

THE ANALYSIS OF ALIENATION [*ENTFREMDUNG*]
IN *BEING AND TIME*
FROM A MARXIST PERSPECTIVE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

EDA KESKİN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

AUGUST 2010

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Barış Parkan (METU, PHIL) _____
Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam (METU, PHIL) _____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ertuğrul Rufayi Turan (Ankara U., PHIL) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Eda Keskin

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE ANALYSIS OF ALIENATION [ENTFREMDUNG] IN *BEING AND TIME* FROM A MARXIST PERSPECTIVE

Keskin, Eda

M. A., Department of Philosophy

Supervisor : Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam

August 2010, 76 pages

In this thesis, the problem of human being's alienation from its own Self, society, species-being, objects (products) and labour, which occurs in capitalist modernity through the formation of mass cultures, is analyzed in the conceptual context of *Being and Time*. In this respect, it is discussed that Heideggerian philosophy is not at odds with Marxism in contrast to Theodor W. Adorno's arguments in *The Jargon of Authenticity*. Additionally, the claim of this study is that Heidegger's ontologico-existential philosophy can be effective in the analysis and solution of the problem with regard to some socio-psychological causes and effects of alienation in which the method of political economy can remain inadequate. In particular, Dasein's free and authentic self-understanding which gets rid of the suppressive authority of publicness and the ontological Being-with Others in society in harmony with nature can introduce a revolutionary perspective into the problem of alienation. In this context, the similarities in the approaches of Marx and Heidegger on the modes of alienation are stated and the concept of alienation [*Entfremdung*] in *Being and Time* is discussed in relation to Marxist conceptions and the relevant concepts in *Being and Time*.

Keywords: Heidegger, Marx, Adorno, alienation, mass culture, authenticity, freedom

ÖZ

VARLIK VE ZAMAN'DAKİ YABANCILAŞMA [ENTFREMUNG] KAVRAMININ MARKSİST BAKIŞ AÇISINDAN ANALİZİ

Keskin, Eda

Yüksek Lisans, Felsefe Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi : Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam

Ağustos 2010, 76 sayfa

Bu çalışmada, kapitalist modernite içinde kitle toplumların oluşması sonucunda insanın kendine, topluma, türüne, nesnelere (ürünlere) ve emeğine yabancılaşması sorunu, *Varlık ve Zaman*'ın kavramsal bütünlüğü içinde ele alınarak irdelenmiştir. Bu çerçevede, Theodor W. Adorno'nun *Sahicilik Jargonu* kitabında iddia ettiğinin aksine, Heidegger felsefesinin Marksist analizle çatışan bir konumda bulunmadığı tartışılmaktadır. Buna ek olarak, yabancılaşmanın neden ve etkileri konusunda ekonomi politik analizin tartışmakta yetersiz kalabileceği bazı sosyo-psikolojik etki ve etmenlerin değerlendirilmesinde ve sorunun çözülmesinde, Heidegger'in varoluşçu ontolojik felsefesinin etkili olabileceği ileri sürülmektedir. Özellikle, Dasein'in kamusallığın baskıcı otoritesinden kurtulan özgür ve sahil benlik anlayışı ve doğayla uyum içinde ontolojik olarak diğerleriyle birlikte-varolma ilkesi, yabancılaşma sorununa karşı devrimci bir uygulama geliştirilmesini sağlayabilir. Bu bağlamda, Marks ve Heidegger'in yabancılaşmaya yaklaşımlarında tanımladıkları benzer yabancılaşma modları tespit edilerek, *Varlık ve Zaman*'daki yabancılaşma [*Entfremdung*] kavramı, Marksist felsefe kavramları ve *Varlık ve Zaman*'daki ilgili kavramlar ile ilişkisi içinde tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Heidegger, Marks, Adorno, yabancılaşma, kitle kültürü, sahicilik, özgürlük

To My Grandfather,

Mehmet Beşliođlu

In Whom The Life Springs In Various Colors...

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam for his precious guidance and support in our long discussions, entangled with motivation and humour, which always left me free and happy in the love of philosophy.

I would like to thank Asst. Prof. Dr. Barış Parkan for her genuine help in this study with her supportive critiques and creative insights, as well as for being a member of the examining committee for this work. I would also like to thank Assoc. Dr. Ertuğrul Rufayi Turan for his guidance, advice and criticism as being a member of the examining committee. I also give my thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Halil Turan for his substantial guidance and support in this study.

I express my sincere gratitudes to Emrah Günok, for his precious support which always renews my urge to work with the enthusiasm of dialectical discussion. In the path of emergence of this work, valuable insights, discussions and encouragements from Ankara and Marburg belong to these dear people whom I thank sincerely: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kaan H. Ökten, Assist. Prof. Dr. Andrea Rehberg, Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Çırakman, Prof. Dr. Christoph Demmerling, Prof. Dr. Andrea Esser, Prof. Dr. Winfried Schröder, Prof. Dr. Robert Schnepf, Prof. Dr. Dariusz Aleksandrowicz, Prof. Dr. Harald Seubert, Dr. René Thun, Dr. Jan Slaby, Charlotte Pardey, Tufan Acil, Damla Altun and Selma Aydın Bayram.

I want to thank my family, Tülay Keskin, Ela Keskin, Ramazan Keskin, Zehra Beşlioğlu and Mehmet Beşlioğlu for their indefinable support with their patience and great love. I am also grateful to my true friends who support me in my studies and my life with their valuable existence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. INTRODUCTION TO MARXIST ALIENATION AND ALIENATION IN BEING AND TIME.....	6
2.a General Introduction to Marxist Alienation in <i>Grundrisse</i>	6
2.b General Introduction to Alienation [<i>Entfremdung</i>] in <i>Being and Time</i>	8
2.c Marxist Analysis and <i>Being and Time</i>	19
3. ALIENATION FROM ONE’S OWN BEING, FROM SOCIETY AND FROM ITS SPECIES-BEING.....	26
3.a Oppression on Potentiality of One’s Own Being.....	26
3.b Alienation from Being as Being-with-Others and Alienation from Species- Being.....	35
3.c Together Living in Empathy vs Being-Alone.....	40

4. ALIENATION FROM BEINGS IN THE SENSE OF NATURE AND ITEMS OF USE.....	53
4.a Marxist Alienation from Object (Product) and Labour.....	53
4.b Alienation from Object (Product) vs Present-at-Hand [<i>Vorhanden</i>] and Ready-to-Hand [<i>Zuhanden</i>].....	62
4.c Alienation from Labour vs Authenticity [<i>Eigentlichkeit</i>] and Solicitude [<i>Fürsorge</i>] in Work.....	65
5. CONCLUSION.....	69
REFERENCES.....	73

THE ANALYSIS OF ALIENATION [ENTFREMDUNG] IN *BEING AND TIME* FROM A MARXIST PERSPECTIVE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Martin Heidegger analyses alienation [*Entfremdung*] in *Being and Time* in an existential-ontological context, where the ontological unity is sustained in one's being own self with Others. Thus, the first task of this research is to explore the concept of alienation in *Being and Time* in detail, by taking the frame of the research as Marxist perspective to alienation.

So as to maintain a Marxist perspective, Karl Marx's *Grundrisse* is used in the discussions of alienation from self, society, object (product) and labour. *Grundrisse* is chosen, since it is produced after *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* and it is a preparatory text to *Capital*. Thus, it includes a wide range of discussions about alienation.¹ *Grundrisse* was uncovered in 1923 by David Ryazanov, who was the director of the Marx-Engels Institute (MEI) in Moscow. In 1939, it appeared in Moscow under the title: *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Oekonomie (Rohentwurf) 1857-1858*.² Marx's *Outline of the Critique of Political Economy (Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Oekonomie)* is made of Marx's drafts before he wrote *Capital (Das Kapital)* but it is wider in many aspects than *Capital* since Marx could not finish *Capital* before his death.³ Thus, studying on *Grundrisse* gives an opportunity to study Marx in a wide range through his drafts.

Alienation is described in a socio-psychological perspective as being "a condition of the individual which involves his estrangement from certain aspects of his social

¹ Lewis A. Coser. *The Grundrisse by Karl Marx : David McLellan*, Social Forces, Vol. 50, No. 2 (Dec. 1971), 1971, p. 262.

² Marcello Musto (ed.). *Karl Marx's Grundrisse: Foundations of the critique of political economy 150 years later*, Routledge, USA, 2008, pp. 180-181.

³ Shlomo Avineri. "The Grundrisse by David McLellan : Karl Marx", *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 67, No. 2 (Jun. 1973), p. 604.

existence.”⁴ In an economical analysis, alienation is a consequence of capitalist system in which “humanity’s objectification of species-being takes” “a distorted form”.⁵ This research is based on the idea that socio-psychological and economical points on the definition of alienation can be merged in order to explore the problem of alienation in a more effective manner. In this line of purpose, Heideggerian existential-ontological philosophy which disputes alienation vitally in the context of modes of human existence can fill in the spaces that economy political analysis leaves bare.

The other argument of this research is that Heideggerian philosophy is not at odds with Marxism in a conceptual basis. Yet an existentialist approach on alienation can bring yielding outcomes in detailed explorations, when it is collaborated with an economy political analysis.

The concept of alienation in Marxist philosophy can be basically described as “the four-fold process of leveling the worker undergoes, which results from the loss of the created object in the process of wage labour” and it has four modes of alienation, namely: “1) alienation from object, 2) alienation from the act of labour, 3) alienation from *species-being (man qua man)*, and 4) alienation from others (man from man).”⁶ The process of alienation to society results in alienation from self. Schmitt also describes that social alienation from self and others occurs through the loss of meaning in lives.⁷

⁴ G. Duncan Mitchell (ed.), *A Dictionary of Sociology*, Aldine Publishing Company, Routledge & Kegan Paul, Chicago, USA, 1968, p. 4.

⁵ John Scott & Gordon Marshall (eds), *A Dictionary of Sociology*, Oxford University Press, UK, 2005, p. 12.

⁶ Brommage, Thomas J. Jr., *A Marxist Glossary*, brommage.freeshell.org/marx/su07/glossary.pdf

⁷ Richard Schmitt. *Alienation and Class*, Schenkman Books, Inc., USA, 1991, p. 157.

