

Triologue between Heidegger, Nietzsche, and Nāgārjuna
in Todtnauberg



By
Daniel Fidel Ferrer
You can take these as *ipsissima verba* of Daniel Fidel Ferrer
August 2011

Motto and muse:

As the sun arises every morning is both new and old, so it is with pondering the nature of philosophy and thinking.

In a cottage in the mountains of the Black Forest in southern Germany this imaginary story unfolds.

Not too far from here the famous physicist Albert Einstein (1879-1955) conducted thought experiments which undeniably lead to his theory of relativity. Example of this theory was that time was no longer absolute or uniform. The following philosophical dialogue between three philosophers is a thought experiment like Einstein's. Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) is the most written about 20th century philosopher. Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) is a critical thinker of the highest order, who proclaimed the death of God and is considered the last western metaphysician. He found Platonism everywhere. The Acharya Nāgārjuna (2-3d century AD) is perhaps the greatest single Indian philosopher; he is considered the greatest Buddhist thinker after the Buddha himself. Nāgārjuna although less famous than the other two philosopher, his audacious and unique eastern way of thinking may provide some fundamental solutions to Heidegger's and Nietzsche's stickler dilemmas; and their morass and entanglement in their western philosophical predicaments and knots. Should we say, Nāgārjuna will act as cutting the Gordian Knot? Philosophical conundrums and quandaries are based on the wrong assumptions and presuppositions. Heidegger in the 1925 lectures does an intricacy and stimulating analysis of different types of ambiguity. Many of these philosophical dilemmas live in the in-between of the labyrinth of ambiguity. Perhaps the three thinkers can overcome a little of their singularity and speak to thinking; and hence lead the fly out of Wittgenstein's bottle. Baruch Spinoza said that all things excellent are as difficult as they are rare. We will see if these three men can come to a meeting of the minds here on a cold day in southern Germany.

Nietzsche is well known to Heidegger.

Heidegger complained to his friends that Nietzsche kaput him, he actually said, "Er hat mich kaputt gemacht!" in English, "Nietzsche kaput me!" (broke me)". In his letter to Medard Boss dated August 16, 1960, he says "I am still stuck in the "abyss" of Nietzsche." He must have been working on his two volume set on Nietzsche which was finally published in 1961; at this point I hesitate to call them books. These two volumes are re-writing by Heidegger of his lectures on Nietzsche dating from the 1930s at the University of Freiberg. Accord to his friend and student Hans-Georg Gadamer; Elfrida Heidegger was very concerned about Martin having another mental break-down; so she asked Otto Pöggeler who was helping edited the volumes, to stop working on his two-volume study of Nietzsche. These autobiographical statements by Heidegger show his ongoing engagement (Auseinandersetzung) and struggle and fight with Nietzsche's critical stance. Heidegger in 1937 said, "to dare to come to grips with *Nietzsche* as the one who is nearest but to recognize that he is farthest removed from the question of Being." So, except for the ontological themes Nietzsche is indeed close to Heidegger. Both are strongly

anti-system thinkers – with Nietzsche taking the lead with a swarm of ideas and aphorisms; whereas Heidegger is just trying to open up the question of Being. Looking for the voice (Stimme des Seins) of Being and the shepherd of Being (Hirt des Seins) -- perhaps in all the wrong places. Is it just so, Socrates? This question and its question mark are often used by Plato in his dialogues to place the final question mark of thinking. This is the question mark which we would now call the reality check or the gut check. In a course (1934-35) on the great Hölderlin, Martin said, “Wer vieles beginnt, kommt oft nie zum Anfang” (Whoever often starts never gets to the beginning). This is a hard choice to make at the beginning.

Dramatis personas:

Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) owner of the ‘Die Hütte’.

Elfride (née Petri) Heidegger wife of Martin and use her inheritance money to build ‘Die Hütte’.

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900)

Archaya Nagarjuna 2-3th century AD Buddhist author of *Fundamental Verses on the Middle Way (Mulamadhyamakakarika)*. Mādhyamaka

Siddhartha Gautama, the Buddha (563-483 BC).

Socrates (Greek philosopher, 469 BC to 399 BC).

Plato (424BC - 348 BC), Greek philosopher who re-wrote the *Republic* seven time over.

Narrator

Scene 1. Die Hütte on the high hills overlooking Todtnauberg, black forest, in southern Germany.

In 1922, Martin Heidegger's wife Elfride Heidegger (née Petri) gave Martin Heidegger a present of a small cottage overlooking the minor mountain village of Todtnauberg in the Black Forrest. This is 16 miles from Freiburg, where Heidegger was living and teaching. Elfride used an advance of her father's inheritance money to buy a plot of land and paid a local carpenter to build the cottage. Because the depression money was rapidly becoming worthless and she thought it wiser to invest her share in real-estate. The land is small it is only 2-3 acres and for the farmer it was 'wet' and 'rocky', thus the farmer were interested in selling it. Win and win situation. Elfride designed the cottage herself. In August 1922 the family moved in the cottage. They had rented their own small apartment in Freiburg to Americans for the summer break. Heidegger worked on most of his writings at this mountain cottage. A large part of his most famous work, *Being and Time* (1927), was finished at a nearby farm house owned by Johann Brender where Martin had rented a room in a part of Todtnauberg called the Rütte. The two children, his sons were too noisy. By some calculations he spent about 10 years out of 50+ years at his cottage working on his philosophical writings. The German word "Hütte" means "hut", but in the general context I think it makes sense to call a "cottage" or a "cabin" in the woods. On the uphill side are the trees and woods, and then on the other downside you can see the distance valleys and ski slopes. It is a nice lovely place for a little philosophical reflection and thinking. There is a very small creek that runs alongside the cottage and the water continuously runs into a

