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ABSTRACT

The process of the formation of the dialogue between the East and the West in the format of Buddhist cogitative tradition, on the one hand, and psychoanalysis and analytical psychology, on the other hand, is analyzed in the article. The search of the dialogue is determined by the condition of alarm of identity of both of its vectors. At the same time progressing of dialogue is provoked by the conflict of values of the East and the West. Such prominent representatives as E. Fromm, K.G. Jung, D.T. of Suzuki brought their contribution in the formation of the language of the cross-cultural dialogue. The participation of these thinkers in the dialogue is determined by both culturological and personal-and-psychological factors. Suzuki realized the personal tendency to go beyond the habitual sociocultural experience in aspiration to a one new. As for E. Fromm the life experience amplified in the word "be" acted as the psychological aspect. His position in relation to the culture of the West always differed in criticism which in turn was also personally caused, and was created as the dominating line in perception of surrounding reality. K.G. Jung's position was contradictory. As in the theory, and practice he addressed materials of Buddhist culture. However, its works allow to draw a conclusion that the mentality of carriers of various cultures is uniform in symbolization processes, but people of the East and West, according to Jung, are divided by the impossibility of mutual understanding at the level of the text. And it, in turn, demonstrates that in Jung's position implicitly there is an idea of cardinal difference between the East and the West during the formation of subject and verbal representations. Other choice of the dialogue object is the Buddhist doctrine about the mentality is necessary for the development of interrogation language qualitatively. The appeal to the deep universal mental bases is capable to update new quality of dialogue space for the East and the West.
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1. Introduction

Contact of Buddhism, psychoanalysis and analytical psychology, which seem to be absolutely different phenomena of the human culture, in many respects anticipated the trends, updated only in the modern situation of the culture globalization. The development of the space of the cross-cultural interaction in the East–West continuum is directed by one of the vectors to the Buddhist East. The attitude of "East" (if we mean South Asian, Hindu-and-Buddhist vector of the world culture) historically developed as introvertive, being turned on the search of intra mental resources of the human nature. Such attitude appeared to be the fraught feeling of cultural loneliness which was only partly compensated during the contact with other civilizations by the position of the chosenedness, natural in case of the introspection prevalence.

If "West" is worried because of washing out of the identity, then the trouble of "East" is the insulating degradation.

"West", entering the dialogue, seeks to peer at himself, being reflected in "another", and "East" seeks "to be with another", to enter the grandiose space of the world culture completely.

The dialogue between Buddhism and psychoanalysis was in many respects provoked by the conflict of values, inevitable in case of closer contact of the civilizations. Now in the situation of globalization of the culture, the tendency to integration of human values distinctly proves. It is obviously possible to characterize the space of dialogue of psychoanalysis and Buddhism on the basis of reconstruction of historical-and-philosophical and sociocultural contexts, in which mutual contact of psychoanalytic and Buddhist styles of thinking developed during the formation of dialogue space. Such prominent representatives as E. Fromm, K.G. Jung, D.T. Suzuki made their contribution during the formation of the dialogue space. Participation of those thinkers is determined by both culturological and personal-and-psychological factors.

2. Literature Review

Some proofs of the acquaintance to the Buddhism can be met in the western thought everywhere: in religion, philosophy and psychology, in the social movements, in the youth subculture.

The famous Austrian psychologist Siegmund Freud (1856-1939), the founding father of psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic school, of the therapeutic direction in psychology is an interesting example. In 1935 Jones wrote about Freud: "Personal studying of religious experience by Freud did not reach the east doctrine". However some facts, unknown earlier are appearing, disproving Jones's opinion. It is precisely unknown, whether Freud applied any Buddhist concepts in psychoanalysis, but he was interested in Buddhism philosophy.

Frank Alexander in 1930 drew an important analogy between Buddhist psychology and psychoanalysis in his small research "Buddhist Training and Artificial Catatonia". This work interested such psychoanalysts as Fromm and Horni later. Erich Fromm held the whole seminar on the subject: "Psychoanalysis and Buddhism" in 1949, which became a sort of push to writing of the whole work with the same name.

Carl Gustav Jung not only studied the concepts of the Buddhism, but also, created the whole directions in psychoanalysis, basing on them. For example, on the basis of the Buddhist concept of "five skandhas" or "pañcaskandhī" (Sanskrit: पञ्चस्कन्धी), Karl Jung entered the concept of "egoism" (German: Selbst) into science, which turned into the whole direction of psychoanalysis later. Jung also wrote prefaces to different Buddhist editions, in particular, to books by professor Daysetsu Teytaro Suzuki.

