

Pawle, R. "The Ego in the Psychology of Zen: Understanding Reports of Japanese Zen Masters on the Experience of No-Self." In Mathers, D., Miller, M., & Ando, O. (Eds.). (2009). *Self and No-Self: Continuing the Dialogue Between Buddhism and Psychotherapy*. London: Routledge, pp. 45-55.

Abstract

This chapter focuses on understanding the Zen term "no-self" from a psychological perspective. The basis of the analysis is reports of five Japanese Zen masters on what is the living of no-self. First significant gaps between Western psychology and the psychology of Zen are considered. Particular importance is given to the different understandings of significance of mind functioning as subject and object. Next the "no" of no-self is examined. This "no" has both positive and negative meanings, both of which are discussed. Importance is given to the understanding that mind is not limited to subject-object mental functioning. Next reports from the Zen masters on the living of no-self are examined from a psychological perspective. Following this the relationship of no-self and ego are focused on. In living no-self there is a natural, healthy ego in the psychology of Zen as well as dysfunctional ego that is the source of psychological suffering. The Zen masters' descriptions of the living of this healthy ego and the "death" of this dysfunctional ego are examined. The ego is identified as the key or pivotal function of mind and this is discussed. The Zen understanding of the role of attachment in mind is considered; how it is natural and healthy, but easily becomes pathological. Finally psychological healing in Zen is briefly considered, with the role of attention being examined. Importance is given to "free attention," attention that is not fixated or stuck, but rather is available as needed according to circumstances. How attention can be worked with in psychotherapy is discussed.

The Ego in the Psychology of Zen: Understanding Reports of Japanese Zen

Masters on the Experience of No-self

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to facilitate dialogue between Japanese Zen Buddhism and Western psychology. The theme of the Kyoto 2006 conference on Self and No-Self in psychotherapy and Buddhism was chosen to facilitate such a dialogue. This goes right to the heart of what is perhaps the fundamental difference between the mainstream of Western psychology and the tradition of Buddhism. Western psychology has commonly understood mental states as necessarily having a subject and an object. Franz Brentano, for example, asserted that all mental states are of or about something, so each mental state necessarily has a 'reference to a content' or 'direction toward an object' (Brentano 1973: 88). This is a good description of how mind functions as subject and object. Carl Jung also understood consciousness and mind as basically functioning within subject-object and asserted that this subject was the ego. One of Jung's main criticisms of Buddhism (and yoga) was what he understood as the goal of eliminating the ego in order to attain no-self. Jung viewed this as impossible. He asserted that if the ego was eliminated, the result was not no-self, but rather only absorption by the unconscious (Clarke 1994: 146-149).

However, Buddhism has for centuries insisted that it is precisely subject-object mental states that are the source of mental pathology and that the transcending of these mental states is full psychological healing, or in the terminology of Buddhism, realization and enlightenment. An example in the tradition of Buddhism is the writings of

Vasubandhu from the Yogacara school. Vasubandhu in his *The Thirty Verses* begins by defining the problem that is to be addressed as “consciousness divided as subject and object” and then proceeds through the text to address how subject-object consciousness can be transcended (Kochumuttom 1982: 128-134). Thus, while Western psychology has commonly held that mind without ego results in some kind of mental pathology, Buddhism and Zen have asserted the opposite - that ego consciousness can be transcended and this transcendent consciousness is actually a clearer and more functional consciousness than ego consciousness. In Zen terminology this transcendent consciousness without ego is referred to ‘no-self.’

Gaps Between Japanese Zen Buddhism and Western Psychology

Before exploring ego and no-self further, I think it is important to be aware of some of the basic differences between Zen and psychology. Having a meaningful dialogue is not an easy endeavor as there are wide discipline, cultural, and experiential gaps.

First, Zen Buddhism is a religion and not a psychology. Remembering this is important. Zen does not attempt to explain how mind works in the way that Western psychology attempts to do. For example, psychological development is never addressed in Zen or in Buddhism as a whole. This is not a limitation of Zen and Buddhism, as some in the West have asserted (Engler 1998: 118), but is rather a result of Zen’s function as a religion. Zen also does not try to work with the range of psychological pathologies that Western psychology attempts to address. Zen monasteries are not mental hospitals. Because of these and other differences, I think to say that there is a ‘Zen psychology’ is inaccurate. There is a psychology within Zen that

is in some ways clearly stated, but in other ways only implicit. Thus, it is more correct to say that there is a 'psychology of Zen.'