Thus, the Marxist and Heideggerian alienation will be discussed in detail through these four modes of alienation in different parts:

1. Alienation from Self⁸
2. Alienation from Species-Being and from Society
3. Alienation from Object (Product)
4. Alienation from Labour

When discussing alienation, these terms are often misinterpreted and mistranslated. Marx uses various concepts for expressing alienation in *Grundrisse*: “*Entäußerung*” is the expression of labour which must involve its objectification. It does not always in all contexts have to entail alienation. The alienation as sale is described as “*Veräußerung*.” “*Entfremdung*” is the actual term that Marx uses to express alienation in the exact sense of the term.⁹

Heidegger draws a similar pattern of alienation in terms of authenticity and freedom where he describes that freedom allows “transcendence as transcending one’s own being, transcending being as being-with-others, and transcending beings in the sense of nature and items of use, where freedom is described as Dasein’s way of existence.”¹⁰

Thus, Heidegger defines that Dasein’s existence deals with:

1. One’s own being
2. Being as being-with-others
3. Beings in the sense of nature and items of use

⁸ Alienation from self is extension of alienation from Others.

⁹ Heidegger expresses only “*Entfremdung*” for the concept of alienation in *Being and Time* in his explorations of alienation from self and society in ontological grounds.

¹⁰ Transcendence to world is the way of existence of Dasein and it is immanent towards the world. Thus, it is not meant to transcend to another world like in a Platonic schema. See Martin Heidegger, *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, trans. Michael Heim, Indiana University Press, USA, 1992(b), p. 190.

Then, the construction of this research will follow the classification of Heidegger:

In Chapter 1, a general description of Marxist alienation and alienation in *Being and Time* is given. Next, the philosophy of Heidegger and Marxist analysis is discussed through the writings of Theodor W. Adorno in *The Jargon of Authenticity*.

In Chapter 2, *Being and Time* will be explored in a conceptual context in cases of alienation to one's own being and alienation to society and species-being of human beings [*Dasein*].

In Chapter 3, alienation from beings in sense of nature and items of use will be explored conceptually in *Being and Time* using the outline of Marxist alienation to objects as products and alienation from labour.

It is refreshing to see that Marxist phases of alienation and Heideggerian formulation of existence of *Dasein* follows similar paths, in terms of alienation to self, society, nature, object (products), labour and items of use. This research will analyse these similar formulations of two philosophers whose methods are very different from each other in fact.

This research analyses the concept of alienation in *Being and Time* in detail, also discussing the relation of many concepts to each other with regard to their political implications, since it is clear that Heidegger's philosophy is mostly left in the shadow of his Nazism in discussions of political philosophy. In continuous debates on Heidegger's Nazism have been going on for many years, there is no conclusion but continuous quarrels.

Thus, the main point of this research is to make an ontologico-existential analysis of some key concepts in *Being and Time* which are related to alienation [*Entfremdung*] in a Marxist frame. It is important to discuss political implications of Heideggerian thought since it has a deep influence on the political theorists of twentieth century which "ranges from the effect on Marxism that Heideggerian ideas have achieved through the works of Kojève, Lukács, Marcuse, and Sartre to their manifold

contribution to hermeneutics and structuralism.”¹¹ Additionally, many other works of political theorists, such as Arendt’s contributions on totalitarianism can be noted in this respect.

¹¹ W. R. Newell. “Heidegger on Freedom and Community: Some Political Implications of His Early Thought”, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 78, No. 3, September 1984, p. 775.

CHAPTER II

INTRODUCTION TO MARXIST ALIENATION AND ALIENATION IN *BEING AND TIME*

2.a General Introduction to Marxist Alienation in *Grundrisse*

Karl Marx discusses the alienation of the worker from his self and society under oppressive domination of capitalism with his term alienation [*Entfremdung*]. He asserts that alienation arises because the indirect relation between the nature and human beings are disturbed by market conditions. The labourer who produced the commodity can no more possess the product which is made by her/his own labour. In conclusion of these unnatural processes and because of the conditions of the market, alienation [*Entfremdung*] occurs in the labourer as an inter and intra-personal effect.

This suppressive process results in the formation of a barrier in front of the worker's development personally, as Marx implies that in the early times and stages of the production's development, "the single individual seems to be developed more fully, because he has not yet worked out his relationships in their fullness, or erected them as independent social powers and relations opposite himself."¹² Accordingly, the alienation process makes the worker less developed and alien to her/his Self.

Due to the repression of the worker's development, the market relations prevent worker to realize her/his own capacities, since all economic relations are independent from and opposite to her/himself as a whole. Hence the capitalist system blocks the capacities and choices of workers in their lives, where the workers are left without power to create their own lives. Marx further discusses that a worker cannot develop her/his capacities without adequate free time for her/his creative activities or for reading. Accordingly, organization of working hours concerning the worker's needs and development is crucial.

¹² Karl Marx. *Grundrisse – Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy (Rough Draft)*, translated by Martin Nicolaus, Penguin Books, UK, 1993, p. 162.

Marx defends socialism's ability to shorten the working-day of workers "to allow this general flourishing to become available."¹³ When the workers have free time, they will have a chance of dealing with the cultural and social activities that are necessary for their personal development. Terry Eagleton also indicates the place of the working hours-schedule in personal development of workers, while stressing that they "would be free instead to develop their personalities in more fully rounded ways" rather than working all day long.¹⁴

The oppressive power of capitalism shows itself as follows: It is the labourer who produces wealth but this power of wealth returns back into to him an oppressive and hostile power that takes all his energy and free time but giving back nothing at all. The worker has to face the difficulties of life since s/he has merely enough money for survival. On the other hand, the alien subject who has wealth and who possesses the property which the labourer produces is disinterested in the labourer's life and struggle in the system of capitalism. Marx clarifies all these statements by writing that "the reproduction and realization [*Verwertung*], i.e, the expansion of these *objective conditions*, is therefore at the same time their own reproduction and new production as the wealth of an alien subject indifferently and independently standing over against labour capacity."¹⁵ The labour capacity of the labourer produces wealth and wealth is away from the labourer, as Marx examines and asserts this situation in his work. Whereas wealth gets independent from labour capacity by the accumulation of money, capital as money makes the laborer always dependent on capital. For going on life, labourer needs money and therefore he has to work in the capitalist system for being able to live.

In this life of the worker under capitalism, the worker is alienated to self by the blockage of her/his potentialities for her/his Being which reveals themselves in his freedom. In this case, Heideggerian emphasis on self-understanding and becoming what s/he is in life through potentiality-for-Being in freedom suits Marxist theory of

¹³ Ibid, p. 21.

¹⁴ Terry Eagleton. *Marx*, Routledge, New York, USA, 1999, p. 21.

¹⁵ Marx, p. 462.

alienation. For the purpose of exploration of the relations between Marxist and Heideggerian philosophies in terms of alienation explicitly, a general introduction of the concept of alienation [*Entfremdung*] in *Being and Time* follows in the next part.

2.b General Introduction to Alienation [*Entfremdung*] in *Being and Time*

Alienation [*Entfremdung*] is described in *Being and Time* as alienating from Dasein's *potentiality-for-Being* which is revealed in its *freedom* and *authenticity*. Potentiality-for-Being is the possibility for the unconcealment of Dasein's Being in its way of existence in the world. As it was stated earlier, Heidegger describes freedom as it allows "transcendence as transcending one's own being, transcending being as being-with-others, and transcending beings in the sense of nature and items of use."¹⁶ Freedom is characterized as being Dasein's way of existence to allow one's relation to one's own Being, to exist as a being in being-with-others as well as to realize its being in nature and items of use. Heidegger writes that: "Man is at best the property of freedom. Freedom is the encompassing and penetrating nature, in which man becomes man only when he is anchored there. That means nature of man is grounded in freedom."¹⁷ Thus, freedom (defined as transcendence to worldliness of itself) is asserted to be the way of existence of Dasein.

Freedom is described as Dasein's existence through transcendence to the world, in relation to its projection into possibilities in the world, to its potentiality-for-Being and authenticity. Heidegger expresses that: "Now insofar as transcendence, being-in-

¹⁶ Transcendence to the world is the way of existence of Dasein and it is immanent towards the world. Thus, it is not mean to transcend to another world like in a Platonic schema. See Martin Heidegger. *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, trans. Michael Heim, Indiana University Press, USA, 1992(b), p. 190.

¹⁷ Martin Heidegger. *Schelling's Treatise On The Essence of Human Freedom*, translated by Joan Stambaugh, Ohio University Press, USA, 1985, p. 9.

There is a direct relation between truth and freedom (freedom is the essence of truth) is that "freedom is engagement in the disclosure of beings as such" and "freedom, as an engagement in the disclosure of beings [seiende], is the basis of such questioning and thinking, and of such a struggle" (Gordon&Gordon, 2006, p. 20).

the-world, constitutes the basic structure of Dasein, being-in-the-world must also be primordially bound up with or derived from the basic feature of Dasein's existence, namely, *freedom*.”¹⁸

Why does Heidegger describe “the existence of Dasein” as “freedom”? There can be many explanations to this name-giving. Some of them are as follows: 1) Dasein is the maker of its world in history when freedom is understood as the freedom of “creating”. Thus, Dasein is free to make its own world. 2) Dasein is free to make choices through many possibilities in life, where projection to possibilities in life is also described as freedom in *Being and Time*. 3) Freedom is described as the way of existence of Dasein to realize its potentiality-for-Being in its worldliness. All these descriptions are bound to each other since they mean the same as freedom of Dasein is its existence and capacity in the world.

Until now, the concept of freedom was described in order to make the place of alienation [*Entfremdung*] open in existential ontology of Heideggerian philosophy. Freedom is the way of existence of Dasein, whereas alienation [*Entfremdung*] is the distorted way of existence (freedom).

¹⁸ Martin Heidegger. *Parmenides*, translated by André Schuwer and Richard Rojcewicz, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, USA, 1992(a), p. 185.