Professor Suzuki deserves special attention. He had an impact on the whole group of psychologists and humanists. In the 1940th years he held seminars on Zen Buddhism in Columbia University, where he got
acquainted with Karen Horni and Erich Fromm; that allowed to maintain the professional relations with them further. Thanks to this cooperation Horni visited Japan in 1951 for the acquaintance to Zen Buddhism, and Fromm organized a special seminar on Zen Buddhism and psychoanalysis in the house in Cuernavaca in 1957. The seminar took place under the leadership of Suzuki and Fromm. The materials of the seminar were published as their joint book "Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis" (Fromm, Suzuki, Martino, 1960).

3. Method

The following approaches and methods were applied within the research:
- comparative-and-typological and topological structural (and-topographical) approaches;
- methods of historical-and-philosophical and historical-and-cultural reconstruction, comparative designing of the system of the interpreting concepts, biographic analysis, problem-and-thematic analysis of sources;
- techniques, characteristic of psychoanalytic approach: symbolical, genetic, analogical interpretations, psychoanalytic reconstruction.

4. Results

The Suzuki's movement towards to the West is the realization of his personal aspirations formed since the early childhood and embodied as one of important meanings of his life as the intermediary in the dialogue of cultures. Being a teenager D.T. Suzuki also contacted to the representative of Greek Orthodox Church, and to the Protestant preacher. He tried to find answers to the intrinsic questions in communication with them: why human society is organized in such a way and how the nature is arranged? Thus, initially Suzuki found the tendency to go beyond the habitual sociocultural experience in his aspiration to anything new, because the known reality did not satisfy his informative inquiries.

The first visit to the temple Kokudaydzi, where Suzuki went by himself, without recommendations, gave him feeling of shameful flight. The young man could not remain for training in art of Zen there, as he was tormented by loneliness and melancholy for mother. Here one psychological moment is important. Suzuki directed to work in fifteen miles from his home, but each day off he preferred to make a five-hour pedestrian way to meet his mother. His existence was like a pendulum: he regularly left and returned. This psychological pendulum in the future gained cross-cultural scope and reached Europe and America. Suzuki’s brother promoted his device in the university, but Suzuki chose other path, having wished to study Zen under the leadership of Kosen Rosy in the monastery Engakudzi. In January, 1892 Kosen Rosy died, and mentor Syaku Soen, the author of books on Buddhism famous in the West replaced him. Syaku Soen was secular-focused person, who devoted a lot of time to the acquaintance to culture and science of West. He took part in the World Congress of religions in Chicago, and spent a lot of time on travelling across Western Europe. Such a conduct of life was unusual for Zen traditions, but that imposed Suzuki in the new mentor, he looked for such an environment, which would combine traditional Japanese and European things.

In terms of psychoanalytic interpretation, the similar lifestyle was the way of Suzuki’s reaction of the first conflict of ambivalence, it was finding of that space in which he could leave his mother (traditional sociocultural way) and to return to her. Than translator’s activity gained characteristics of the intermediary in the dialogue of cultures: he found himself in the "translation" into the native language of the things he saw, staying in Japan and vice versa. Symbolically he reproduced the former way home and back then.

Erich Fromm was engaged in studying of Buddhism in the 1920th. He actively got acquainted with literature – some general works, devoted to the corresponding perspective. Only in the 40th, thanks to the seminars held by
Suzuki in which Karen Horni also took part, Fromm realized the opportunity to investigate Buddhism, in particular, Zen in the aspect of comparison with psychoanalysis. What this opportunity at this historical stage was, it is clearly visible at the appeal to the works by T.D. Suzuki.

Suzuki, stating bases of Zen, appealed first of all to the Yungian doctrine (Yung’s theory), seeing in it, but not in Freudian psychoanalysis, the scope for the search of cross-cultural parallels. But the Yungian concept in view of the self-sufficiency did not need any foreign culture incentives for the development. The dialogue, offered by D. Suzuki was demanded by Freudians and by those who sought to move apart the horizons of the theory of Freudian psychoanalysis (like E. Fromm or K. Horni).

The studying of culture and philosophy of East, which took Fromm for several decades, found the completeness in intellectual contacts with Suzuki and the scientific project, developed and carried out together with him. It was not only promptly revealed Fromm's interest to Zen, which was embodied in this cooperation. The process of formation of the dialogue space the psychoanalysis Buddhism directed to identification of sociocultural universalia of East and West became result of the project.