Another significant gap between Zen and Western psychology is cultural. Zen is embedded in an East Asian cultural context that is very different from the cultural context within which psychology began and has developed. One result of this is that the use of the same term can have different meanings in the different disciplines. Particularly relevant to this point is the fact that when Zen practitioners speak of ego, they may or may not be speaking of the same thing that Western psychologists speak of when using the same term.

A third significant gap between Zen and Western psychology is epistemological. It is commonly asserted in Zen that only a person who has realized the truth of the Buddhist teachings can really understand these teachings. I have been often told this. Thus, the question arises: How is it possible for a 'nonenlightened' psychologist to understand 'enlightened' Zen experience? While there are many possible responses to this question, including the analysis that it is only social opportunism (Faure 1991: 21-23), my response is that it is particularly relevant to methodological issues.

Since there are so many gaps between Zen and Western psychology, I believe to understand the psychology of Zen, it is first necessary to understand mind from the Zen point of view. In cross-cultural psychology this is an 'emic methodological approach,' by which the researcher tries to understand in terms of the local frame of reference. My belief is that Zen not understood from the inside is Zen not fully understood. Thus, the methodological approach of this paper is fundamentally

experiential. The basic source material for my ideas comes from interviews I did with Japanese Zen priests regarding their experience of no-self and ego (Pawle 2003).

The 'No' of No-self

Let us begin with the end of Zen training, which is the living of no-self. I have often heard it said that true Zen practice does not begin until realization of one's true self. The living of this realization in life, in the midst of daily life, is what Zen really is. The practice that a person does which leads to this living is Zen training. And, according to Zen, central to this realization of one's true self is the realization that one's self is actually not a self in the usual understanding of the term. In Zen terminology the true self is a 'no-self.' Let us examine some descriptions of no-self.

Keido Fukushima Roshi described no-self as 'the self of *mu*' and said living no-self can be described as 'being oneself *mu*, nothing' (Pawle 2003: 218). *Mu* is a Japanese syllable that functions as the negating part of the word, as in 'no-mind,' *mu-shin* (無心) in Japanese. Fukushima Roshi said he uses the Japanese syllable *mu* rather than the English word 'no' because 'no' does not convey the meaning of *mu* (Pawle 2003: 107).

To understand the Zen meaning of *mu* it is first necessary to understand that *mu* does not mean literal nothingness or emptiness as many interpret it. It rather means, in the words of Sekkei Harada Roshi, "It's not that it is a literal void, it's just that the mind cannot perceive it" (Pawle 2003: 99). In other words, the self of *mu* is not a self that the mind can perceive or describe. Rather, it is empty of such perceptions or descriptions. Edward Conze, a Buddhist scholar, wrote similarly: "The Buddha never taught that the self 'is not,' but only that it cannot be apprehended" (Conze 1970: 39).

There are two meanings in these statements as to what no-self, or the self of *mu* is: one a negation and the other an affirmation. The negation is what the self is not, or, in other words, what one's actual self is empty of. Zen often speaks in such negative terms. One significance of this is the limits of the human mind, important for psychologists to remember. Every time I pass through the Osaka International Airport I am reminded of this. The drug-sniffing dogs there have the perceptual ability to smell drugs inside luggage, but I as a human do not. The affirmative meaning of *mu* is what the self is. It is something, but what it actually 'is' is very hard to say, due to the limits of mind and language. Maybe one could say the self is limitless because it is outside the perceptual abilities of mind.

The self of *mu* combines both these negative and affirmative meanings. Fukushima Roshi described this in the following way: "I think it's better just to keep it as *mu* because of the experiential sense, it has both senses, not just nothing" (Pawle 2003: 107). This is the sense of *mu* that is in the *Heart Sutra*, one of the basic texts of Zen, which states, "Form is no other than emptiness, emptiness is no other than form" (Sasaki 1974). This means that, according to the psychology of Zen, the self both is something and at the same time is limitless, thus not being a thing. Thus, the term no-self, the 'self of *mu*,' points to both being and non-being together at the same time.

Clearly there is a reluctance on the part of Zen masters to say clearly what is no-self. However, when pushed, a couple of Zen masters did describe it in their respective ways. One was Harada Roshi, describing it as 'mysterious.' He said, "It is important, there is something and it's mysterious." He then admonished me, rather than to try to over-analyze it, to "leave it just being mysterious" (Pawle 2003: 1).