Also in later works of Heidegger, such as his writings on technology and art, it can clearly be seen that the loss of subject in modernity is criticized. Heidegger discusses the loss of *freedom as transcendence* in *Contributions to Philosophy (From Enowning)*. Inwood asserts that: “Heidegger considers the possibility that technology, rooted in the modern man-centered view of freedom and unable to let things be, will subvert freedom by reducing man to the ‘mechanised animal’, that no more transcends to world, and is no more free.” See Michael Inwood. *A Heidegger Dictionary*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, UK, 2000, p. 76.

It means that technology inhibits the freedom by reducing man's capacity of transcendence from world in their ontological investigation about the truth of Being. Heidegger asserts that in the age of technology there is “the utmost danger of completely missing the domain of decision.” See Martin Heidegger. *Contributions to Philosophy (From Enowning)*, trans. Parvis Emad & Kenneth Maly, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, USA, 1999, p. 66.

The loss of choice means the loss of freedom in human existence. Heidegger also discusses the concept of freedom in *The Essence of Freedom* where he explains that “practical freedom is grounded in transcendental freedom.” Similarly, ontological freedom here forms a ground for the actualization of free will. See Martin Heidegger. *The Essence of Human Freedom – An Introduction to Philosophy*, trans. Ted Sadler, Continuum, New York, 2002, p. 17.

Heidegger mainly uses the term “they [*das Man*]” in *Being and Time* to indicate the alienated Dasein. Dasein is differentiated from “they [*das Man*]” since their way of existence is not the same. One important characteristic that results in this difference is that they [*das Man*] are not free (as ceasing to have capacity of transcending to the world). “They” cannot realize their potentiality-for-Being, while they have lost their self-understanding and understanding of the world. Dasein’s turning into they [*das Man*] arises from the fact that they are deceived by having the idea that *they know everything*. There is no empty room left for the striving for authenticity which comes through self-understanding.

Heidegger maintains that this state of they [*das Man*] brings “tranquility”, where they [*das Man*] think that “everything is ‘in the best of order’ and all doors are open. Falling Being-in-the-world, which tempts itself, is at the same time *tranquilizing [beruhigend]*”¹⁹ Owing to this way of thinking, Dasein does not know what it has to understand since the fundamental questions according to Being of world are not asked yet. That is to say, common answers are accepted and not questioned.²⁰

At this point, freeing oneself from the common answers gains importance to be able to be free for realizing one’s potential to ask unthought questions about Being in daily life. Heidegger’s line of thinking is clear in his assertion: “Understanding itself is a potentiality-for-Being which must be made free in one’s *ownmost* Dasein alone.”²¹ That is, Dasein’s way of existence is structured with its understanding. Thus, Dasein’s understanding allows the revealing of the potentiality for its Being in the world. This act of revealing can occur only through Dasein’s freedom as

¹⁹ Martin Heidegger. *Being and Time*, trans. by John Macquarrie & Edward Robinson, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford, UK, 1996, p. 222.

²⁰ Heidegger emphasizes the freedom of thought and freeing of the thought from common sense while “common sense is blind to what philosophy sets before its essential vision” in “On The Essence of Truth” (Heidegger, 1998, p. 137). He states that human beings should beware the general inclination towards “secure” knowledge of common sense according to which every question is obviously answered (Heidegger, 1998, p. 137).

²¹ *Being and Time*, p. 222.

freedom is its way of existence which constructs its Self and the world in its potentiality-for-Being.

Alienation comes into the stage at this point of getting away from what has to be asked. Heidegger defines alienation [*Entfremdung*] in this context:

When Dasein, tranquilized, and ‘understanding’ everything, thus compares itself with everything, it drifts along towards an alienation [*Entfremdung*] in which its ownmost potentiality-for-Being is hidden from it. Falling Being-in-the-world is not only tempting and tranquilizing; it is at the same time *alienating*.²²

In the existential and ontological alienation process, Dasein dissects its existence into ‘characterologies’ and ‘typologies’ through the illusion that “they” know everything. Yet Dasein does not get away from its facticity, it only goes under another type of living which is more shallow and definite.²³ Dasein’s facticity is defined by Heidegger as its being in the world (in its fallenness). Fallenness [*Geworfenheit*] is a part of Dasein’s existence in the world, when Dasein essentially gets away from its self understanding and its Being. Groundlessness [*Bodenlosigkeit*] is Dasein’s not having a pre-defined ground belonging to its existence. Dasein’s way of living is the event which grounds its existence. Being is the ground in this sense of becoming a base for the lives of Dasein. Dasein is also groundless in the world since it loses contact with the fundamentals of its life (regarding its Being) in everydayness by not having the awareness of the ground for its existence as its Being.

It was stated above that Heidegger maintains alienation is factual. That is, alienation belongs to Dasein’s being in the world in its fallenness. However, Heidegger also implies that alienation hinders Dasein’s authenticity: “This alienation closes *off* from Dasein its authenticity and possibility, even if only the possibility of genuinely foundering.”²⁴ Heidegger emphasizes that all these

²² *Being and Time*, p. 222.

²³ *Ibid*, p. 222.

²⁴ *Ibid*, pp. 222-223.

phenomena belong to falling of Dasein and “this ‘movement’ of Dasein in its own Being, we call its “downward plunge” [*Absturz*]. Dasein plunges out of itself into itself, into the groundlessness and nullity of inauthentic everydayness.”²⁵ This movement towards the groundlessness of Dasein realizes itself in they [*das Man*]’s *knowing everything* in life in a shallow manner.

The illusion of knowing everything blocks Dasein’s potentiality and turns Dasein into they [*das Man*]. This decline occurs because of the groundlessness of Dasein in relation to its fallenness in the world.²⁶ One significant difference between the approaches of Heideggerian and Marxist philosophies is that the concepts of alienation and freedom are discussed as being ontological in *Being and Time*. The intention of this ontological research is the belief that an exploration involving the groundlessness and homelessness of Dasein can reveal the grounds of alienation which blocks the potentiality-for-Being and authenticity of Dasein. Groundlessness [*Bodenlosigkeit*], thrownness [*Geworfenheit*] and homelessness [*Obdachlosigkeit*] in *Being and Time* open many explorations in terms of alienation since the alienation from one’s own being is not independent from alienation from Being.

The concept of homelessness [*Obdachlosigkeit*] is directly defined with regard to they [*das Man*]’s attitude of knowing everything. Coming back from an inauthentic understanding to an authentic understanding related to Being, Heidegger discusses that Dasein is *guilty* for this awakening, because this lostness in ‘they’ gives Dasein a feeling of security of *being at home*. On the other hand, Dasein can realize its finitude by facing death in everydayness which opens a possibility for forming one’s own Self and own life. In this respect, Dasein has the possibility to reveal and understand its relation to its Being. In addition, Dasein can understand that everydayness is alienating since it discloses the relation of Dasein to its own Being. Dasein can face the truth of its self-existence to see that it is away from Being in its homelessness, uncanniness and falling in everyday life. This change in

²⁵ Ibid, p. 223.

²⁶ Groundlessness [*Bodenlosigkeit*] is

understanding gives Dasein a chance to realize its potentiality-for-Being which is hindered by inauthentic understanding of daily life (that is definite and shallow).

Heidegger continues that truth of things is opened to Dasein through its understanding: "Truth of the being-to-be-judged is basically an un-hidden-ness, or open-ness, of that being to the knower."²⁷ Hence Dasein is "guilty" for being free to sustain its potentiality-for-Being in self-understanding related to truth of Being. Heidegger writes that: "This calling-back in which conscious called forth, gives Dasein to understand that Dasein itself – the null basis for its null projection, standing in the possibility of its Being – is to bring itself back to itself from its lostness in the 'they'; and this means that it is guilty."²⁸ He regards the concepts of being guilty and freedom in relation to each other, as Dasein chooses to be free from false consciousness of they [*das Man*]: "What is chosen is having-a-conscious as Being-free for own's ownmost Being-guilty. 'Understanding the appeal' means 'wanting to have a conscience.'²⁹ In this case, detachment from the common answers of everydayness leaves Dasein in a mood of guiltiness when s/he is not familiar to become what s/he is in everyday life under the domination of the masses. As Newell also discusses about the anxiety and homelessness with relation to Dasein's stand against Being:

Subverting our mere "fear" (*Furcht*) of failing to conform and get alone, this anxiety bespeaks a sneaking consciousness of everyday life's groundlessness-its vaporous, "rootless" quality as it floats further and further from the "house" (*Heim*) of our primordial interaction with Being. Anxiety dispels the illusion that we have been "living concretely." On the contrary, we feel "uncanny" (or "unhoused" *unheimlich*), "floating" and "fallen" in the midst of the familiar and customary.³⁰

²⁷ William J. Richardson. *Heidegger. Through phenomenology to thought*, Fordham University Press, New York, 2003 p. 212.

²⁸ *Ibid*, p. 333.

²⁹ *Ibid*, p. 334.

³⁰ Newell, pp. 778-779.

The fact that human beings are thrown to the world and they are homeless is due to the lack of their relation to their own Being. Fallenness belongs to Dasein's existence in its being in the world. To put it differently, truth of Being is concealed to Dasein, because the unconcealment of truth is possible. Thus, this concealment of Being to Dasein is a part of essence of the truth of Being. In this respect, thrown and homeless Dasein is at the same time comported to reveal the truth of its Being. Thus, freedom as the essence of truth allows Dasein to have a conscience in order to get rid of becoming "they [*das Man*]." Hence, Dasein's becoming "they" in inauthenticity and its being authentic are complementary to each other in existence of Dasein in its worldliness.

Actually Heidegger shows a possibility for Dasein by the discussions of fallenness. The possibility of potentiality-for-Being arises from the feeling of homelessness, when Dasein becomes aware of its groundlessness and thrownness into the world. It allows Dasein to think about the ground of its historical and cultural existence, about its Being. While Dasein faces its groundlessness, it comports itself to the truth of its Being. The contemplation about its Being opens Dasein to its historical and cultural Being as a whole. In consequence, Dasein's alienation from its own self also means alienation from its Being.