Suzuki planned in his "Lectures about Zen Buddhism" (Fromm, Suzuki, Martino, 1960) the approach, which in many respects defined the perspective of the development of the dialogue and proved then E. Fromm had the aspiration to the registration of mutually recognition in psychoanalysis and Buddhism. The stories which were offered by T.D. Suzuki are self-sufficient. I would call them archetypic. Though we can admire, for example, the oriental dance, we can study its movements and imitate east dancing plasticity, there will always be that side which differentiate the imitation from the authentic execution. East and West, psychoanalysis and Buddhism request each other for various levels of reflection and imitation for the confirmation and formation of sociocultural identity; that is one of the cross-cultural dialogue lines.

Unconscious can be reflected in life experience, is amplificated in the word "to be". E. Fromm whose position in relation to the culture of West always differed in criticism responds to the world "to be". But this criticism of E. Fromm first of all is personally caused and was created as the dominating line in perception of surrounding reality. To open the genesis and development of this position of Fromm – the culturologist, the thinker it is obviously possible only with the support on the biographic method.

The dialogue of East and West in the foreshortening of psychoanalysis and Buddhism, personalized in the cooperation of E. Fromm and D. Suzuki was effective in such an aspect, as the mutual demand of the parties was brightly demonstrated, and their resources were complementary. Yungian doctrine, whom addressed Suzuki in his search of adequate dialogue partnership did not reveal as it is represented to me, the corresponding potential. The comparison of Yungian doctrine which is carried out by Suzuki and Zen demonstrated the similarity, which was so considerable, that it caused not a mutual attraction, but competitive motives.

Erich child (as far as it is possible to judge by his own memoirs) has the negative attitude to the world surrounding him. It was the world of the people, who are mainly making money, not caring for spiritual. Possibly, being at children's age he depreciated, was not able to allocate the proper elements of life of his immediate environment from the stream of existence and to accept them. It should be noted, that the boy was inclined to perceive only a part of the spiritual atmosphere. Erich Fromm's biographer Funk Ranier considers that he did not forgive his grandfather for the refusal of the mission of the rabbi in favor of material stability of the family. But, if to think, Erich's disappointment was connected not with the grandfather, it was only splashed out on the grandfather, who belittled himself. Father acted as the primary object of this experience. It destroyed idealization which, without having the opportunity to be turned to the father initially, moved to the grandfather as on the "last
hope" which also appeared to be vain. Any slightest hint on money caused deep shame in Erich, and meanwhile, his father, Naftali Fromm, was a wine producer and supplier, i.e. he was engaged in commerce, though he is not too successful. Discrepancy of the relations of E. Fromm with his father were reflected in his memories: "My father was very nervous. He was scary timid in everything that was related to me. Pro se he had no fear, but concerning me he was the real neurotic. As the only child, I was in a bad situation. He indulged me, and I was very undisciplined. He most of all wanted me to remain always a three-year-old child. The elder I became, the less original interest in me he had. However, it does not mean that he loved me less." (Funk, 1998). Uneasiness of the father deprived Erich of the opportunity to go to the Middle East for studying Talmud. East remained his unrealized desire, which was waiting in the wings and which was carried out in the dialogue and cooperation with D. Suzuki.

Now we will consider how Eric Fromm's biography was interwoven into the American psychoanalytic movement. E. Fromm faced the manifestation of sense of guilt of the American psychoanalysis at Institute of social research. Fromm, developing social-and-psychological approach and emphasizing the primacy of vital destiny before inclinations, faced quite a sharp change of the attitude towards himself from newly appeared supporters of the orthodox freudianism. This situation coincides with the transition of an oncological disease of S. Freud to the preterminal phase.

Fromm's works devoted to criticism of orthodox psychoanalytic approach did not receive due consideration in the academic circles, and the arisen conflict soon passed into the plane of the personal relations, having come to the end with the cooperation termination.

I can note that "withdrawal" from the situation is not only characteristic vital strategy for E. Fromm in solution of the conflicts. I consider this trend decisive in the emergence of the dialogue between psychoanalysis and Buddhism and as it is paradoxical, constructive within the development of psychoanalysis in America. It is not undue to draw the attention of the reader, that sense of guilt is involved in this Fromm’s "first leaving".