A second description was directed at my own notions of no-self as some kind of literal emptiness and really surprised me. Gikan Nakajima Roshi described emptiness as 'life.' I asked him, "Are you sure you mean life?" He affirmed that he did and further said, "The Zen sect relies upon life itself, the unthinkable life itself. Zen training is the investigation of how life works within his or her self" (Pawle 2003: 107). From this description I take a risk in saying that the 'self of *mu*,' or no-self, is the activity of life within a person, or is limitless, or is anything. Fundamentally, the self of a person cannot be known. It is truly 'mysterious.'

The Living of No-self

So having understood no-self a little, how do Zen masters describe the living of no-self? What does it mean psychologically for mind to function as no-self?

Returning again to Fukushima Roshi, he explained that the living of no-self is living freedom of mind in the Zen sense, which is "freedom to, not freedom from" (Pawle 2003: 122). 'Freedom from' is the common understanding of freedom as freedom from some kind of oppressive force, which psychologically could be negative environmental influences. 'Freedom to' is not freedom from anything, but rather is the psychological ability to be free to function as is needed, as is appropriate, in any situation. In a negative sense 'freedom to' means that any of the functions of one's mind are not bound or limited by another part of mind. A common example in Buddhism of not having 'freedom to' is to perceive something from one's personal point of view and not being able to perceive this thing as-it-is. In this context no-self is freedom of activity and is not an entity in any way. Another way of living no-self is being emptiness. Harada Roshi described this when talking about how the five senses function as no-self:

It's no different than seeing the morning star or seeing a flower or hearing a sound, where two things that do not have substance melt together. That's the self or the thing hearing it and the thing that was heard. Both things have no substance. So in that instant those things became one.

(Pawle 2003: 214)

In this activity one's independent or separate self disappears. No-self in this sense is an ability of mind to function in such a way as to allow for mental states to lose their person-based characteristics and their characteristic of subject perceiving object. Having 'no substance' refers to mind being able to function without a fixed sense of self. Subject-object mental states can disappear and a mental state of oneness can arise.

This mental state, using Brentano's words quoted at the beginning of this chapter, is without "reference to a content" or "direction toward an object" (Brentano 1973: 88). This is one psychological understanding of emptiness, a mental state empty of reference points and a direction. This is a potential of mind that is crucial to the psychology of Zen, for it gives a person the possibility of dropping their self-centered orientation, to be truly open psychologically, and to experience from a perspective that is much bigger than a limited personal one.

A mental state of oneness of self and environment allows for the flowering of compassion in the Buddhist sense. Nakajima Roshi described the experience of this in the following way:

Everything can be seen as me. So when you see the flower, the flower is mine and the flower is me. Therefore we say it's the great self, the self expanded to

the universe. So even though I feel pain, this pain is not originally from my self. I also accept pain from others. So if you're painful, I can feel your pain.

(Pawle 2003: 113-114)

From the perspective of the psychology of Zen this is optimal functioning of mind.

Living no-self, rather than negating life or withdrawing from life, is full participation in life. No-self is mind that is flexible - its faculties functioning optimally, not being restricted by the limits of those faculties, able to respond appropriately in each circumstance.

The Ego and No-self

The common way of talking about the ego in Zen is in negative terms, particularly in terms of something that needs to be eliminated. Jung and much of Western psychology, as mentioned earlier, have viewed eliminating the ego as pathological. So the question arises: Are Zen and psychology talking about the same thing?

It should be quickly clear to anyone who talks to a Zen master who speaks about the living of no-self, that much of what Western psychology commonly attributes to the ego is very much alive in this living. For example, regarding identity, such Zen masters know who they are! They also are able to coordinate and carry out their actions, so obviously there is a part of their minds that is functioning in some kind of executive way. This kind of functioning of mind in Zen is not spoken of as the ego as it is in psychology, but is rather considered to be part of the natural functioning of mind. In Tibetan Buddhism this is referred to as the 'mere self' (Hayward and Varela 2001: 118). In Zen this is a part of what is referred to as 'everyday mind', and is part of living no-self. An example of this in Zen literature is case 19 of the *Mumonkan*, in which the Chinese Zen

teacher Nansen (748-835 A.D.) talks of ordinary mind as the Way of Zen (Huikai 1977: 73). In the psychology of Zen I refer to this as the ‘natural ego.’