Heidegger maintains that interpretation of things publicly hides Dasein's turning into "they [*das Man*]". It is caused by the process in which Dasein's self-understanding and understanding of Being are deteriorated for the sake of its "living concretely."³¹ Heidegger explains the affects of this movement of falling as plunging into "the groundlessness of the inauthentic Being of the 'they', has a kind of motion which constantly tears the understanding away from the projecting of authentic possibilities, and into the tranquillized supposition that it possesses everything."³² In addition, he brings about a new concept which is called "turbulence [*Wirbel*]" in this movement of falling: "Since the understanding is thus constantly torn away from authenticity and into the 'they' (though always with a

³¹ Being and Time, p. 223.

³² Ibid, p. 223.

sham of authenticity), the movement of falling is characterized by *turbulence* [*Wirbel*].”³³

Hence everydayness is regarded as alienating for Heidegger. The interpretation of everyday is a lost sight of Dasein; since it forgets its relation to Being. Heidegger declares: “In going back to the existential structures of the disclosedness of Being-in-the-world, our interpretation has, in a way, lost sight of Dasein’s everydayness.”³⁴ Heidegger argues that “they” reveal nothing of one own’s Being through this kind of sight, since it is alienated to its Self:

what are the existential characteristics of the disclosedness of Being-in-the-world, so far as the latter, as something which is everyday, maintains itself in the kind of Being of the ‘they’? Does the ‘they’ have a state-of-mind which is specific to it, a special way of understanding, talking and interpreting?”³⁵

Inauthenticity belongs to the way of living of Dasein, when Dasein is thrown into everyday world of publicness: “Is not Dasein, as thrown Being-in-the-world, thrown proximally right into the publicness of the ‘they’? And what does this publicness mean, other than the specific disclosedness of the ‘they’?” These characteristics belonging to “they” in its publicness [*Öffentlichkeit*] also reveal the Being of Dasein, as they are a part of existence of Dasein.³⁶ Thus, Heidegger adds that everydayness of Dasein also reveals Being of Dasein when it is interrogated “in an ontologically adequate manner”. In this respect, Heidegger defines it as the “phenomenon of thrownness” of Dasein in the world and offers a serious analysis of inauthenticity in explication of the truth of ontologico-existential being of Dasein:

³³ Ibid, p. 223.

³⁴ Ibid, p. 210.

³⁵ Ibid, p. 210.

³⁶ Ibid, p. 210.

When this tendency has been explicated in an ontologically adequate manner, it must unveil a primordial kind of Being of Dasein, in such a way, indeed, that from this kind of Being the phenomenon of thrownness, to which we called attention, can be exhibited in its existential concreteness.³⁷

This disclosure of the phenomenon of the “they” is possible through discourse, sight and interpretation as Heidegger asserts: “In the first instance what is required is that the disclosedness of the ‘they’— that is, the everyday kind of Being of discourse, sight and interpretation – should be made visible in certain definite phenomena”³⁸ Therefore, idle talk [*Gerede*] reveals Dasein’s thrownness into “they”; it is related to “everyday understanding and interpreting”: “The expression ‘idle talk’ [*Gerede*] is not to be used here in a ‘disparaging’ signification. Terminologically, it signifies a positive phenomenon which constitutes the kind of Being of everyday Dasein’s understanding and interpreting.”³⁹ However, the everyday Dasein is away from authentic understanding of Self in moments of idle talk [*Gerede*].

Understanding constructs the Being of Dasein while it also allows the interpretation of Dasein by being a ground for it. The Being stay hidden in all these approaches; since it is the character and ground for all interpretation.⁴⁰ On the other hand, inauthentic understanding of “they [*das Man*]” belongs to the groundlessness of Dasein, on account of getting away from its Being. Hence idle talk reveals the everydayness of Dasein. Idle talk is groundless because it does not reveal the authentic understanding of Being: “Idle talk is constituted by just such gossiping and passing the word along – a process by which its initial lack of grounds to stand on [*Bodenständigkeit*] becomes aggravated to complete groundlessness [*Bodenlosigkeit*]”.⁴¹ Since truth of Being is concealing and unconcealing at the

³⁷ Ibid, p. 210.

³⁸ Ibid, p. 210.

³⁹ Ibid, p. 211.

⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 211.

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 212.

same time throughout the day of Dasein in authentic and inauthentic modes of their existence; discourse also passes to idle talk at some whiles in everyday life. Heidegger discusses this passage as: “Discourse, which belongs to essential state of Dasein’s Being and has a share in constituting Dasein’s disclosedness, has the possibility of becoming idle talk” and becomes “groundless” by “perverting the act of disclosing [*Erchliessen*] into an act of closing off [*Verschliessen*]”.⁴²

Heidegger adds that this discourse of idle talk “has lost its primary relationship-of-Being towards the entity talked about” and it is lost an adequate relationship to the truth of entity, it is “*gossiping* and *passing the word along*” as Heidegger puts it:

Because this discoursing has lost its primary relationship-of-Being towards the entity talked about, or else has never achieved such a relationship, it does not communicate in such a way has to let this entity be appropriated in a primordial manner, but communicates rather by following the route of *gossiping* and *passing the word along*.⁴³

Heidegger discusses if fallenness means a loss of itself or not. He answers that inauthenticity also belongs to the life of Dasein. Heidegger discusses this statement also with the impossibility of isolation of Dasein: Falling into the world would be phenomenal ‘evidence’ against the existentiality of Dasein only if Dasein were regarded as an isolated ‘I’ or subject, as a self-point from which it moves away. In that case, the world would be an Object.”⁴⁴ On the other hand, the world cannot be objectified since Dasein lives in the world, its existence cannot be separated from the world. Therefore, inauthenticity and fallenness belong to the existence of Dasein. However, they are deficient modes of Dasein’s way of living.

⁴² Ibid, p. 212.

⁴³ Ibid, p. 212.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 223.

Heidegger argues that even inauthenticity in fallenness of Dasein belongs to the existence of Dasein, its fallenness creates a turbulence which makes Dasein distant from authenticity and its potentiality-for-Being. Thus, fallenness of Dasein is alienating by definition.

How do we define authenticity, then? Is authenticity being away from fallenness in the world? Does authenticity belong to some moments which are isolated from everydayness? No. Heidegger discusses that authenticity also belongs to everydayness: “*Authentic* existence is not something which floats above falling everydayness; existentially, it is only a modified way in which such everydayness is seized upon.”⁴⁵ Therefore, authenticity is a modified way of understanding of everydayness. Authenticity also belongs to the world, however, it copes with things in a different manner which is related to authentic self-understanding of Dasein.

In brief, the alienation is described as getting away by being unaware of its potentiality-for-Being since Dasein thinks that it knows “everything” in its inauthentic understanding. This way of thinking which is definite and shallow makes Dasein get away from its potentiality-for-Being in the mode of authenticity.

But how does alienation prevent human beings from realizing their potentials for their own self-understanding? In order to answer this question adequately, some key concepts of *Being and Time* will be explored in relation to alienation [*Entfremdung*] to one’s own Self in the next chapter. For this purpose, Marxist concept of alination will be discussed together with the alienation in *Being and Time* where Marxist discussions on alienation also focuses on this oppression on the potentiality on human beings as a result of economical relations in capitalist system.

⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 224.

2.c Marxist Analysis and *Being and Time*

Most detailed critiques on the political impacts of Heideggerian philosophy (since he does not use a Marxist dialectical analysis) is made by Theodor W. Adorno, in his *The Jargon of Authenticity*. In order to dispute the approach of the Frankfurt School to the philosophy of Heidegger, relevant arguments to the concept of alienation and mass culture will be discussed in this part.

First, Adorno has an illusion that truth in Heideggerian philosophy is transcendent to the structures of life like in a Platonic formulation. Adorno misinterprets the concept of transcendence of Heidegger as being disinterested to ontic structures of life and focusing on the ground as ontological. Ontic-ontological distinction in the philosophy of Heidegger can be explained as follows: the simple facts of “entities” in the world belong to ontic investigation and what is “ontological” forms a ground for all these ontic structures as sustaining the Being of entities and Dasein.

In contrast to Adorno’s claim on ontic and ontological, Heidegger maintains that Dasein transcends to the existential structures of life in its worldliness, rather than an external world which its Being belongs to. In this respect, its Being and the world is immanent to Dasein’s existence. Hence his philosophy takes its basis on both ontic and ontological existential structures of Dasein’s way of living in the world. While the ontological grounds the ontic structures of existence, focusing on one and leaving aside another is not possible in Heideggerian philosophy.

According to his line of argument, Adorno evaluates that Heidegger focuses on “ontological” and disregards ontic structures. Adorno discusses that Heidegger’s ignoring the discussions on ontic political economy in his philosophy would be a good use for dictatoria. He stresses also “irrational, self-sufficient authority” that comes with Heidegger’s jargon of authenticity would be a good use of a dictatorship such as Hitler’s.⁴⁶ Adorno is so extreme in this evaluation since Heidegger’s philosophy is coherent in its conceptual context and it has a method of its own (phenomenological method and hermeneutic method). He shows the

⁴⁶ Adorno, p. 65.

inadequacy of rationalism in explaining life; however his philosophy is not produced to be a tool for Nazism. It just follows the existentialist tradition.

Adorno interprets the results of the lack of Marxist rationalism in Heidegger's philosophy by observing that it stays as a jargon which maintains the high ego in culture industry and even it becomes a slogan of culture industry:

Pure clean hands recoil from the thought of changing anything in the valid property-and-authority relationships; the very sound of it all makes that idea contemptible, as the merely ontic is to Heidegger. One can trust anyone who babbles this jargon; people wear it in their buttonholes, in place of the currently disreputable party badge.⁴⁷

Whereas the lack of a discussion of property relations in Heideggerian philosophy can be used by the control of masses in culture industry, the revolutionary self-understanding which shows the ground of the problem of alienation and mass formation can be a good help for finding a way through the problem fundamentally. Also when authenticity is taken in its genuine meaning, it can not be reduced to a jargon of masses [*das Man*] which can be carried on "buttonholes", since the concept of authenticity is itself against the alienating effects of public interpretation in definition. Public interpretation is described as being "shallow and definite" by Heidegger.

In the discussions of authenticity, each Dasein becomes what it is through dealing with its own Self. In this respect, it does not lose its Self in uniformity of public interpretation belonging to "they" [*das Man*]. Heidegger's stress on revolutionary self-understanding of Dasein in its authenticity can solve the problem of uniformity and loss of selves in alienation of mass cultures.