Psychoanalysts-revisionists among whom Karen Horni was the brightest star, became the circle of contacts for E. Fromm. Till 1940th Fromm and Horni maintained the close friendly relations. In 1937 Marianna, Horni’s daughter, came to the Fromm’s analysis according to the recommendation of her mother. In 1941 because of the difference of opinion which led to a conflict situation, K. Horni was disqualified at a meeting of the New York psychoanalytic society. Along with the group of supporters she organized an association, and then on the basis of that association an institute was established. But E. Fromm had no opportunity to get education in that institute as he did not have a medical diploma. Thus, in this conflict he appeared on the opposite side for Horni. Fromm resolved this situation in the way, usual for himself: when the conditions set for him were not accepted, he left.

The conflict with Horni also had other aspect caused by the results of psychoanalytic work by Fromm and Marianna, after carrying out the analysis, her relations with mother worsened. Karen Horni accused Fromm that put the end to their friendship. Fromm left, and his leaving was connected with the sense of guilt.

E. Fromm went to work in branch of the Washington school of psychiatry, and K. Horni's group endured one more large split subsequently.

Next "leaving" of E. Fromm represented his moving to Mexico in 1949. This time, leaving was not mediated by a split with the institution - the Washington school which turned into Institute of Williams of Elenson Whyte by then. Partly it was caused by some family circumstances: the performance the health of the second Fromm’s wife Henny (who, as well as her predecessor Frida, was more senior than the husband for ten years). It should be noted also that in the USA the end of the 1940th was marked by a McCarthyism era, and it was possible, Fromm as the Jew sympathizing Marxism distinctly felt the threat of charge of the anti-American activity which hung over
The tendency to go beyond the methodological circle, "to leave" the conflict is represented to me important in the formation of the disconnect of the American psychoanalysis in the relation to the sociocultural environment. Certainly, this trend is not unique in case of E. Fromm, but as a personal contribution it is important.

The biographic and culturological literature, devoted to Fromm, includes a point of view that his acquaintance to Buddhism, thanks to G. Grimm's works and orientation to Zen in religious practice happened irrespectively of Fromm's formation as a psychoanalyst (Brown, 1997).

This conclusion is represented to me rectilinear and one-sided. E. Fromm, whose participation in the peripetias of the professional conflicts differed in relief of the position, having left a methodological circle of the psychoanalytic movement, "sacrificed himself", transforming the psychoanalytic theory. He unconsciously promoted constructive trends in development of psychoanalysis in the USA. Moreover, Fromm promoted that the American psychoanalysis did not lose real Freudian approach, - just like during a game of chess, for the sake of advantage, the master sacrifices a figure.

Fromm addressed the Buddhism mirror with the attempt of the analysis of the American sense of guilt which personal resonance in him was so strong, and many joined him. Zen Buddhism became very popular in the American psychoanalytic circles and then it got to a sociocultural context.

E. Fromm's work "Zen Buddhism and psychoanalysis" had a considerable impact on this process as it was devoted, among other things, to the disclosure of the essence of spiritual crisis of culture of West. From the point of view of cultural comparative studies not so much detection of a set of real and imaginary analogies between Zen and psychoanalysis, but the solidarization of positions D. of Suzuki and E. Fromm surprise in the work. E. Fromm saw senselessness of existence in steadfastness of the material embodiment intellectual - in creation by the person of increasing number of things in the course of which and it also becomes a thing. The deprivation of sense of the existence, when the possession becomes the main thing in human life: It is more important "to Have" now, than "to Be" (cited as Fromm, 2004).

Some problems are created, Fromm says, in the face of those problem the person is powerless. The person of West lost the ability to resolve contradictions between thinking and feelings, otherwise such as ability is not created. The person of West exists in the disturbing and depressive continuum of subjective feelings, and it appears not to clear the purpose and sense of the life in forces. Activity of the carrier of the western culture is mainly directed away from danger and loneliness, thereby it only approaches them. The religiousness according to E. Fromm considers, is popularized and, at the same time, depreciated. According to him, the disclosure of sense of religiousness by S. Freud is that the faith in God comes from helplessness and vulnerability of the person, hoping for the parental support brought to the level of divine (cited as Fromm, 2004).

The modern western person "does not see God in the image of the father and thereby loses parental support in his face."