In Zen, the ego is spoken of commonly as something that is a hindrance to the living of no-self. Thus, its elimination is viewed as an important step in psychological development. An example is Fukushima Roshi describing living no-self as “a way of living without ego. It’s the experience of having the ego cut off” (Pawle 2003: 195). Other Zen priests also spoke in similar ways. Nakajima Roshi spoke of ‘killing’ the ego, Kanju Tanaka Roshi spoke of his ego “disappearing,” Sodo Yasunaga Roshi said the “old ego bursts and explodes,” and Harada Roshi spoke of the “death of his ego” (Pawle 2003: 206-223).

Earlier I quoted Harada Roshi who described the process of becoming one, in which subject and object merge and a mental state of oneness appears. He continued his description regarding becoming one by saying, “If there is a thought that there is a self on this side, it’s not possible for that [oneness] to happen. We think that there is a self here on this side, so this merging does not happen” (Pawle 2003: 214). This self that Harada Roshi refers to here is what Zen usually understands as the ego. The ego in Zen is that which is extra to the natural ego and interferes with the natural functioning of mind. The natural ego is a function of a certain kind of consciousness and is not needed for all types of consciousness. The ego in Zen is that type of consciousness which asserts that it must always be present, thereby preventing mental states that result from the merging of subject and object.

The Pivotal Role of the Ego in Mind

The psychology of Zen asserts that the ego, with its tendency to interfere in the living of no-self, is the pivotal or crucial function in mind. Fukushima Roshi asserted, “Without getting rid of ego we cannot move on. I mean that’s the basis of it. It’s fundamental” (Pawle 2003: 235). Zen agrees with the assertion of Western psychology that the ego, with functions such as identity and executor, has a central function in mind. Zen additionally asserts that the ego, having this central function, can influence or ‘tilt’ (Guenther 1989: 30) the whole system of mind. Thus, all of mind is affected by how the ego is functioning. An example is the Buddhist understanding of emotion, which is that emotion has an inherent evaluative quality. Thus, emotions are pleasant, unpleasant, or neutral, depending on the ego’s evaluation. Another example is perception. Buddhism asserts that people perceive according to what the ego judges as important or not important. Thus, rather than perceiving things as-they-are, things are perceived through the lens of the judgment of the ego.

An ego that interferes with the living of no-self is functioning pathologically. According to Zen, this happens as people commonly misunderstand their natural ego as an actual being rather than a function, thereby creating the illusion of a separate self. They identify with their egos in an exclusive way, and believe their egos are entities that must be nourished, protected, and at all costs endure over time. They misapprehend their subjectivity as being distinct from what they perceive as objective and miss the interconnection of subject and object. This, Zen asserts, is a cognitive delusion which is the fundamental source of psychological suffering.

Harada Roshi said, “It is not desire that is the problem, but the one who is desiring that is the problem” (Pawle 2003: 353). Desire is a part of natural or ordinary

mind. The one who is desiring is the ego and this is, according to the psychology of Zen, the source of pathology in mind. From this perspective the ego can be seen as the basis of all problems in the world.

The pathology of the ego can be thought of as being of two kinds. One is cognitive, the delusion that the ego is a self, is a substantial entity. This I have just spoken about. The second is emotional, which is attachment to the ego. Zen considers attachment to be fundamental to all phenomena. Harada Roshi said that “it would not be a mistake to say that the world is made of conditions and attachment” (Pawle 2003: 146). Yet, if one becomes attached to attachment, and holds onto one’s attachment over time, then natural attachment becomes a different, unhealthy kind of attachment. Conversely, if one detaches from attachment, then one is denying the kind of attachment that is fundamental to being a person in the world. Thus, Zen emphasizes non-attachment, which means being attached fully in the moment without trying to maintain the form of this attachment. Psychologically this can be expressed as simultaneously taking something very passionately and completely seriously while being fully relaxed. In action, non-attachment means participating fully, but without attachment to the result of this participation. Non-attachment refers to a kind of ‘natural attachment,’ similar to the natural ego.

Non-attachment is one way to express the living of no-self. Yasunaga Roshi, using the term ‘no-attach’ rather than my term ‘non-attach,’ described it this way: “Being no-attached is being attached to everything. So if you do not covet anything you covet everything. Attachment continues to exist, but as for the quality it is drastically changed” (Pawle 2003: 182).

The Death of the Ego

Attachments and illusions are the ways in which the ego 'tilts' and interferes with the system of mind. This includes the unconscious, which, from a Buddhist perspective, consists of attachments and illusions of which a person is unaware. Eliminating these attachments and illusions is the goal of Zen practice. Unconscious attachments are considered particularly difficult to work with, requiring a transcendence of the functions connected to natural ego consciousness. Fukushima Roshi said, "Unless you get to the point in your practice beyond mere discrimination and consciousness it's not possible to get through those unconscious attachments" (Pawle 2003: 148).