Awareness of Self and together-being is also discussed by the works of Marx in awakening masses, where the revolution requires the awareness of workers in class

⁴⁷ Adorno, p. 15.

consciousness to indicate why the world should be changed.⁴⁸ This awareness comes through a detailed analysis of the effects of capitalism on human life.

Heideggerian analysis of alienation searches the grounds of alination in an ontological level. Adorno's critique arises from the fact that Heidegger's approach to the analysis of socioeconomic relations is different from that of Adorno. Newell asserts that Heidegger believes that "critique of modern society had to be deepened beyond the socioeconomic":

Heidegger believed this was necessary because objective socioeconomic conditions (the everyday world) held no key for man's liberation from modern life; man was in no way progressively enriched and advanced by them. The belief that new human beings would emerge from such a progression, whether it be Marx's proletariat or even Nietzsche's superman, had, in his view, merely elevated and strengthened the grip of modern rational organization. Heidegger's response to this condition is to advance a notion of community so radical that, under its influence, alienation or lack of freedom can be seen not merely as material or even relative deprivation, but as the oppressive need to live in a world where anything is fixed and permanent."⁴⁹

Heidegger formulates an ontological existential philosophy where Dasein live together in unity, also in a world in which nothing is defined in a fixed and permanent manner. He leaves the existence of Dasein intentionally as an open-project in time. In this respect, his philosophy allows the liberation from oppressive modern conceptions of human beings and life. Heidegger defends that getting rid of the domination of they [*das Man*] in society can only be possible through strengthening the self-understanding of Dasein through a revolutionary awakening. While the subjectivity and existence of Dasein gains power in together-living with

⁴⁸ Kenneth L. Morrison. *Marx, Durkheim, Weber: formations of modern social thought*, Sage Publications Ltd, 2006, USA, p. 391.

⁴⁹ Newell, p. 783.

Others, the oppressive affects of they [*das Man*] as forming masses could be overcome.

In addition to his critiques on Heideggerian approach towards economical relations, Adorno also argues that existentialist jargon (such as Kierkegaard's radical inwardness) conceals the differences among the human beings in society, where Heidegger's concept of authenticity leaves aside the differences among human beings in their existence and equates them in their capacity for authenticity. A worker can be authentic as well as a bourgeois can be, it depends on their beings towards death. In all of these discussions, Heidegger is careful to describe how Dasein defines itself since Dasein as social human beings is an uncompleted project. Dasein's self-understanding is taken as the motive for change in its ground. Thus, Heidegger takes its ground in a more fundamental way than Adorno, whereas economy political approaches are left blank in his philosophy.

Whereas Heidegger leaves Dasein as "not-defined" intentionally, Adorno advocates that leaving rational descriptions aside would lead to a domination of capitalist rationality in society rather than a Hegelian-Marxist dialectical analysis of society. It is true that Heidegger did not have a dialectical analysis towards society; however Heideggerian philosophy is also not at odds with Marxism. Then, the sociopsychological approaches of Heidegger can be merged with socioeconomical analyses of Marx in order to grasp problems of capitalist modernity, such as alienation, mass culture and fetishism of commodities.

Adorno makes clear why he regards Heideggerian philosophy as conformative. He disputes that Heideggerian philosophy feeds the culture industry since "the bourgeois form of rationality has always needed the irrational supplements."⁵⁰ He discusses that the liberalism and fascism uses the existentialist jargon since it describes itself as groundless in contrast to having an origin.⁵¹ According to Adorno, the rational analysis of ontic structures of society as economy politic relations is a must for a healthy analysis of society.

⁵⁰ Adorno, p. 38.

⁵¹ Ibid, p. 39.

Contrary to his arguments against Heideggerian philosophy, Adorno's ideas on the masses are very similar to Heideggerian discussions of "they [*das Man*]" which have no consciousness of themselves and are merely manipulative. Adorno asserts that some people in society dominate others and they bring about the formation of mass cultures. He states that "it was not Man who created the institutions but particular men with a particular constellation with nature and with themselves. This constellation forced the institutions on them in the same way that men erected those institutions, without consciousness."⁵² Similarly, Hogan discusses Dworkin's theory that legal interpretation that effects society comes through "a sort of moral rationalization of the law or legal system in question" and therefore affirmative.⁵³ Stecker also quotes Dworkin that an interpretation always shows "the community's structure of institutions and decisions" by political morality.⁵⁴ For Heidegger, inauthentic understanding and public interpretation are directly affected by the institutions of authority which are formed by "they" and the manipulation of Dasein's understanding and action will take place under the dominion of they [*das Man*]'s authority. By this dominion of they [*das Man*] in society, alienation occurs by the distortion of Dasein's genuine self understanding and thus its freedom.

In contrast to Adorno's critiques on which Heidegger's conception of Dasein as groundless, Heidegger does not describe the essence of man intentionally, owing to the fact that existence comes before essence according to his philosophy.

Heidegger reveals human beings' modes of existence without separating their moods from their reason. He is a philosopher who conceptualizes the existence of human beings in detail, evaluating the being of them not as a finished project but as continuously reinterpreted in time through hermeneutics. It is probably the cause what made Heidegger so influential on other thinkers of the modernist and post-modernist philosophy.

⁵² Ibid, p. 50.

⁵³ Hogan, Patrick Colm, *On Interpretation – Meaning and Inference in Law, Psychoanalysis, and Literature*, The University of Georgia Press, Greece, 1996, p. 101.

⁵⁴ Stecker, Robert, *Interpretation and Construction – Art, Speech, and the Law*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, UK, 2003, p. 171.

Heidegger's ontological-existential analysis of human beings does not follow a Hegelian rational analysis; however, it widens the social analysis by counting also the moods of human beings, whereas Hegel only stresses the dialectical reason in the history. In general, Marxist analysis is not at odds with Heidegger's philosophy. While Heidegger's student, Herbert Marcuse found a place in Frankfurt School and developed his thesis on "one-dimensional society", deriving from *uniformity of human beings [Einheitlichkeit von Dasein] in modern technological age*, through a clear effect of Heideggerian philosophy. Also, political theorists such as Hannah Arendt derived their theories from the individuality and authenticity of Dasein against the totalitarianism in societies.

Heidegger's philosophy evaluates subject with historical and cultural determinations that are carried along in generations by language and common ways of Dasein's living. In this context, Heidegger's analysis is not a rationalistic analysis in scope of Hegelian/Marxist tradition, but it takes its ground also from emotional determinations in addition to its stress on historical determinations on human life through culture and language. In this case, the philosophy of Heidegger sustains a balance line between historical rational analysis and existentialism. In addition, the importance of the individual is recognized since the society is made up of human beings which cannot be regarded as masses. Existentialism in Marxism also gains importance to analyse the affects of capitalism on people especially their alienation from themselves and from other people in the society.

Samuel Weber's stress can be regarded in this sense, when he notes that "to construct a whole new logic of collective dynamics" through individual experience is necessary for Marxist theory."⁵⁵ In addition, Frankfurt School realized "orthodox Marxism's inability to transcend affirmative culture."⁵⁶ In fact, Heidegger's approach to society and his criticisms of modern life is not far away from that of critical theorists. Newell asserts that Kolakowski describes Heideggerian

⁵⁵ Samuel Weber. *Institution and Interpretation*, Stanford University Press, USA, 2001, p. 53.

⁵⁶ Martin Jay. *The Dialectical Imagination – A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research 1923-1950*, Little, Brown and Company, USA, 1973, p. 181.

philosophy as “Marxism without . . . the proletariat” in his *Main currents of Marxism*. Heidegger shares the attitude of the Frankfurt School in its historical social analysis, where it has “much- heightened sensitivity toward the perceived failings of modern society extended beyond the economic to include the cultural, psychological, and aesthetic, accompanied by a lack of certainty that any currently existing class or group has a demonstrable historical mission to remedy them.”⁵⁷

Dallmayr also maintains that “in the reading of the early Marcuse, *Being and Time* furnished impulses for a philosophical rejuvenation of Marxism in which project and decision resurfaced in the guise of "revolutionary praxis.”⁵⁸ Newell also maintains that Lukacs and Heidegger shared the vision that “the critique of modern society had to be deepened beyond the socioeconomic” and “Lukacs' category of reification, Goldman demonstrates, occupies a position in his theory analogous to Heidegger's category of "presence," the objective aspect of things whose elevation into absolute reality is the hallmark of everyday life.”⁵⁹ Goldmann also discusses that Heidegger and Lukacs agree on their oppositeness to positivist thought on affirmation of everyday life. According to both of them, presence of an object is not a fact but a construction, “every thought implies the construction of the subject” and “there is no given world, the object is constructed.”⁶⁰ On contrary to Adorno’s claims that Heideggerian philosophy is positivist and Heideggerian philosophy is partly an affirmation of daily life in “praise of positivity” like Jaspers,⁶¹ it is clear that this claim of Adorno is result of a prejudice.

⁵⁷ Newell, p. 783.

⁵⁸ Dallmayr, p. 211.

⁵⁹ Newell, p. 783.

⁶⁰ Lucien Goldmann. *Lukács and Heidegger – Towards a New Philosophy*, trans. William Q. Boelhower, Routledge, USA, 2009, p. 30.

⁶¹ Adorno, p. 17.

CHAPTER III

ALIENATION FROM ONE'S OWN BEING, FROM SOCIETY AND FROM ITS SPECIES-BEING

3.a Oppression on Potentiality of One's Own Being

First of all, understanding [*Versehen*] of the world opens the possibilities for the self-understanding of human beings in society, understanding has the capacity to reveal what human beings are. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger asserts that human beings in a society [*Dasein*] *become what they are* by their understanding.⁶² The understanding in this assertion is the authentic understanding of *Dasein* which is different from inauthentic understanding which claims to know “everything” in a shallow manner. It means that human beings have an existential characteristic of “choosing” when they are projected into various possibilities in life. Heidegger implies the relation of understanding and becoming with these words: “Become what you are', and say this with understanding.”⁶³ About the self realization in its authentic understanding, Dallmayr also discusses that: “Thus the focus in the early period on *Dasein* and authentic human self-enactment has given rise to an existentialist type of political theorizing that places the accent squarely on individual choice, decision, and activity.”⁶⁴ Thus, self-choice in *Being and Time* leads to an existential stand which is contrary to alienation to one's own self.