The sociocultural situation of the West is presented by Fromm to be closed on itself, deprived of resources for overcoming that insulation. He also demonstrated to the reader "the East mirror" for the first time: "… in the east there was no concept of the transcendental father Christ Redeemer peculiar to the monotheist religions. The rationality and realism were inherent in Taoism and the Buddhism more than in West religions. In East a person voluntarily, without coercion, joins the "awakened" people, because each person is capable to awakening and enlightenment. For this reason east religious thinking embodied in Taoism, the Buddhism and Zen Buddhism as their synthesis is of so great importance for the Western culture today" (cited as Fromm, 2004).
According to the results of consideration of the process of participation of Suzuki and Fromm in the dialogue Buddhism and psychoanalysis it should be noted that Zen is used by Fromm mainly as a mirror in which psychoanalysis should see its own lines more boldly. The search of analogies and registration of coincidence, which were carried out by the thinker in the work "Zen and psychoanalysis", did not apply, as a matter of fact, for the philosophical or culturological comparative studies. Retelling of some Suzuki’s ideas undertaken by Fromm in the final part of this work proved that. He tries to record the vision of the foreign culture horizon in the dialogue of Buddhism with psychoanalysis once again. "In any case, - he summarized, - it is possible to say much more surely that studying of Zen and the interest shown to it can influence the theory and practice of psychoanalysis in an extremely fruitful way, which is capable to clear many of its aspects" (cited as Fromm, 2004).

In the context of the initial stage of the dialogue between Buddhism and psychoanalysis the activity of Suzuki appears to be multifunctional on the purposes. Certainly, Suzuki acted in the American culture both as the religious missionary, and as the culturologist educator, and as the historian of Buddhist philosophy, and, certainly, as the peculiar colleague of psychoanalysts, who was looking for new ways to the harmony of the person and the world too. Suzuki rehabilitated the image of Japan, depreciated by the role of this country in World War II, in the Western world, and particularly in the sociocultural reality of the USA. He showed the richness of the Japanese cultural heritage to the world and proved the prospect of integration of cultural values of the different people at the level of individual spiritual search. The appeal to Buddhism in the modern western culture is followed by references to the analytical psychology everywhere, particularly in the K.G. Jung's concept. The modern cut of interaction of the analytical psychology and Buddhism is characterized, in my opinion, by three main directions. The first of them is the attempt of integration of Buddhist ideas of mentality into the western compendia of psychological knowledge to enrich and expand the methods of transformation of intra-personal representations and the interpersonal relations.

The second way consists in the direct export of Buddhist psychotechniques, by their identification on the basis of the Jungian concept (cited as The Sahaja Yoga - great Yoga of our days).

The following questions are natural: how adequate are both ways of the use of analytical psychology as the explaining metaphor (transitional integrative space) and is the similar trend substantially constructive for the development of cross-cultural dialogue? The answers to these questions are hidden in the matter of the role of analytical psychology as the field of contact of East and West.

The third direction of the dialogue interaction of analytical psychology and Buddhism accumulates in itself those comparative researches in which tasks of search of a convergence and distinctions, identifications of analogies are set. In this question the research position of the St. Petersburg school of the philosophical comparative studies was focused on the analysis of works of Jung on psychology of religion and his comments to the works by D.T. Suzuki. The accent is put on the difference of West and East in their typological intensions - extroversion and introversion. According to this approach K.G. Jung made an attempt of the translation of symbolical language of culture of the Buddhist East into the West language, in which the subject's primacy is the basis for thinking (cited as History of modern foreign philosophy: Comparative approach).

Also the point of view of the cultural anthropologist R. Moakanin, who brought the parallels and analogies between analytical psychology and Tantric Buddhism to the first place, is of a certain interest. This comparative analysis is devoted to the comparison of analytical psychology and Tantric tradition in Tibetan Buddhism (Moakanin, 2004). However, as it is represented to me, the choice of subjects to comparison sins with incorrectness: the Tantric tradition is considered by the researchers in the aspect of the ritual practices and the most
general concepts, and analytical psychology is considered as a theoretically complete concept.

K.G. Jung's position in relation to South Asian psychotechniques and exercises on the mentality comes to light in some his works of different time as the set of ideas, which are being in continuous development. The internal discrepancy of this position is also explained by that. All the research works, devoted to and K.G. Jung's life activity emphasize high extent of influence of Buddhist religious and doctrinal symbolism on the formation and development of his scientific views. The theoretical solvency and independence, the analytical psychology created by him as I believe, is found out in the fact, that the thinker appeal to Buddhism in the matters of symbolical interpretation of collective unconscious (Jung, 1994 [1]). Similar appeals are also found in his research of psychological types (Jung, 1994 [2]).

The universalism of the symbolical relations, revealed within the scientific research by K.G. Jung acted as the basis, the platform on which the construction and development of mutual understanding of East and West in the aspect of interpretation of human mentality is possible.