When Zen masters speak of 'killing' the ego, they are referring to eliminating these attachments and illusions, the source of which is the ego. Fukushima Roshi said, "Being oneself *mu*" is "getting rid of all attachment to ego," and that this was "cutting off the illusions of the ego" (Pawle 2003: 167). He said that as a result of many years of Zen training "you can really get to that point where all of them [illusions and attachments] are actually cut off. Then there is no more ego to arise" (Pawle 2003: 220). Two Zen priests described their experience of the disappearance or death of the ego. Tanaka Roshi said:

So one day when I reflected on myself I recognized that I couldn't find myself. My small ego was disappearing completely. That was a kind of complete experience. I sought myself, but I couldn't find myself. A great pleasure grew up, occurred.

(Pawle 2003: 196)

Harada Roshi spoke of how the "death of his ego" occurred during a conversation while having tea:

If I express it in words in my case it happened through a thought. Someone asked me, 'Where's the way of the Buddha?' And then I thought to myself, 'Where's the way of the Buddha?' So I couldn't say I really knew it, but, ah ... at that time it's not a realization of having become one, it's a feeling or sensation shall I say that everything has disappeared.

(Pawle 2003: 214)

Harada Roshi said the death of the ego "happens once and is final" (Pawle 2003: 220).

A noticeable difference in these descriptions is that while Harada Roshi speaks of a particular event, Tanaka Roshi speaks more of a process. This may reflect the difference between the sudden and gradual schools of Zen. Nevertheless, both affirmed that their ego did vanish, that this is a lived experience, and that it is an important step in psychological development.

Individualism/Collectivism

I want briefly to place this psychology of Zen within the broader context of the field of cross-cultural psychology. A very popular and also much-debated idea in cross-cultural psychology is the concept of individualism/collectivism. One approach to this concept is the 'self orientation' (Kagitcibasi 1997: 19-22), the idea of the self as individual or collective. It is interesting to consider the no-self psychology of Zen as an expression of a psychology of a collective self. I think it is important to de-mythologize Zen and understand no-self within a cultural context. In this sense no-self symbolizes, to use Jungian terminology, an archetype of a collective self. No-self expresses an ideal collective self – a self that is interdependent, contextual, flexible, and whose mental

faculties are available as needed according to the situation. A person in Zen reflects the Japanese word for human being, '*ningen*' (人間), which literally means 'between people.' A person in this sense becomes fully human when they are able to be fully in relationship with other people.

In my teaching experience, using Hofstede's Individualism Index (Hofstede and Hofstede 2005: 78-79) as a reference, students who come from collective countries easily understand no-self as expressing a collective psychology, whereas students from individualist countries tend to struggle to understand no-self. When a person extinguishes their ego in the Zen sense, rather than becoming a void, the Zen idea is that a person's inherent personal self blossoms naturally. Evidence for this is the eccentric Zen masters I have met. Rather than being dull and the same as everyone else, Zen masters are quite individual - yet they still have a collective sense of self.

Psychological Healing in Zen

Healing in Zen is clarifying the functioning of the ego, so that one awakens to their inherent limitless self. The basic difficulty in this clarification is that the ego cannot be seen directly or objectively. The ego in its function in mind is like the eyes in that it can only be seen in reflection or through its connections to other mind functions.

One of the primary functions of mind that Zen utilizes to work with the ego is attention. I want to examine it here as I consider the relationship of the ego and attention generally overlooked by psychology: There is much consideration in psychology given to a biological basis of attention problems (Safren 2006), but not so much to an ego basis. One way of living no-self that I described earlier is mind being 'free to.' In Zen one description of mental pathology is fixated attention, attention

thereby not being available for use as needed. Conversely, one way to describe mental health, or living no-self, is free attention, attention that is available. By focusing attention on a single object, it becomes possible to see the activity of attention: what one commonly discovers is that attention is functioning exclusively in a subject-object way, a way that is rooted in the ego as a self. Upon realizing no-self, fixated or pathological attention disappears and attention becomes free to function optimally. Working with attention in this way is a means to clarifying the ego.