Heidegger implies that “any *Dasein* has already diverted its potentiality-for-Being into a possibility of understanding.”⁶⁵ Understanding gives human beings a possibility to disclose their Being in the world in being “there” in the world [*Dasein*: being-there], their *potentiality-for-Being* in an existential-ontological sense. It

⁶² *Being and Time*, pp. 185-186.

⁶³ *Being and Time*, p. 186.

⁶⁴ Fred R. Dallmayr. “Ontology of Freedom: Heidegger and Political Philosophy”, *Political Theory*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (May, 1984), p. 210.

⁶⁵ *Being and Time*, p. 186.

means that Dasein can only understand itself in terms of its world.⁶⁶ Every understanding is the understanding of “there” for Da-sein. Such disclosive understanding is pre-given to Dasein by language and culture, interpretation “operates in fore-structure” and Heidegger adds that understanding reveals the existence of Dasein in the world as a whole.⁶⁷

Caused by the understanding which reveals the capacity of human beings’ becoming what they are, human beings are not alienated to their Selves and to the world in these conceptions of understanding and world. Dasein arrives at an awareness that the world is not separate from its Self. By this way, the ontological-existential structure of Dasein’s understanding maintains the relation between ontic and ontological, since the unconcealment of Being in Dasein is possible only through Dasein’s understanding of the world.

Hence understanding opens the way of potentiality-for-Being, it shows Dasein what it is capable of. By understanding, Dasein “ ‘knows’ *what* it is capable of – that is, what its potentiality-for-Being is capable of. This ‘knowing’ does not first arise from an immanent self-perception, but belongs to the Being of the ‘there’, which is essentially understanding.”⁶⁸ Thus, Dasein’s finding its potentiality-for-Being belongs to the way of its existence as its understanding.

Since “Dasein is the possibility of Being-free *for* its ownmost potentiality-for-Being,”⁶⁹ it can understand its capacity and potentiality-for-Being, or it can fail to recognize these capacities related to Being since they are thrown to the world. Accordingly, Dasein’s search in possibilities in world should be directed into recognizing own potentiality which is related to Being:

⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 186.

⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 194.

⁶⁸ Ibid, p. 184.

⁶⁹ Ibid, p. 183.

And only *because* Dasein, in understanding is its “there”, *can* it go astray and fail to recognize itself. And in so far as understanding is *accompanied by* state-of-mind and as such is existentially surrendered to thrownness, Dasein has in every case already gone astray and failed to recognize itself. In its potentiality-for-Being it is therefore delivered over to the possibility of first finding itself again in its possibilities.⁷⁰

When Dasein chooses in the possibilities of his life, his potentiality-for-Being is disclosed in such a way that it reveals the existence of Dasein, since Dasein is what it chooses by its understanding. Heidegger asserts: “*Understanding is the existential Being of Dasein’s own potentiality-for-Being; and it is so in such a way that this Being discloses in itself what its Being is capable of.* We must grasp the structure of this *existentiale* more precisely.”⁷¹

Potentiality-for-Being belongs to world, since Da-sein lives in the world. Freedom, as the way of existence of Dasein, means in this context, being free for possibilities in the world: “As a disclosure, understanding always pertains to the whole basic state of Being-in-the-world. As a potentiality-for-Being, any Being-in is a potentiality-for-Being-in-the-world (...) when that which is within-the-world is itself freed, this entity is freed for its *own* possibilities.”⁷² Heidegger also expresses the relation of authenticity and Dasein’s *freedom of choosing-itself* as such:

Anxiety makes manifest in Dasein its Being towards its ownmost possibility-for-Being – that is, its Being-free for the freedom of choosing itself and taking hold of itself. Anxiety brings Dasein face to face its Being-free for (propensio in...) the authenticity of its Being, and for this authenticity as a possibility which it always is. But at the same time, this is the Being to which Dasein as Being-in-the-world has been delivered over.⁷³

⁷⁰ Ibid, p. 184.

⁷¹ Ibid, p. 184.

⁷² Ibid, p. 184.

⁷³ Ibid, pp. 232-233.

In this sense, anxiety [*Angst*]⁷⁴ towards death brings the capacity of choice between the possibilities in human existence. That is because facing its own death allows Dasein to be free to choose its own life, recognizing its own potentiality in relation to Being. Dasein can understand its own potentiality in connection to self-potentiality towards its Being. Anxiety opens the possibility for being authentic as Heidegger implies that: “Being-free for one’s ownmost potentiality-for-Being, and therewith for the possibility of authenticity and inauthenticity, is shown, with a primordial, elemental concreteness, in anxiety.”⁷⁵ Hence anxiety discloses a possibility of opening a self-potential in Dasein’s existence, which is its authenticity. Dasein’s capacity of free choice and authenticity are bound to each other in this case of revealing its potentiality-for-Being.

There is another important point to be discussed, where Heidegger differentiates between anxiety [*Angst*] and fear [*Furcht*]. Anxiety and fear are different from each other in their capacities of choices between possibilities in the existence of Dasein: “Anxiety can mount authentically only in a Dasein which is resolute. He who is resolute knows no fear; but he understands the possibility of anxiety as the possibility of the very mood which neither inhibits nor bewilders him.”⁷⁶ Heidegger maintains certainly the relations of anxiety and fear to authenticity and freedom: “Anxiety liberates him from possibilities which ‘count for nothing [“*nichtigen*”]’ and lets him become free for those which are authentic.”⁷⁷ To put in another way, freeing oneself for authenticity means that Dasein’s being ready to choose its own

⁷⁴ Anxiety is used in *Being and Time* as referring to an individual experience of anxiety; it is not used for the benefit of Nazism: “With the appearance of *Sein und Zeit*, it is likely that none of Heidegger’s students would have imagined that “my ownmost” death, radically individualized, and a central category of *Sein und Zeit*, would be travestied six years later in a celebration of a National Socialist “hero.” See Karl Löwith, Richard Wolin, Melissa J. Cox. “The Political Implications of Heidegger’s Existentialism”, *New German Critique*, No. 45, Special Issue on Bloch and Heidegger (Autumn, 1988), p. 127.

Hence anxiety opens a possibility *for one’s ownmost potentiality-for-Being* as included in the concepts of freedom and authenticity not for the potentiality of a nation or a mass.

⁷⁵ *Being and Time*, p. 236.

⁷⁶ *Ibid*, p. 395.

⁷⁷ *Ibid*, p. 395.

Self and own life in freedom. Dasein's existence in freedom allows it to project into various possibilities in its world for choice.

Authentic understanding, which is denoted as Dasein's understanding of its Being, is related to the potentiality of Dasein for Being. The authenticity is generally discussed with Dasein's making choices between possibilities in the world for revealing the potentiality for Being. But what kind of choices are called as authentic choices? Heidegger disputes: "In understanding the call, Dasein is in thrall to [hörig] its ownmost possibility of existence. It has chosen itself."⁷⁸ Furthermore, he implies that: "This potentiality is that for the sake of which any Dasein is as it is. In each case Dasein already compared itself, in its Being, with a possibility of itself."⁷⁹ These discussions imply that Dasein views the possibilities in its life and compares itself with the potentiality of itself.

Due to the fact that Dasein's revealing the potentiality for its Being is only possible through making authentic choices in *her/his becoming what s/he is*, alienation from one's own self can be analysed as being contrary to the concept of authenticity. Heideggerian stand against alienation can be summarized as follows: Self-forgetfulness in everyday life leads to false consciousness by bringing about the distortion of authentic self-understanding. Dasein tries to hold on to inauthenticity by being afraid to face its finitude in its fallenness. Accepting the common answers in everydayness in a manner of "knowing everything" gives a feeling of security, rather than Dasein's facing death in anxiety and choosing its own Self and life. This inclination towards easiness in Dasein's inauthenticity hinders its authentic understanding which belongs to its genuine Self with regard to its Being.

While Marxist alienation makes the analysis of alienation through the method of economy politic, Heidegger focuses on the loss of self-understanding and meaning in life. In this respect, the existential exploration can shed light onto the socio-psychological dynamics of alienation.

⁷⁸ Ibid, p. 334.

⁷⁹ Ibid, p. 236.

The authenticity allows Dasein to face its death and to choose its life for itself, when it allows Dasein to fulfill its potentiality by realizing its own self towards death. Heidegger defends the authenticity to having a retrieval from fallenness at some instants by a modified view in worldliness, as Newell also asserts that the everyday life is “alienating” and “to remedy this alienation, man must achieve ‘authenticity’ through ‘freedom-toward-death.’”⁸⁰ The concept of *freedom towards death [Freiheit-zum-Tod]* will be analyzed in detail in coming paragraphs in its opposite stand to alienation.

Heidegger also makes a distinction between *inauthentic Being-towards-death* and *anticipation [Vorlaufen]*. He implies that:

anticipation, however, unlike inauthentic Being-towards-death, does not evade the fact that is not to be outstripped; instead, anticipation frees itself for *accepting* this. When, by anticipation, one becomes free for one’s own death, one is liberated from one’s lostness in those possibilities which may accidentally thrust themselves upon one; and one is liberated in such a way that for the first time one can authentically understand and choose among the factual possibilities lying ahead of that possibility which is not to be outstripped.⁸¹

Additionally, he emphasizes the ownmost potentiality of Dasein as freedom when it faces its end. Dasein is “free for its ownmost possibilities, which are determined by the *end*.”⁸² Since Dasein is finite [*endliche*], the awareness of its finitude forms a ground for its choosing its Self and world between various possibilities in the world in its authenticity and freedom. Facing its death gives Dasein the possibility of revealing its potentiality-for-Being through its authentic understanding which discloses the Being of its existence. Hence, Heidegger implies that anticipation

⁸⁰ Newell, p. 776.

⁸¹ Being and Time, p. 308.

⁸² Ibid, p. 308.