Jung's thesis (formulated by him in the preface to the English edition "Bases of Zen Buddhism" by D.T. Suzuki) about the impossibility of understanding of Buddhist texts by the western reader comprises the contradictions of at least two levels: "East religious concepts usually so much differ from our western concepts, that in case of attempt of a closer translation (not to mention value of these or those ideas), you meet such difficulties, that under some circumstances it is better not to translate them at all … Original Buddhist texts contain views and ideas, which the European intelligence is hardly capable to acquire" (cites as Jung, 200 u.0). On the one hand, Jung updates that interest in East, and in particular, Buddhist, to the representations of mentality which (as it becomes clear), cannot be realized without full disclosure of the corresponding concepts. Om the other hand, scientific interest is blocked by their inaccessibility to adequate translation and judgment. But the contradiction appears to be funded much more deeply; the mentality of the carriers of various cultures is uniform within the symbolization processes, but people of East and West, according to Jung, divides impossibility of mutual understanding at the level of the text. And it, in turn, that demonstrates that in Jung's position implicitly there is an idea of cardinal difference between East and West during the formation of subject and verbal representations.

According to the contradictory there was also Jung's contribution to the development of the dialogue between East and West: opening the dialogue space, it at the same time postulated essentially superficial level of the cross-cultural interaction which was expressed in particular in primitive and any analogies (attempts of integration and direct export Buddhist psychotechniques).

Why did such a courageous and original thinker how K.G. Jung, who put tradition of search of analogies in the psychological concepts of East and West, persistently come back to the problem of limited mutual understanding and impossibility of adequate translation?

I believe that the limit of penetration into depths of the Buddhist religious philosophical thought, in the doctrine about mentality was caused by the development of knowledge, coeval to Jung, including repertoire of translations, known by him. Acquaintance to Jungian heritage allows to claim that the translations of Buddhist theoretical treatises were not known to the thinker, he mentions only Mahayana sutra, i.e. samples of religious and doctrinal, but not philosophical discourse. Operating with figurative structures of the Buddhist religious discourse, Jung naturally expected the danger of irreversible regress of these figurative structures during contacts with some archetypic layers. Observing expansion of East to the daily culture of West, the thinker also warned about the danger of escape from the reality arising in the culture of West and sought to limit this expansion (Sidorova, 2004, Sidorova, 2005).
"An enlightened person, or a person convinced that he is enlightened, - Jung wrote, - anyway thinks that he is brightened up. The things, others think about that, can determine nothing for concerning his experience. Even if he lies, his lie is a spiritual fact. Moreover, even if all religious evidence are no more, than conscious inventions and falsifications, it is possible to conduct very interesting psychological research about the facts of such lie with the same scientific approach with what the psychopathology approaches studying of manias." This thesis caused the competitive and critical response of Fromm, regarding as a delusion that indifference, with which Jung treated the matter of reality of the enlightenment. According to Fromm this approach is unacceptable for Zen judgment (Jung, 1988).

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The difference in the approaches to the enlightenment phenomenon between analytical psychology and psychoanalysis distinctly reveals the conflict both in structuring dialogue between East and West, and in the vision of the prospects of integration of the ideas of human mentality, created in the genetically dissimilar cultures.

It is important to emphasize, that the direct dialogue was carried out between E. Fromm and D.T. Suzuki. Suzuki widely presented the Mahajana Buddhism in the culture of West, however in the dialogue with psychoanalysis he placed emphasis on Zen Buddhism. Such development of the dialogue space led to fixing only of the most general analogies, caused by the features of Zen Buddhist psychotechnique practice.

So, the dialogue of East and West, which was developing by the efforts of Zen Buddhism, psychoanalysis and analytical psychology was structured as obviously superficial, limited by the involvement of religious and doctrinal and psychotechnique material, and thus theoretically conflict.

Jung used Buddhism, Zen Buddhism as the illustrative material for the demonstration of opportunities of explanatory model of mentality in the analytical psychology. He spoke about Goethe's Faust, Nietzsche's Zarathustra as about the products of the European culture, correlated to the East culture. The systematic comparative research of Buddhism and analytical psychology did not take place, being changed for superficial analogies in attempt of overcoming sociocultural loneliness.

The comparative analysis of the Jungian psychological concept and Buddhism assumes, in our opinion, the appeal to the theoretical heritage of Buddhist religious-and-philosophical thought in which the doctrine on mentality found its strict logical-and-discursive outlines. In case of such a choice of the dialogue object the analytical psychology, appealing to the deep universal mental bases, is capable to update new quality of dialogue space for East and West.
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