There are two keys to working with attention in the Zen way. The first is staying with attention to something, not looking outside oneself, only looking at one's own activity. And the second is not judging oneself by what arises in this practice. Harada Roshi said this kind of practice is "like tying yourself up with a rope, and then in that condition finding your freedom" (personal communication, May 6, 1991). This methodology allows a person to focus on their activity in the present rather than the influence of the past and to work directly with one's conscious mind rather than having to go into a trance or dream or such. This also enables therapy to be experience-based. A person in this way attends to their experience in the moment; experiences first, and evaluates second. Such methodology, when integrated into therapy, can be beneficial.

Conclusion

Mind functioning as subject and object is often assumed in Western psychology to be fundamental to mental health. The psychology of Zen offers an alternative way to understand the functioning of mind, one positing the ego as the key function of mind. In this article, reports of Zen masters speaking of their experience of living no-self, living without an ego in the Zen sense, has been examined. Integrating this understanding

into psychology provides an understanding of mental health that includes the limits of mind, how psychological development can include the disappearance of the ego, and alternatives in terms of therapeutic work. Further study of this topic will expand the possibilities of psychological work.

Roshis (= Zen masters) Quoted

(Residence information is at the time of the interviews, 2001-2002.)

Sekkei Harada Roshi (原田雪溪老師), abbot of Hosshinji Monastery, Obama, Fukui prefecture; Soto sect of Zen Buddhism; received *shiho* (= certification of being a teacher of Zen in the Soto school) from Sessui Harada (原田雪水) Roshi and *inkashomei* (= certification of enlightenment) from Gien Inoue (義衍井上) Roshi.

Gikan Nakajima Roshi (中島義觀老師), priest of Tadaoji Temple, Nagahama, Shiga prefecture; Myoshinji school, Rinzai sect of Zen Buddhism; retired from his position being in charge of the education of the monks in the Myoshinji school; did *koan* study (Rinzai school of Zen practice) with Dokuzan Hashimoto (橋本独山) Roshi.

Keido Fukushima Roshi (福島慶道老師), abbot of Tofukuji Monastery, Kyoto; head priest of the Tofukuji branch, Rinzai sect; trained with Zenkei Shibayama (柴山全慶) Roshi; received *inkashomei* from Taigen Takayama (高山泰巖) Roshi.

Sodo Yasunaga Roshi (安永祖堂老師), priest of Shounji Temple, Ikeda, Osaka prefecture; trained with Seiko Hirata (平田精耕) Roshi, Tenryuji Temple, Rinzai sect; completed *koan* practice in the Tenryuji School.

Kanju Tanaka Roshi (田中寛洲老師), priest of Nanyoin Temple, Kyoto; trained in the Shokokuji School, Rinzai sect; received *inkashomei* from Sounin Kajitani (梶谷宗忍) Roshi.

References

- Brentano, F. (1973) *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Clarke, J. (1994) *Jung and Eastern Thought: A Dialogue with the Orient*, New York: Routledge.
- Conze, E. (1970) *Buddhist Thought in India*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Engler, J. (1998) 'Buddhist Psychology: Contributions to Western Psychological Theory', in A. Molino (ed), *The Couch and the Tree*, New York: North Point Press, 111-118.
- Faure, B. (1991) *The Rhetoric of Immediacy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Guenther, H. (1989) *From Reductionism to Creativity: rDzogs-chen and the New Sciences of Mind*, Boston: Shambhala.
- Hayward, J., and Varela, F. (eds.) (2001) *Gentle Bridges: Conversations with the Dalai Lama on the Sciences of Mind*, Boston: Shambhala.
- Hofstede, G., and Hofstede, G.J. (2005) *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, 2nd edn, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Huikai, W. (1977) 'Mumonkan,' trans. K. Sekida, in K. Sekida, *Two Zen Classics: Mumonkan and Hekiganroku*, Tokyo: Weatherhill. (Original work 1228).
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1997) 'Individualism and Collectivism,' in J. Berry, M. Segall,

- and C. Kagitcibasi (eds), *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology: Social Behavior and Applications (vol. 3)*, Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kochumuttom, T. (1982) *A Buddhist Doctrine of Experience: A New Translation and Interpretation of the Works of Vasubandhu the Yogacarin*, Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Pawle, R. (2003) 'The No-self Psychology of Zen Buddhism: Causality, Attachment, and the Manifestation of Fundamental Aliveness' [Diss], *UMI Dissertation Services, Number 3080423*.
- Safren, S. (2006) 'Cognitive-Behavioral Approaches to ADHD Treatment in Adulthood,' *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 67, supplement 8, 46-50.
- Sasaki, J. (1974) *Buddha is the Center of Gravity*, trans. F. Akino, San Cristobal, New Mexico: Lama Foundation.