“includes the possibility of existing as a *whole potentiality-for-Being*.⁸³ Heidegger states the importance of anticipation and freedom towards death in human existence towards authenticity:

*Anticipation reveals to Dasein its lostness in the they-self, and brings it face to face with the possibility of being itself, primarily unsupported by concerned solicitude, but of being itself, rather, in an impassioned **freedom towards death** – a freedom which has been released from the Illusions of the “they”, and which is factual, certain of itself, and anxious.*⁸⁴

Heidegger emphasizes the freedom towards death as it allows Dasein *to be released from the Illusions of the ‘they’*. In Heideggerian terminology, the loss of self-understanding leads to the failing of potentiality-for-Being, which turns Dasein into they [*das Man*]. Briefly, Heidegger makes accent on individual when he describes the authenticity towards death, where self-understanding is the key point in Dasein’s unconcealing itself as truth.

The mass culture of modernity is seriously criticized by Heidegger in his description of they [*das Man*] as being *no one*. This serious analysis on “they [*das Man*]” in Heideggerian philosophy can be thought similar to Frankfurt School’s critique on mass culture. Hoy and McCarthy also imply Heidegger’s stance in the critiques on conformism of mass culture: “The critique of conformism is not unique to Horkheimer and Adorno, of course. Another, earlier example is Heidegger’s description in *Being and Time* (1927) of “das Man,” the anonymous third-person (‘one’ or ‘they’) who does everything that is expected but who can never be called to account.”⁸⁵ On the other hand, the Frankfurt School regards Heidegger as having an apolitical and asocial philosophy and disregards his ideas on distortion of Self in modernity. As Hoy and McCarthy discuss: “Horkheimer and Adorno wish to keep their distance from Heidegger because they believe that Heidegger’s appeal to

⁸³ Ibid, p. 309.

⁸⁴ Ibid, p. 311.

⁸⁵ Hoy, David Couzens & McCarthy, Thomas, *Critical Theory*, Blackwell Publishers Inc., USA, 1996, p. 129.

authenticity is an asocial, bourgeois reversion to an empty individualism.⁸⁶ Conversely, many concepts in *Being and Time* especially being-with [*Mitsein*], solicitude [*Fürsorge*], empathy [*Einführung*] and being bound in authenticity [*Eigentlichkeit*] in work clearly imply that Heideggerian philosophy is not “mere individualist” and asocial.⁸⁷

They [*das Man*] can be identified by its oppressive effect on way of existence in world. They suppress the free thinking of Dasein, while presenting *every judgement and decision as its own*. Newell also maintains the discussion of Steiner on “they”:

Heidegger’s evocation of the “dictatorship of the ‘they,’ “a dictatorship that includes, but goes beyond the seemingly self-perpetuating and disembodied mechanism of public opinion, has made a powerful contribution to the sociology of alienation from bourgeois “mass” society.⁸⁸

Heidegger clearly discusses the authority relations of the “they” in *Being and Time*: “The “they” is there alongside everywhere [ist überall dabei], but in such a manner that it has always stolen away wherever Dasein presses for a decision” and they also block the process of judgement and decision, “yet because the “they” presents every judgement and decision as its own, it deprives the particular Dasein of its answerability.”⁸⁹ Additionally, these decisions are made by nobody, since “they” are just masses, they do not have a peculiar understanding of their own: “It is not someone, who needs to vouch for anything. It ‘was’ always the “they” who did it, and yet it can be said that it has been ‘no one’. In Dasein’s everydayness the agency through which most things come about is one of which we must say that “it was no

⁸⁶ Ibid, p. 129.

⁸⁷ These concepts will be discussed in the coming parts in detail.

⁸⁸ Newell, p. 777.

⁸⁹ *Being and Time*, p. 165.

one.”⁹⁰ That is, the loss of Dasein in the concept of they [das Man] shows the alienation to Self in modernist society.

Heidegger describes the difficulty in grasping “they [*das Man*]”s behaviour in *Being and Time*: “The more openly the “they” behaves, the harder it is to grasp, and the slier it is, but the less is it nothing at all. If we see it ontico-ontologically with an unprejudiced eye, it reveals itself as the ‘Realest subject’ of everydayness.”⁹¹ Even they are real, they stay as “no one” in *Being and Time* by having no authentic self-understanding.

In short, Heideggerian stand against alienation to one’s own being takes groundlessness, homelessness and thrownness into the world as the ground of alienation ontologically. As long as Dasein gets away from Being, its existence is fallen into the world, where it forgets its authentic self understanding in everydayness. The inauthenticity pushes Dasein into covering of its potentiality-for-Being. Potentiality-for-Being reveals in existence of Dasein, namely its freedom, in the projection onto possibilities in its life. In this line of argument, anxiety and solicitude opens the way for authentic understanding which uncovers Dasein’s potentiality-for-Being. Or, the alienation occurs when Dasein turns into they [*das Man*] in its fallenness where “they” think that they know everything. In this case, they [das Man] cannot realize its potentiality-for-Being since the fundamental questions are not asked and common answers of daily life are accepted.

⁹⁰ Ibid, p. 165.

⁹¹ *Being and Time*, p. 166.

3.b Alienation from Being as Being-with-Others and Alienation from Species-Being

Marx maintains that the prior condition of exchange values in market brings about the alienation effect. He states that the exchange values “whose universality produces not only the alienation of the individual from himself and from others, but also the universality and the comprehensiveness of his relations and capacities.”⁹² Thus, the alienation process makes the worker less developed and alien from her/his Self, from her/his own product as well as from the society.

Heidegger implies that understanding *allows Dasein to become itself*. Additionally, an isolated human being would not be defined as a “Dasein”, for Dasein is described in living with Others in social structures that are shaped by culture and language. It is not a Dasein, since it means also to detach itself from history which reveals the “truth” of its Being at the same time.

Understanding of world and truth are connected in the conceptual context of *Being and Time* closely. Inwood maintains that “Heidegger implied that truth is related to *standing in the openness* in his early works on truth, understanding “*verstehen*, comes from *stehen*, ‘to stand’ in the intransitive sense, though it was originally used transitively too. After BT, Heidegger sometimes writes *ver-stehen*, stressing that to understand something is to stand, or to make it stand, in the open.”⁹³ “Standing in the openness” is defined as being “truth as unconcealment” (in term *aletheia*) in the works of Heidegger. Hence the description of “truth” is attached to understanding of human beings directly.

It can be interpreted that for Heidegger human beings make their own world by their understanding. Thus the world is not independent from Dasein, there would be no world construction if Dasein did not exist. The truth of Being, in this sense can be conceived by human beings through their understanding of Being in their being-

⁹² Marx, p. 162.

⁹³ Inwood, p. 234.

with others and in their care to each other. Therefore, Dasein's unconcealing the truth of Being by its understanding reveals the relation between ontic and ontological. In this sense, Dasein is different from entities which can only be regarded as ontic. Since Dasein can understand its Being, its understanding is also ontological. Accordingly, Dasein's understanding carries the common heritage of understanding through pre-givenness of world to human beings by language which binds all human beings in "being-with" in worldly structures.

While understanding sustains the relation of Dasein to the world, human existence cannot be independent or alienated from the worlds of Others. When Dasein realizes the ontological existential structures of its understanding with regard to its Being in authentic mode of living, it has the potential to see itself in the whole picture of the world and it can realize its existence in the totality of time and place. In this existential ontological formulation which takes its basis from the structure of together-existence in a world, a Dasein who is alienated from its Self and from Others does not live its existence fully, but only deficiently.⁹⁴

On top of that, Heidegger also asserts on alienation from Others that it occurs in "publicity", which can be evaluated as through "the formation of masses in everydayness of modernity". In this respect, he stresses that the they [*das Man*] as masses control and manipulate the everyday life of Dasein, especially in the public sphere. He discusses publicity as belonging to "they" where he first explains why they [*das Man*] can not reveal their potentialities for Being in their lives. Thus, their way of living is a "leveling down": "Everything gained by a struggle becomes just something to be manipulated. Every secret loses its force. This care of averageness reveals in turn an essential tendency of Dasein which we call the "levelling down" [*Einebnung*] of all possibilities of Being."⁹⁵ He further explains what "publicness" is and how they [*das Man*]'s domination of publicness is:

⁹⁴ Dasein's being-alone and being away from others are described as deficient modes of solicitude [*Fürsorge*] of Dasein, which will be discussed in the coming parts in detail.

⁹⁵ Being and Time, p. 165.

Distantiality, averageness, and levelling down, as ways of Being for the “they”, constitute what we know as ‘publicness’ [“*die Öffentlichkeit*”]. Publicness proximally controls every way in which the world and Dasein gets interpreted (...) By publicness everything gets obscured, and what has thus been covered up gets passed off as something familiar and accessible to everyone.”⁹⁶

In fact, Heidegger’s critique of publicness arises from the loss of self understanding of Dasein in a mechanized sense. The alienation from others takes place in this process of the obstruction of selves in mass culture, where he notes that: “Everyone is the other, and no one is himself. The “they” , which supplies the answer to the question of the “who” of everyday Dasein, is the “nobody” to whom every Dasein has already surrendered itself in Being-among-one-other [*Untereinandersein*].”⁹⁷ They [*das Man*] become “nobody” for Dasein, since its existence belongs to together-being with others. On the contrary, they [*das Man*] are alienated to society and to their species-Being.⁹⁸

They [*das Man*] is also alienated to its species-Being as human beings, since the life of the members of a species is an example of together-existence in nature. The concept of side by side [*Nebeneinander*] is important in this discussion, while Dasein “coexist with natural objects (and with one another) in the kind of mutual externality” and “‘side by side’ here connotes an external relation that is modeled on the one that obtains among the natural objects we perceive around us”, where the concept of “side by side” declares that existence of objects may affect one another’s existence in many ways in Heideggerian ontology, which is contrary to Descartes’ modeling of entities that they exist independently from each other.”⁹⁹ Since objects

⁹⁶ Ibid, p. 165.

⁹⁷ Ibid, pp. 165-166.

⁹⁸ Species-Being [*Gattungswesen*] is defined as human beings’ having the consciousness of its species in its essential nature.

