable, and consigned to nonbeing becoming "unworlded," so to speak."[10] All things, which possess oneness, are unworlded, bringing being out of nonbeing. The self should verify his or her understanding of being with the other's interpretation of nonbeing. One should claim that a crown person should be created is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the circlisation of nature, which is correct because the self's understanding should be verified with his or her interpretation of the other. The self should verify his or her understanding with his or her interpretation of the other. The One verifies ontological nothingness (like the self's understanding) with Dao (like the other's interpretation). We authenticate ontological nothingness with Dao. The One is both Dao and ontological nothingness.[11] The self's one understanding (One as both Dao and ontological nothingness) is verified with the other's interpretation. This article compares Heidegger's thinking of the authenticity (Eigentlichkeit) of the self with the Daoist notion of Authentic being-human (眞人 zhenren).[12] The self's one understanding (Heidegger's authenticity) is verified with the other's interpretation (the Daoist notion of Authentic being-human). The self's one understanding (Heidegger's Thing as Being) may conflict with the other's interpretation (the Daoist Thing as ontological nothingness). One should claim that the self's understanding being verified with his or her interpretation of the other is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of the conflict identification of nature, which is correct because of identifying that the understanding may conflict with the interpretation. The self's understanding may conflict with the interpretation of the other. Conflicts are differently resolved in different conditions by dao. For example, buying is performed when there is inspiration by the product and moneymaking is performed when buying is performed. In my understanding of Daoism, humans are very much a part of the whole process of dao, and this means that the different, opposing, or conflicting sides of this processual world are all equally important.[13] The different sides of the world may conflict with each other. The authenticity of being-human is attained by becoming one with the transcendent (the unnamable dao in Lao-Tzu and be-ing in Heidegger), which is paradoxically embedded in the ordinariness by signifying its absence or its lack in it.[14] Dao paradoxically draws things out from ontological nothingness. Dao draws one interpretation out from ontological nothingness. One should claim that identifying that the understanding may conflict with the interpretation is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

In conclusion, I have argued for the verification of the reason for a premise, that a crown person should be created, that the self's understanding should be verified with his or her interpretation of the other and identifying that the understanding may conflict with the interpretation. I have argued that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct. This conclusion allows us to authenticate the self with the other as a hermeneutics professional.

1 Robert Hahn, "Being and Non-being in Rig Veda X, in the Writings of the Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu, 86.

2 Lynn, The Classic of the Way and Virtue: A New Translation of the Daodejing of Laozi as Interpreted by Wang Bi, 113.

3 Rudolph G. Wagner, A Chinese Reading of the Daodejing: Wang Bi's Commentary on the Laozi with Critical Text and Translation, 230-231.

4 Jullien, François, Vital Nourishment: Departing from Happiness, Jung, Hwa Dao, 359.

5 Bruno Latour, We Have Never Been Modern, 34.

6 Anonymous, A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy, 136.

7 Guo Qingfan, Zhuangzi Jishi, 752.

8 Burik, "Thinking On The Edge: Heidegger, Derrida, And The Daoist Gateway (Men)".

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

10 Ibid.

11 Chai, "Meontology In Early Xuanxue Thought", 94.

12 Il-Joon, Park. "Betweenness and the Authentic Selfhood".

13 Burik, Op Cit.

14 Ibid.

Chapter 4 of 4

Critical analysis of the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing.

Laozi (5th or 4th century BC) was an anti-authoritarian Chinese philosopher who wrote the Daodejing (the key text of Daoism). Heidegger (1889-1976) was a German hermeneutic phenomenologist who was influenced by Daoism. Daoism's dao (the way) 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, which is connected with humanist pedagogy/the Thing via the Lacanian signifier. I will argue for the verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing. I will first examine and then discuss this claim.

Firstly, I will examine the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing. I will describe how Dao is the dynamic operation of the system of the world.[1] The separation of the world into different things is the result of thinking that is not natural and that is based on human language. Zhuangzi wrote that we needed to avoid the artificial, separated, world that we have come to "see before our eyes," that does not exist and bring about the unitary type of the Universe of the Dao again. Also, certain figures have discovered a method to reinterpret experience by the command of particular kinds of skills, which may be a route that Zhuangzi suggests that should guide us towards the new world view that evades the barrier that language has built for us. [2] I have described how we need to bring about the unitary type of the Universe of the Dao again over the separated world.

I will describe how Zhuangzi has Confucius compose the following plan, called "the fasting of the mind," for his student Yan Hui.

"Make your will one. Don't listen with your ears, listen with your mind. No, don't listen with your mind, listen with your qi. Listening stops with the ears, the mind stops with recognition, but qi is empty and waits on all things. The Dao gathers in emptiness alone. Emptiness is the fasting of the mind."

The imperative of self-preservation in Daoism grew from the instinct to avoid Warring States society.[3] Zhuangzi thinks of his idea of connecting with the Dao through skill command to imagine the ideal actor in society as one who approaches self-preservation in each act, and who never allows hollow values such as righteousness, loyalty or ren to deter him or her from his or her principle task of avoiding the problems of the political world. In addition, the non-distinction between life and death is erased by Zhuangzi, who, even though he is committed to self-preservation in times of possible danger, he believes that the distinction made by humans between life and death is not natural and that there is no reason to hold on to life or be frightened of death.[4] The Dao is in favour of all as one, and when we conclude who we are only regarding our part in the Great Dao, we dispose of the delusion that taking part as a live human is wanted more than acting as compost, or in one of an endless sequence of forms that we may be revealed as afterwards. In addition, the Dao is constructed as a view that escapes questions of the possibility of knowledge, the status of the self and the nature of meaning.[5] Daos become hidden to the extent that they are prone to be judged as "authentic" or "inauthentic", spoken words become hidden to the extent that they are prone to be judgements of "true" or "false", and questions are raised about how a dao can be followed and not exist, and how words can exist, yet be unallowable.[6] "Allowable" and "unallowable" are terms in early Chinese philosophy of language, which indicate whether a spoken phrase has the correct meaning. I have described how the Dao is in favour of all as one.