hollowed out log that is used as a cooler for food. There is no running water inside. There are three small rooms inside. Supposedly, much of the actual building was done by Pius Schweizer. Two portraits hang on the walls the famous Alemannic poet Johann Peter Hebel (1760-1826) and great philosopher Friedrich Schelling. Karl Jasper had given Martin a copy of Schelling book on freedom that he took to hut. Heidegger said about the following about Schelling, that he was the “truly creative and boldest thinker of this whole age of German philosophy”. G.W.F. Hegel remarked about this work, “Schelling had made known a single treatise on Freedom. It is of a deep speculative nature, but it stands alone. In philosophy a single piece cannot be developed”. Heidegger was award the Johann Peter Hebel prize May 10, 1960 in Baden-Württemberg. Martin was often alone in the cottage for his thinking and writing.

Elfride did some skiing in the area during the winter of 1914 when she was a young student at Kiel. She stayed at a similar cottage skiing with her student friends. After her marriage in 1917 to Martin Heidegger she decided to have the cottage built as a place where her husband could work in all quietness and find his own way.

There is no driveway to die Hütte. Heidegger would often walk all the way there or sometime take a bicycle, there was also a train up to the nearby village of Todtnauberg. When Heidegger rejected his appointment to the University of Berlin for the second time in 1933, the University of Freiburg offered to pay for putting in electricity to the cottage, which was buried in the ground and came up from below. But there are no outside lights, no electric poles, or telephone lines. No cell phones, no smart phones, and no computers. Most likely, even no typewriters – Martin did not use one.

There are few modern conveniences, there is no refrigerator instead a very small cold creek that runs next to the Hütte and is used to cool milk, butter, and cheese. Nevertheless, great philosophers, thinkers, scientists, and poets like Edmund Husserl, Hans-Georg Gadamer, René Char, Jean Beaufret, Derrida, Jean-François Lyotard, Herbert Marcuse, Karl Löwith, Gerhard Ritter, Heinrich Petzet, Rudolf Bultmann, Werner Heisenberg, Rudolph Augstein, and Paul Celan; have joined Heidegger at this remote and secluded location to engage in moments of reflections. Many of Heidegger’s writing can be called in German: Hüttenbüchlein.

Nietzsche arrives.

The first snow fall had happen last night and the winter sun was shining when a figure appears at the door – Nietzsche arrives with his thick glasses and bushy mustache, and knocks on the doors and asked if Professor Heidegger was at home in a very formal manner. He says the old philologist is here. Nietzsche strode into view as he enters the Hütte. Heidegger offers Nietzsche some hot chocolate free of oil.

Nāgārjuna approaches.

In the distance a Buddhist monk wrapped in a monk’s yellow robe appears in the snow walking slowly and obviously cold and forlorn. Nāgārjuna looks right and left appears to be wandering

through the little woods leading up to the Hütte. Nāgārjuna walks up to the door and knocks, asking for Herr Heidegger in broken German.

Scene 2. Inside the Hütte. Fire in the stove provides some heat, warmth, and nourishing hot drinks. Winter.

There is a front room by the door, the Vorraum – where the boots and heavy winter coats are removed.

Nāgārjuna -- the south Indian pulls off his warm fur Tibetan hat (a Xamo Gyaise) and his completely shaven head appears and looks out of place on this cold winter day in southern Germany as he lays down his alms bowl (patra). He has come thousands of miles to engage in a dialogue with these two philosophers over nature of their thinking and especially their own impenetrable enigmas. Later he will give a seminar at the University of Freiburg on the nature of the Buddhist's nothingness or voidingness (Śūnyatā); but in the meantime, he came across a great distance to help these humans in need of relief from their suffering. Suffering is the basic stance, position, and fundamental factual condition of all humans for Buddhist. Heidegger is in his proverbial Heimat, his home against the homeless (Heimatlosigkeit) nature of modern life. Nietzsche is still a wander and meandering in his life, but he is looking for a home; whereas, Nāgārjuna is a Buddhist monk, who by definition is a homeless monk. He knows that no home is either needed or possible for us humans. Nāgārjuna came from a long ways from Nalanda in northern India but this is neither his home nor his homeland. Nāgārjuna had taught at the Buddhist University the ancient and famous Nalanda University in Bihar, India; when he taught there centuries ago there were some 10,000 students and 2,000 monks at the height of Buddhism in India. The background of 1000s of years of traditions and competing schools with different philosophical thoughts is part of the process. In Jainism the word and meaning of Anekāntavāda or multiplicity of viewpoints anekānta ("manifoldness") and vāda ("school of thought") dates back before even the Buddha.

Martin bends his head and says “**parnam - namaskar**” to the great teacher, the Archaya Nāgārjuna Indian Buddhist monk. You are welcome here. I meet once with a Thai monk Bikkhu Maha Mani and we had a wonderfully conversation about nothingness. That dialogue was in German, I understand you only speak English, Hindi, Sanskrit, and Telugu. I think English is the closest to German on that list. Heidegger turns to Nietzsche and says what about we carrying on our dialogue in English is that ok with you the old philologist?

Nāgārjuna bows his head deeply and says “**parnam - namaskar**” to you all.

Nietzsche turns and states briefly, I have not spent one good hour speaking German or with Germans, for myself I would have preferred French, but *saue qui peut* (every man for himself). As for Germans, Herr Goethe is the last German that I have any respect for and he died a long time ago. I wished I had written more in French.

Nietzsche remembers a poem he wrote in 1884, his poeticized homelessness in one draft calls the title of the poem of 'Homesickness'; and the ending words are:

Woe to the one who had no home! (Weh dem, der keine Heimat hat!). What we have here is godlessness, worldlessness, and homelessness.

In another note, I said:

We homeless ones from the beginning – we have no choice, we have to be conquerors and discoverers: so that we perhaps may bequeath to our descendants what we ourselves lack – that we bequeath a *home* to them. (1885-1886).

Martin says, I welcome you here in my home in the protection against the cold and snow.

Heidegger reminds us that the first western Sanskrit grammar was done by the German missionary Heinrich Roth, a native of Augsburg, who died in India in the city of Agra in 1668. Sanskrit is close to Greek and that makes an ideal language for philosophy, but I wish I knew more about Sanskrit and I hope to find out about the ontological difference in Sanskrit from Nāgārjuna. It is too bad we cannot speak in the classical Sanskrit of Pāṇini – it may help get to the ground and origins (**Ursprung**) of real onto-theo-logical thinking pre-metaphysics and pre-Christian – like the ancient Greeks before Socrates and Plato. I like the return to the first thinking before all of the assumptions have crept into our mind, which we called today the 'common sense' disease of metaphysical thinking or in most case the popular case now it is just called "philosophy". We have to move back before the common sense and abstract thinking of today to a time when thinking was "raw".

Nāgārjuna jokes and says, it is lucky in your conversations with the Japanese about nature of language that did not include the learning to play the shakuhachi or the Zen flute; that my friend would have taken you years to begin to play at all. But this may have led to a great awareness for you: the first step in Zen is that there is no Zen – the world is a Zenless place. To speak in sports metaphors think of a mindful aikido throw and ukemi. I too have spent time with the Japanese Buddhist. Nāgārjuna stands up and put out one hand: listen and you will hear that one hand clapping loudly – if you are ready. I wanted Aishwarya Rai to come and model for us as a one hand clapper; but apparently she is not coming. Martin you had away with women once upon time – no?

Nietzsche.

Nietzsche likes the mood of music. You know I played and wrote music for piano; but not for the Zen flute – I was certainly not ready at that time. The young Russian Ms. Lou von Salomé enjoyed my music too. Perhaps I have come a little further or at least a little closer. Like you were fond of talking about your great work *Being and Time* (1927) – which you have not gotten any further, something we might call empty progress. Oswald Spengler talks of Germany being a frontier against "Asia." Martin, did not you want to find out more about the Eastern philosophical world? Some illustrations of your western tradition connection and philosophers

with Eastern thinking: Christian Wolff, example: in 1721 Wolff delivered in Latin the ‘oratio de Sinarum philosophia practica’ at the University of Halle; Leibniz, Hegel, Schopenhauer, and of course I have praised Buddhism above Christianity since Buddhism is beyond our simple Christian concepts of good and evil.

The old philologist looks around for his hot chocolate and says that because of our faith in the Indo-European language’s grammar we still have this dreaded theology in our blood. Nietzsche turns to Heidegger and asks him, Martin where did you end up with this last God or last gods business after the 1930s? Nietzsche, his eyes gaze upper ward and starts looking up at the portrait of Schelling hanging on the wall.

Heidegger.

I will keep my silence on that question that is why I never wanted those thoughts published during my life time. When I said, “Only a God can save us,” I knew that there would be a lot of room for misunderstanding. Perhaps I was not a philosopher when I said those remarks. Although in 1964, I wrote, “One should avoid the impression that dogmatic theses are being stated in terms of a Heideggerian philosophy, when there is no such thing.” There is no soul in *Being and Time* and yet, I am still a religious person and I used an expression from Schelling, “the last God” to open a space that would allow for a dialogue about God [in his mind: How can I tell them how mixed I was throughout my life about religion? I wanted to be more than a philosopher doing western philosophy].

Narrator: Schelling wrote the remarkable words, “das Werden eines umgekehrten Gottes”. In English perhaps the sense of the words would be: become the reversible or inverted God. What aporia or perplexity from our great Schelling? Schelling genius was greater than his ability to actually write, he was always re-thinking everything.

Martin says, when I was working on Schelling, I once wrote, God lets the oppositional will of the ground operate in order that might be which love unifies and subordinates itself to for the glorification of the absolute. The will of love is about the will of the ground and this predominance, this eternal decidedness; therefore, the love for itself as the essence of Being (Wesen des Seyns) in general; this decidedness is the innermost core of absolute freedom.