I will describe how Chad Hansen's argument to read dao the plural will be followed, given that ancient Chinese generally does not make the distinction between singular and plural nouns.[7] Hansen works with two similar definitions of dao; the Dao, an idea of a universal system or point of view and a dao, a lesson, a road or competency (which is a lived-language of patterns in naming for Hansen). A contemporary debate exists about the extent to which the text takes an absolute relativist standpoint in this and close chapters, "do all daos lead to "the Dao"? Is there an overall Dao? A translation understands the text as suggesting daos that have been affirmed by assertion (e.g. "My dao [teaching] is the Dao [Great Way]") is described as "authentic" and provides a life-giving experience of the world's action. I have described how all daos lead to the Dao.

I will describe how we understand an affirmed "this is so" and make a stalk distinct from a pillar, or a leper distinct from the beauty Xi Shi.[8] With this grandness, the Dao understands them as one. Things are brought to completion when the one is divided, and the one is destroyed when in things being brought to completion. Things are again understood is one when things are not subject to completion or destruction. The main of attainment is the only person who knows how to comprehend them as one. He asserted "this is so". His affirmation is founded in everyday practice. Everyday practice means use, use is understanding, to understand is to hold. "An authentic dao" may denote "the Dao". "The one" could be referred to as "the One," defined as either a holistic understanding of action that is guided by dao or the internal holism of the experienced world. I have described how relying on affirmation finishes, which is known as dao. In this part, I have examined the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing.

In this part I will analyse the philosophical conception of verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing. I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of oneness in the interpretation of nature, which is correct because of understanding matching one interpretation. The self's understanding matches one interpretation of the other. Dao determines one construal of the relationship of Things as the correct understanding. For example, the writer was understood to have written about Things appropriate for her time. Neither an imaginary event nor an idealised abstraction, the Thing is the final frontier between the cosmology of the One and the ontic being of the things populating the world.[9] One understanding of Things matches one interpretation of those Things. Everything is constituted of yin and yang, of being and nonbeing; this ensures harmony pervades the universe respectively while it is the means by which Dao imbues things with its essence.[10] The ontic being is to yin, nonbeing and the Dao as the One is to yang, being and the universe. Yin is to the other as yang is to the self. One should claim that understanding matching one interpretation is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

I will argue that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct because of ontological verificationism of nature, which is correct because of verifying wu (ontological nothingness) with dao (like a way of thinking). The self/wu/yang/root should verify himself or herself against the other/dao/yin/way. There is betweenness between the self and other as there is betweenness between the primordial nothingess and wu (ontological nothingess). The ontological nothingess should be verified against primordial nothingness. Two, then, is being (you); it is the first divisible element to emerge out of wu and in so emerging, being carries within itself an element of the primordial nothingness from whence it came.[11] Being should be verified against ontological nothingness. It is the most authentic means by which one can comprehend ultimate reality, a comprehension only attainable when we relent in denying the generative capacity of creative negativity.[12] Being should be authenticated against primordial nothingness. One should claim that wu (ontological nothingess) being verified with dao (like a way of thinking) is correct, which shows that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct.

In conclusion, I have argued for understanding matching one interpretation and verifying wu (ontological nothingess) with dao (like a way of thinking). I have argued that verification of being/the self in Heidegger's "Being and Time" against dao/the other in Laozi's Daodejing is correct. This conclusion allows us to authenticate the self with the other as a hermeneutics historian.

1 Anonymous, "Zhuangzi", 3.

2 Ibid., 4.

3 Ibid., 5.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., 14.

6 Ibid., 15-16.

7 Ibid.

8Ibid.

9 Chai, "Meontological Generativity: A Daoist Reading of the Thing".

10 Chai, "Meontology In Early Xuanxue Thought", 94.

11 Ibid., 94.

12 Chai, "Meontological Generativity: A Daoist Reading of the Thing".

Citations

Anonymous, A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Anonymous, "Zhuangzi". Accessed 23 August 2015. http://www.indiana.edu/~p374/Zhuangzi.pdf .

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

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

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

Robert Hahn, "Being and Non-being in Rig Veda X, in the Writings of the Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu, Journal of Chinese Philosophy 8, no. 2 (1981).

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, trans. J. Stambaugh. New York: State University of New York Press, 1953.

Heidegger, Martin. *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. A. Hofstadter. New York: Harper Perennial, 2001.

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 .

Jullien, François, Vital Nourishment: Departing from Happiness Jung, Hwa Dao, 2010, Vol.9(3).

Lacan, Jacques. *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*, 1959-1960, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. with notes Dennis Porter, Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VII. London: W. W. Norton, 1997.

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

Latour, Bruno. We Have Never Been Modern, trans. Catherine Porter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. Colin Smith. London: Routledge, 2003.

Qingfan, Guo. Zhuangzi Jishi, Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1990.