Nietzsche gasps and mutters, just what I thought that the shadow of God is still playing on Plato’s cave no matter what has actually been said. You thought I -- (Nietzsche) was stuck with Plato – here you are with the metaphysical realm or the supersensuous world of Plato’s returning again. I found this theological instinct everywhere – no wonder I found it here again in Germany. Hence, the total corruption of German philosophy is by metaphysical theology which still lives in the soul of this one Herr Heidegger. Southern German’s the Swabians and their innocent lying and need I mention the historical school, the Tübinger Stift and their insidious theology everywhere, plus the whole ponderousness of the German scholar (oh, eek gods!).

Nietzsche said, “In relation to Plato, I am a thorough skeptic, and was never in the condition to add my voice to the chorus of praise, which is common among the learned people, for the *artist* Plato ... Plato throws ... all forms of style together, he is thus a *first* decadent of style ... Plato is boring ... my refreshment, my preference, my cure from all Platonism was always *Thucydides*.” *Twilight of the Idols, or, How to Philosophize with a Hammer Götzen-Dämmerung, oder, Wie man mit dem Hammer philosophirt*. Written in 1888. ‘What I Owe to the Ancients’.

Heidegger I wanted to cure Nietzsche of his deep-seated Platonism.

Nietzsche. Now, I really need some more hot strong tea, please if you have some.

Nāgārjuna takes a striking pose and says: no soul or an eternal soul, the Buddha was silent on this question for good reasons. It is completely beside the point of suffering (Sanskrit □□□□ duḥkha and in German the word is Leiden) and cessation of suffering for these humans on this planet. The Sanskrit word duḥkha should be linked to: impermanence (anicca) and not-self (anatta or a-natta). Martin wanted Being’s truth to have an ultimate value. I am not sure I understand the whole ‘value’ questions, since that has come up in Kant during the late 1700s, which was 1500 years after I had died. What does this mean the revaluation of all values? I do not give a value to suffering or its overcoming or cessation, or the blowing out of suffering by one person like the Buddha who means “awakened” or **bodhi** (Sanskrit: □□□□). It was like he got hit by lightning and was enlighten. But no self or no soul (**anatman**); hence, who was it that got enlightenment, since there is no one (no self) at home? In Sanskrit the Buddhist’s word is Sūnyatā for emptiness or nothingness. Whereas in the Chinese Daoist words can be xu or kong or taixu. For Daoist xu are connected to the words nonaction (wuwei) and nonthinking (wusi). Remember the Buddha spoke in Pāli and so much has been translated back and forth into Sanskrit, Hindi, Chinese, Japanese, and of course Tibetan; so we get the Buddha’s words in English or German that has come down over centuries of the art of hermeneutics and translation. But for most of ‘us’ the Buddha’s message is clear for suffering humans.

Nāgārjuna talks directly to Martin. Martin, you had Parmenides and impossibility of thinking of non-Being. Supposedly, he wrote: “neither could you know what is not nor could you declare it”. Indeed, the rest of the western philosophical history is: Plato’s dialogue the *Sophist* and stranger’s position about non-Being and the simple discussion of the semantics of non-Being; or Hegel’s view of non-Being in the *Science of Logic* which is only thought in the general context of progress of the methodology of the “circles of circles”. No wonder your remarks that “nothing nothings” (Das Nichts nichtet) is often thought of as your confusions. You started off with a chair with only one leg and that was unbalanced – this is the western approach which you had to deal with metaphysically. You got stuck too.

Nāgārjuna says on the way to here to the Black forest, I had an elegant dream of the Buddha coming to talk with me. I was actually asleep and dreaming -- but I dreamt, “I had awakened in the morning as was my normal custom to come down to the river Ajitavati and drink the cool water. As I turned to walk back up the hill I turned to see the Buddha walking down to the river, I assume to have a drink of cool water too. I turned to the Buddha and asked him if I could ask my deepest question. The Buddha laughed at me; he said there are no deep and hidden questions

for me as I am a simple man with a simple message: the four essential truths and you should follow the eight steps. Ok, go ahead and ask your question – now be mindful of what you wish for it might be your future to live with the answer. Nāgārjuna asks, what is the nature of the two truths? Sanskrit words: samvrtisatya and paramarthasatya? My statement of the ‘four essential truths’ and you should follow the correct ‘eight steps’ (āryāṣṭāṅgamārga). This statement is a different kind of truth of how to make ghee from butter or how to make masala chai – yes? The Buddha and Nāgārjuna started laughing – since everyone can hear this practical and concrete message, there is nothing esoteric here. The Tibetans have come up with eighteen kinds of emptiness and the Maitreya's Abhisamayalankara (Ornament of Clear Realization) says there are sixteen kinds of emptiness – which one is right? The Buddha laughed like no laughter I heard before. The scholarly mind always misses the point. Hence, that is why I was silent on these metaphysical questions – ask my elder friend Subhūti about silence. I saw the Buddha on Mount Holy Vulture with a bouquet of fig flowers in his hand; and only his friend Mahākāśyapa had a subtle smile and understands this simplest and unpretentious message. No words were spoken by the Buddha – obviously, for all good reasons. The cup needs to be empty and not full of “views” (no darśana).” My dream was part of my own personal awakening. The sound of the river of life.

Nietzsche walks over to Martin: you attacked my thoughts about value and value metaphysical systems and Nihilism too as some kind of subjectivity. We are humans and we use the rank of values to ascribe a value and a judgment to everything we encounter. Metaphysics in the past gave the foundation and ultimate support to our rank of values (God as the highest), I wanted to re-do that ranking and to put the meaning of the earth as the highest value and the overman above mere mankind. Plus, the old saw and words of the Christian God and blessed world, I wanted it to be gone! In fact, I need to wash my hands after coming into contact with these so called religious people. Image: wiping his hands dramatically in mid-air to make this his crucial point. Oh, sorry; sometimes I get carried away, please forgive me, you see that is why it was always best for me to write in private or on long walks in the country side. I did not mean to upset you; I appreciate your hospitality and did not mean to overstep the bounds of our dialogue and our attempts at thinking together. Nietzsche stands up and walks around the room a little and takes a few marching steps – I need to walk around and let my muscles celebrate.

Heidegger.

Martin laughs, very charming; your little personal problems are no interest to us. You wrote a note about misplacing your umbrella in one of your notebooks, and there has been no end of discussion about that written remark (Derrida's *Spurs*). What do you think about your umbrella remark now? It is funny no doubt, how little we really know about you as a teacher. You often lied in your letters about how sick you were, so the university would pay your stipend; and the whole story of rants against reading books when your personal letters suggest you were indeed reading a lot of books. So, Nietzsche we know that sometimes you are a little larger than life. In fact, I tried to put you center stage with the philosophical crowd of Germany and I even got

Jasper to think about you and write a book. We have to “acquire” you by first waking up great and creative adversaries. Your life is just a group of parables like mine. Philosophers no longer philosophize from issues or from out their life’s facticity; but only from the dusty books of their colleagues.

You know me too well, sir. At least, I did not suffer the same fate as that little ugly Socrates.

The old Philology Professor asks the question to Martin; can we know the will or just see the will in action?

Martin. The “will” is an ontological and ontic metaphysical confusion that I have been struck by and finally got the vaccine that saved my anti-metaphysical soul. Nietzsche you should have used your philological sharpness to see historical problems with Kant’s and Schopenhauer’s confusions about the concept of the ‘will’ including the will to life, will to power, and I call just the will to will. On one hand, Nietzsche you were the beginning of a new way of anti-metaphysical thinking; and yet, on the other hand – you were seriously stuck in the myriad of Platonism and reaction against it; plus, you did not twist your way free of planetary Nihilism (thanks to Ernst Jünger’s for his insight).

Nietzsche. Are you suggesting that the concept of “will” is no longer available for us philosophers or should I put on my classical philological hat now?

Nāgārjuna. This will is just action of the intellect – so, a part of the confusing with the activity of the western philosophical core concept of spirit – right? You think there is a spirit in the person and nature that drives the rational spirit. Hegel has this idea in spades – no? More non-sense stuff with no practical importance to gain enlightenment – and certainly just an albino and empty metaphysical concept made up by someone. Spirit and souls – no wonder you western philosophers are the hand maidens of Christian theology and eschatology. Unless you do yoga (**yogash-citta-vrtti-nirodhah**) your mind is active and it is best to rid yourself of the suffering that comes out of your mind’s activity that leads to suffering. Patanjali’s *Yoga Sutras*’s (200 AD) second sutra is this definition of what is the essential nature of yoga. Namely, in Sanskrit the words are: yogash-citta-vrtti-nirodhah or yoga is the cessation of the fluctuation of the mind-stuff. Clear your mind of all of that ‘stuff’ that is overburden you with the heaviness – be rather light on your feet and in your mind. Martin and Friedrich, now do you see why the Buddha was silent on these kinds metaphysical questions? The question: is there eternal soul – deserves no answer; hence, the Buddha’s silence. Do not make up a conundrum here, since there is none.

Martin. Is for you not to say – yes?

Nāgārjuna. Right, your study of the history of philosophy or the meta-historical analysis shows the endless views and worldviews that have made up your western occidental philosophy. I call that a terrible sickness and disease of holding on to views. Philosophy is not about constructing worldviews (examples of: Kantian, realism, leftist, liberal, ethical, or right-wing). Why one view

or another view? In the west you have caught this dreaded disease and you seem to have little idea of treatments and a cure. Traditionally the six schools (āstika) of Hindi philosophy are called: darshanas which means ‘views’. The old Sanskrit term for a "philosopher" is the word: **dārśanika**. Catch the drift of these Sanskrit words? Philosophy in general as just a ‘worldview’ is indeed a very old notion or idea. Both in the eastern and western philosophy this needs to be totally rejected now, no more fear of flying – just fly.

Friedrich. Yes. I tried to write about physics as just an interpretation and the fundamental issue of perspectivism. Most if not all philosophers suffer from paradigm paralysis and group-think. The whole idea of –isms (even perspectivism) or –ismology does not get to the matter for thinking, since it just another worldview of how to deal with a whole set of philosophical questions and of course mostly it just “provides” so called ‘answers’ to these questions. But my friends: Lu Xun in China 1907, Karl Popper, Freud, Jung, Jasper, Adorno, Spengler, Mann, Hesse, Jünger, Sartre, Foucault, Deleuze, Derrida, Dali, Picasso, and even this funny little guy Feyerabend; yes, they all took and stole my ideas. Incommensurability – oh, really? Come on where did this all begin? With me – [I am] Nietzsche of course. I was born posthumously...so many have read me cover to cover – no? Influence others – not my idea. I could not contain my thoughts, since they were much too powerful to remain unspoken. Martin maybe you and the Buddha could be silent, but I did not have that kind of awful strength of will.

Martin. My meta-history of philosophy was to find the single ontology and the same thought in all of the great philosophers. To find one comprehensive ontology or the lost and covering up of Being as Being and the whole process of redefinition as just a general universal. My best example is Hegel’s *Science of Logic*, book one the doctrine of Being, Being (Sein) as just indeterminate immediacy, the empty and pure nothing. Rather, my Being is the rich fullness and it is not empty.

Nāgārjuna looks around and an idea comes to his mind from his study of the greatest of Hindu philosopher the Ādi Śāṅkarācārya. Martin it seems like your notion of Being is the full Being, unlike and opposite of Hegel, and is it just like the Vedanta’s Brahman. Can that be right? Gut check.

Nietzsche looks at Martin and pronounces: ontology and concept of Being is just an empty fiction. You know I am on the side of Heraclitus who was forever right on this question mark.

Narrator. In fact, Nietzsche attacked all of this as the lie of unity, the lie of thinghood (Dinglichkeit), of substance, of permanence. The philosopher’s "Reason" is the reason that falsifies our true testimony of the senses. That Being is an empty, blank, void, vacuously and is just a fiction or in German: Dass das Sein eine leere Fiktion ist. Hegel and Nietzsche are on the same side for a change – wow, such a thing we should keep track of and write down. Is it just so, Socrates?

Martin standing up. Friedrich do you want some more tea and Nāgārjuna what would like to drink? Martin pours himself some wine, some German Markgräfler today.

Friedrich. I will some take some hot cocoa now; since it is too late for tea. I will never sleep if I have tea this late in the day. I ask you, Martin why all of this hidden forests hut and so much provincialism in your appearance? You know there are these funny remarks of how you were dressed when you were in conversation with Ernst Cassirer in Davos, Switzerland in March 1929. You were dressed as a peasant and Ernst had on a three piece suit. Let us just say it was a clash of cultures. Jimmy Buffett's Margaritaville versus the wall-street types. Did you belong to the Wandervögel movement is that why you were dress like that? Martin did you want to become a Gauleiter or like your teacher Joseph Sauer (1872-1949) the Papal House Prelate? Yes, I know.

Addressing Martin, Nietzsche says, I wrote this note in (1883-1888).

“The most universal sign of the modern age: man has lost dignity in his own eyes to an incredible extent. For a long time the center and tragic hero of existence in general; then at least intent on proving himself closely related to the decisive and essentially valuable side of existence--like all metaphysicians who wish to cling to the dignity of man, with their faith that moral values are cardinal values. Those who have abandoned God cling that much more firmly to the faith in morality.”

Martin – you philologist, you are really attacking me now. My most hidden and sensitive thoughts are being pounced on by you.

Nāgārjuna. Just some warm water for me. The British brought tea to India from China long after I was in India. There is no tea traditionally in India; it was just used as a drug in traditional medicine in India which is called Ayurveda medicine. The East India Company started the first tea plantations in the lovely hill stations of Assam in 1835. These are high up and yet merely in the foothills of the Himalayas. I will return to Assam and help those gorgeous tea pickers by giving the gift of the Buddha's message.

Martin. The historical destiny of philosophy culminates in the recognition of the necessity of making Hölderlin's word be heard. Nietzsche, did you hear that in poetic thinking (song of fate: Schicksalslied) of Hölderlin? Hölderlin will save us. Or, is it Hölderlin will save us?

Nietzsche. There is no prophet here. The irony is the fate of Germany was decided long before you born. Do not look to the past – forward to the future now! Even I had to read Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872) on the nearness of the future.

Martin. I one time said “all philosophy from first to last merely unfolds its presupposition (Voraussetzung or Vor-aussetzung)”; and I find it an important methodological point to start

with all of our presuppositions and to bring into question any of our foundational principals. This is not in the context of the Frege-Strawson tradition or the Karttunen/Schlenker presuppositions, since I am talking about metaphysical systems, philosophical schools, founders of philosophical traditions, and all of these crazy philosophical worldviews. Maybe just ontology as a viewism?

Nietzsche asks Martin what about ethics and morality?

Martin. As I have said, “I have already indicated that psychologism as a theory has not restricted itself to logic but has already played a role in ethics and aesthetics, insofar as people attempted to apprehend and understand the problem of ethics and aesthetics from psychology. Husserl’s criticism was directed essentially at psychologism in logic, although his criticism occasionally touch in passing on basic questions in ethics. In that context, Husserl shows that every ethics claims to be a science of norms, a science of correct acting, analogous to logic as science of the norms of correct thinking. Therefore it presupposes as theoretical discipline as the foundational discipline for a normative science of norms – and that science cannot be psychology. Rather, just as logic deals with pure content of propositions, so analogously ethics must deal with pure content of norms, that is, values. In other words, Husserl’s and critique of psychologism also opened the path to a critique of values. Max Scheler (1874-1928) has taken up this question, and in the field of ethics or practical philosophy has constructed an ethics of value.” (November of 1925). This is my ethics or am I just confused?

Nāgārjuna – please Martin; you are still working out a philosophical project as worldview, metaphysical goal setting, fate, and creating a value system or even an ethics – hence, everything you say you want to really drop and then get on with non-metaphysical thinking and in your case the second thinking of Being; but instead you are still stuck like a fly in the philosophical bottle looking for the way out. Look around for once: there is no Wittgenstein’s bottle. Or is it rather like a geometer’s nightmare: the Klein bottle? Felix Klein (1882) thought up a true four dimensional bottle with no inside, or is it no outside? Two Möbius loops are used to create a bottle that does not really exist; so image being inside a Klein bottle and no way out. “What is your aim in Philosophy? -- To show the fly the way out of the fly-bottle” (*Philosophical Investigations*, #309) by Wittgenstein. Was ist dein Ziel in der Philosophie? What is the target, goal, aim, purpose, finish or point of Philosophy? So asked the famous Wittgenstein. For us Buddhist there is no bottle – but the way forward is the four truths and eightfold path toward Nirvāṇa (निर्वाण).

Narrator:

Golessness is sometime translated from German as aimlessness. Nietzsche first used this term in 1875, and last time in a note from the Fall of 1887 – for twelve years. For Nietzsche the word ‘golessness’ (**Ziellosigkeit**) is a form and basic belief of Nihilist (*Will to Power*, #25). Heidegger wrote in the *Contributions*, “Nihilism in Nietzsche’s sense means that all goals are

gone”. Later in this paragraph he talks of ‘admit the goal-lessness’ and then believing again in goals, for example: the folk (people), movies, seaside resort vacations. On the other hand, he also talks about his own goals in the *Contributions*; Heidegger remarks about the goal is just “seeking”. In *Contributions* he goes on to say, “In this way the inceptual mindfulness of thinking becomes necessarily genuine thinking, i.e., a thinking that sets goals. What gets set is not just any goal, and not the goal in general, but the one and only and thus singular goal of our history. This goal is the seeking itself, the seeking of Being (Seyn).” Heidegger is seeking a worldview of Being, the value of the highest is Being, the goal is seeking for fullness of Being. See what is the fundamental conundrum and riddle here for us now?

Martin speaks, in *Mindfulness (Besinnung)* (1938/39) I am no longer talking about goals but I say in the poetic introduction “We do not know goals and are only a pathway.” Indeed, the whole notion of goals requires the will to a goal or even just a will; so as we are moving the will to power or the will to will out of metaphysics; hence, this means that process of setting goals also has to be left behind. He clearly saw this issue in the *Considerations (Überlegungen)* X section 52 according to Richard Polt’s review.

In terms of culture, this is seen in the goals setting of such ideals as: Plato’s *Republic*, Karl Marx’s communist utopia or during in 1930s in Germany the so called “Thousand-Year Empire“. Nietzsche was critical of the improvers of mankind in *Twilight of Idols* and other idols or ideals. Can we will non-willing as such? I no longer will a goal. A few days before Martin death in 1976, he came up with the motto for his collected writings (*Gesamtausgabe*), he engraved the words: “Wege – nicht Werke”. Ways – not works. In the summer of 1946 when the city of Freiburg was a mess, I (Martin) started working with the Chinese philosopher, Paul Shih-yi Hsiao here at the cottage on translating from Chinese into German the famous book *Tao Te Ching, Dao De Jing, or Daodejing (道德經)* – hence, Tao as the way. I learned much from the Chinese philosophy, but because of the difference in languages I was always afraid to step in to the deep. Crib a few notes – no?

Martin stands and starts to peer into the distance out the window of the Hütte, he finally says solemnly: the goallessness will not go away by its own account in any of our thinking. Can we affirm without a will, generally speaking no goals at all – how does that compress our way of doing philosophy? Can we just dismember the common sense view of philosophy now?

Nietzsche, I once wrote: The entire idealism of mankind hitherto is on the point of changing suddenly into nihilism--into the belief in absolute valuelessness (Wertlosigkeit), i.e., meaninglessness (Sinnlosigkeit). (*Will to Power*, #617). Active Nihilism affirms the goallessness and affirms life without goals or values. Incomplete Nihilism is when revelations of values are incomplete or just when old values are re-inverted, which is the flip flop of core values. The idea of complete Nihilism no longer needs the concept of values at all. Nihilism has the will to the continuing return of nothingness-ing, valuelessness-ing, and goallessness-ing. We must take all the Indo-European languages abstract nouns and turn them in verbs, since we live

in a ‘verbing’ world of process and change. Hegel, Nietzsche, Whitehead, the Hopi Indians in the southwest, they all want us to reject abstract and static nouns, since all is becoming. Our language makes us confused about the world. Johann Herder (1744-1803) made some progress on this knot. Remember our real world without the Indo-European grammar: Heraclitus said you cannot step twice in the same river.

I am getting uptight. Heidegger goes on to say, I see in every western metaphysical system is indeed a system of value-estimations. I also remarked, to think against values therefore does not mean to beat the drum for valueslessness and nullity of beings. Values started with Plato and the ideal and/or the idea (ἰδέα) of the Form of the Good (τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἰδέαν, agathon); and idea of values is now at the historically end of western philosophy with Nietzsche and his revaluation of all values. But what is really next for us?

Game on! Nietzsche says.

Nāgārjuna looks around and says, are shitting me? Both of you should not get locked up with this stuff. Rid your minds of this crap. I know it sounds like a lapidary (made of stone) statement; but get with the program would you. Sometimes western philosophy is just simply gnarly with your disease and it ends up with just punching your way out of a paper bag. You and Sisyphus keep rolling the rock up the hill – creating these endless views and worldviews.

Narrator.

In 1932, Martin penned the words, "There is no point of viewlessness, there is only choice of point of view, strength of point of view, and courage of point of view." Supposedly, Heidegger came up with the German word “Ansichtslosigkeit”. There is an interesting Sanskrit word that is related: adṛṣṭavādinī translated as notviewism or nonviewism, Made by a- prefix meaning not, and dṛṣṭi - view, vādinī or vādin which translation to –ism or school (doctrine or theory). The German word: Ansichtslosigkeit-ismus = (in Sanskrit adṛṣṭavādinī) or, notviewism, nonviewism, viewless-ism, or viewlessness-ism.

Nāgārjuna stands up and says he needs some food and looks around for his alms bowl. Martin states, just sit down; I will get some food for all of us. Nāgārjuna looks a bit fatigued.

Nāgārjuna exclaims – I really like it when Martin’s German ends up with a Sanskrit word. I know, I know it is just a few words but it is remarkable that it is your German word and the Sanskrit term are pointing and indicating to us – what is the core of the Buddha’s viewlessness as our path. Both of should get on the bandwagon now.

Nietzsche says, the last time, I was in wagon with *anyone* was in Lucerne with my gorgeous lovely young Russian friend Ms. Lou von Salomé with a whip in her hand and my other friend Paul Rée during the spring in May 1882. There is a photo of us. But for the final record: I do not join any group or any organization at all. Some join groups like some kind of Socialism and formal religions. Even the Amish are better than getting involved in structured groups.

Obviously, all of those notions are for the hopeless sheep; and I am always in first and foremost a hawk or a flying eagle – singular, unique, distinct, and just me. Is this in the Promenade of the puzzle?

Heidegger whispers in a soft voice, “Yet we must heed one thing: this standpoint of freedom-from-standpoints is of the opinion (Meinung) that it has overcome the one-sidedness and bias of prior philosophy, which always was, and is, defined by its standpoints. However, the standpoint of Standpointlessness (Standpunktslosigkeit) represents no overcoming (Überwindung). In truth it is the extreme consequence, affirmation, and final stage of that opinion concerning philosophy which locates all philosophy extrinsically in standpoints that are ultimately right in front of us, standpoints whose one-sidedness we can try to bring into equilibrium.”

In another place, in 1932; I wrote these words and thoughts on standpointlessness:

“The desire to philosophize from the standpoint of standpointlessness, as a purportedly genuine and superior objectivity, is either childish, or, as it usually the case, disingenuous...Not freedom from any standpoint (something fantastic), but the right choice of standpoint, the courage to a standpoint, the setting in action of a standpoint and holding out within it, is the task: a task, admittedly, which can only be enacted *in* philosophical work...”

Some years before, during 1928 -- I had tried to make the point essentially: Heidegger says: *philosophy is a stance, not a standpoint*. I often thought of historical Socrates before Plato had his total way with him.

Martin goes in to the other room and comes back with some cheese and bread. Sits down at the table with his friends. Getting colder in the evening now.

Nietzsche says, “this looks good to eat. I am a bit tired and exhausted.” Nietzsche goes on and says, in 1886 I drank cognac twice; but before in December 1882, Lou’s created such darkness for me I took opium; but now I am cured of that darkness. Like the singer Madonna I needed to re-invent myself; and hence transformed my thinking into my wonderful *Zarathustra* and in ten days I wrote the first part. With regard to Lou and Rée, I once wrote, “In every conversation between three people, one person is superfluous and therefore prevents the depth of the conversation.” I was mistaken to make that a general rule, because our experience today has convinced me that three minds are indeed better than two.

As they are sitting down at the table, Nāgārjuna looks at the food on his plate, and asks – what is this white stuff on the plate?

Martin states, this is cheese – made from cow’s milk. [Doppelrahmstufe].

Nāgārjuna – we do not have this type of cow cheese in India, but it is good and tasty with the bread. When I was a child, I eat some delicious paneer cheese made from buffalo’s milk and

once some tasty sutra paneer – cheese, but that was a long time ago. Maybe some more black pepper to go with the cheese – this food in Germany is so bland. Hot water for me – please, it is quite cold here.

Heidegger pronounces: being here with you both now reminds me of the story that my precious Greek philosopher Aristotle wrote down: ‘Heraclitus said to some strangers who wanted to come visit him. Having arrived, they saw him warming himself at a stove. Surprised, they stood there in consternation—above all because he encouraged them, the astounded ones, and called them to come in, with the words, ‘For here too the gods come to presence’ (in *De partibus animalium*). The cottage (Die Hütte) has brought the two of you here and now I have to ponder and reconsider what calls for thinking.

Nietzsche says I have enjoyed spending some time with the both of you. For me, I would rather quote the great Horace from his letter, where he says: “Time will bring to light whatever is hidden; it will conceal and cover up what is now shining with the greatest splendor”. Thinking and learning may bring unconcealment.

Nāgārjuna takes out a fig fruit from under his monk robe and opens the fig up; and holds up a rare udumbara flower... he has a mysterious and exalted smile on his face....but says nothing.



Todtnauberg.
Southern Germany in the black forest.
Photo looking west from the Heidegger’s cabin.