⁹⁹ Frederick A. Olafson. *Heidegger and The Ground of Ethics – A Study of Mitsein*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1998, p. 17.

and Dasein affect each other in their existence and they are in unity in nature, Dasein can not be alienated to its species-being in its full way of existence. Yet Dasein can turn into they [*das Man*] and become “nobody” for other Daseins through the loss of the meaning belonging to together-living in society. The natural objects’ and Dasein’s existence belong to each other since “Dasein has already surrendered itself in Being-among-one-other [*Untereinandersein*]”.¹⁰⁰ It is why Heidegger does not term a human being who is alienated from society as “Dasein” but denotes as “nobody”, where Dasein’s existence is grounded in being-with Other in ontological unity.

The domination of they [*das Man*] in society deteriorates also the free capacity of understanding of Dasein. This domination exists everywhere in publicity as Heidegger implies that: “Thus the particular Dasein in its everydayness is disburdened by the ‘they’. Not only that; by thus disburdening it of its Being, the ‘they’ accommodates Dasein [*kommt . . . dem Dasein entgegen*] if Dasein has any tendency to take things easily and make them easy.”¹⁰¹ They [*das Man*] take everything easy by a shallow consideration which disregards the Being, which also suppresses the existence of Dasein. He adds that: “And because the “they” constantly accommodates the particular Dasein by disburdening it of its Being, the “they” retains and enhances its stubborn dominion.”¹⁰² Hence the continuous disburdening of Being forms a shallow way of life which also dominates the existence of Dasein in everydayness.

In this respect, we can find parallels between Marx’s critique of the capitalist system as an alien power that controls the producers themselves and Heidegger’s critique of the masses which dominates and blocks the existence of Dasein. In both cases, the actors’ own actions turn against them. Hence Heidegger would regard capitalist economical life as inauthentic since it works to sustain the everyday world of Dasein for the continuation of masses in modernity.

¹⁰⁰ Being and Time, p. 166.

¹⁰¹ Ibid, p. 165.

¹⁰² Ibid, p. 165.

Adorno implies that Heidegger would find property and authority relations as merely ontic.¹⁰³ Similarly, Newell maintains that “The mediation of freedom, in the Hegelian or Marxist sense, by current empirical conditions would, from Heidegger's viewpoint, chain it to the inauthentic conditions of everyday life and the pervasive dictates of the they-self.”¹⁰⁴

Despite the fact that the economical relations are regarded as ontic by Heidegger, the resultant formation of the masses is due to “the alienation in ontological sense”, as the *groundlessness* of the activity of masses. Thus, Heidegger discusses groundlessness, homelessness and fallenness as the ontological causes for alienation [*Entfremdung*]. These characteristics of Dasein in its inauthenticity belongs also to its way of existence. However, Heidegger shows another mode of living by his concept of “authenticity” (as a modified way of inauthenticity) which deals with genuine understanding of Being.

In this part, alienation from society was discussed in detail in a conceptual context of *Being and Time*. In the next paragraphs, Marxist alienation from society will be discussed in relation to Heideggerian conception of alienation from others, since Dasein's existence cannot be independent from others ontologically, through the concepts of “side by side” [*Nebeneinander*] and “being-with” [*Mitsein*].

¹⁰³ Adorno, p. 15.

¹⁰⁴ Newell, p. 780.

3.c Together Living in Empathy vs Being-Alone

There are three main concepts of Heidegger by which an ethical theory can be grounded. Those are Being-with [*Mitsein*], solicitude [*Fürsorge*] and Resoluteness [*Entschlossenheit*].¹⁰⁵ Being-with implies “our being in the world together with one another” where solicitude [*Fürsorge*] is central to being-with and it implies “one human beings’s caring about another.”¹⁰⁶ Resoluteness also “pushes us into a caring *Mitsein* with others.”¹⁰⁷

Heidegger stresses that *Dasein is for the sake of Others*.¹⁰⁸ He maintains that “Being with Others belongs to the Being of *Dasein*, which is an issue for *Dasein* in its very Being. Thus as Being-with, *Dasein* ‘is’ essentially for the sake of Others.”¹⁰⁹ “For the sake of” arises from our caring for each other, where Okrent asserts that “we understand ourselves and our existence by way of the activities we pursue and the things we take care of.’ The self is primarily tacitly intended as that ‘for the sake of which’ things matter to us and our activities make sense”¹¹⁰ Since *Dasein* is already projected into possibilities in existential structures and Heidegger calls *for-the-sake-of-which* as *projection* on possibilities, there is always a purposivity in the understanding and existence of *Dasein*.¹¹¹ Hence, “*Dasein* is for the sake of others” means that *Dasein*’s understanding and existence is on purpose and direction of living with others. That is, *Dasein*’s existence belongs to a kind of existence of being-with Others.

¹⁰⁵ Olafson, pp. 3-5.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, pp. 3-4.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, pp. 4-5.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, p. 4.

¹⁰⁹ *Being and Time*, p. 160.

¹¹⁰ Mark Okrent. “The ‘I Think’ and the For-the-Sake-of-Which”, in *Transcendental Heidegger*, Steven Crowell & Jeff Malpas (eds.), Stanford University Press, USA, 2007, p. 151.

¹¹¹ Hubert L. Dreyfus. *Being-in-the-World- A Commentary on Heidegger’s Being and Time*, Division I, The MIT Press, USA, 1991, pp. 186-187.

Heidegger argues that “even if the particular factual Dasein does *not* turn to Others, and supposes that it has no need of them or manages to get along without them, it *is* in the way of Being-with. In Being-with, as the existential ‘for-the-sake-of’ of Others, these have already disclosed in their Dasein”; this statement occurs because Dasein “with their Being-with, their disclosedness has been constituted beforehand; accordingly, this disclosedness also goes to make up significance—that is to say, worldhood.”¹¹² Significance or meaningfulness [*Bedeutsamkeit*] is defined by Heidegger as Dasein’s existential structures of living in the world through Dasein’s meaning-giving process. Thus, the worldhood of Dasein is constituted beforehand by meanings which are carried by language and cultural structures in time.

Heidegger maintains that “the world is always the one that I share with Others. The world of Dasein is a *with-world* [*Mitwelt*]. Being-in is *Being-with* Others. Their Being-in-themselves within-the-world is *Dasein-with* [*Mit-Dasein*].”¹¹³ Being-with Others is ontological where Heidegger maintains that the assertion of “‘Dasein is essentially Being-with’ has an existential ontological meaning.”¹¹⁴ It corresponds to the fact that Being-with works through the understanding of Dasein which makes the existential-ontological worldliness.

Understanding itself is bound to understanding of Others, thus the world which is made by understanding of Dasein belongs to the world of Being-with ontologically. Heidegger asserts about the understanding of Others: “Being-with is such that the disclosedness of the Dasein-with of Others belongs to it; this means that because Dasein’s Being is Being-with, its understanding of Being already implies the understanding of Others.”¹¹⁵ Thus, this understanding is related to the way of Being: “This understanding, like any understanding, is not an acquaintance derived from knowledge about them, but a primordially existential kind of Being, which, more

¹¹² Being and Time, p. 160.

¹¹³ Ibid, p. 155.

¹¹⁴ Ibid, p. 156.

¹¹⁵ Ibid, pp. 160-161.

than anything else, makes such knowledge and acquaintance possible.”¹¹⁶ Therefore, alienation to self is directly means alienation to Others, since we share a “world” together ontologically.

Heidegger disputes that “knowing oneself” is grounded in Being-with. Hence, to know oneself is also constituted in knowing Others in a together-world:

Knowing oneself [*Sichkennen*] is grounded in Being-with, which understands primordially. It operates proximally in accordance with the kind of Being which is closest to us—Being-in-the-world as Being-with; and it does so by an acquaintance with that which Dasein, along with the Others, comes across in its environmental circumspection and concerns itself with—an acquaintance in which Dasein understands.¹¹⁷

When the deficient modes of solicitude [*Fürsorge*] arises in the fallenness, such as Being alone or being away from Others, Heidegger offers trying to “see through them” and get rid of these modes of deficiency: “And when, indeed, one’s knowing oneself gets lost in such ways as aloofness, hiding oneself away, or putting on a disguise, Being-with-one-another must follow special routes of its own in order to come close to Others, or even ‘to see through them.’”¹¹⁸

Heidegger defines “one’s kind of Being” as Being-with where “opening oneself up [*Sichhoffenbaren*] and closing oneself off is grounded in one’s having Being-with-one-another as one’s kind of Being, in its “primarily Being with him in each case.”¹¹⁹ Since the truth of Dasein belongs to a world of being-with Others primarily, the realization of Self cannot be independent from the life of Others. Thus, solicitude [*Fürsorge*] binds people together in an ontological sense related to Being.

¹¹⁶ Ibid, pp. 160-161.

¹¹⁷ Ibid, p. 161.

¹¹⁸ Ibid, p. 161.

¹¹⁹ Ibid, p. 161.

Trying to understand the psychological life of Others, Dasein “constitutes Being towards Others.”¹²⁰ Through such a grounding of Dasein’s existence and understanding with Others, the phenomenon of *empathy [Einführung]* is made possible.

Empathy is able to “provide the ontological bridge from one’s own subject, which is given proximally as alone, to the other subject, which is proximally quite closed off.”¹²¹ Heidegger maintains that empathy is “possible only if Dasein, as Being-in-the-world, already is with Others. ‘Empathy’ does not first constitute Being-with; only on the basis of Being-with does ‘empathy’ become possible.”¹²² Hence the ontological *being-with* opens the possibility of *empathy*, where the understanding of Others is made possible ontologically. In this common ontological ground of Being-with Others, understanding of Others is made possible and empathy can be constituted.

Heidegger also argues on the possibility of empathy to get lost when genuine understanding gets restrained in some instants of life: “The special hermeneutic of empathy will have to show how Being-with-one-another and Dasein’s knowing of itself are led astray and obstructed by the various possibilities of Being which Dasein itself possesses, so that a ‘genuine’ understanding gets suppressed.”¹²³ The fallenness in the world leads Dasein to have deficient modes of solicitude where capacity of understanding Others in empathy is suppressed. Heidegger implies that “Being-alone is a deficient mode of Being-with” whereas the other deficient modes of Dasein-with are “Being missing” and “Being away.”¹²⁴

In contrast to those deficient modes of solicitude, Heidegger defines the Being-with-one-another as *the only kind of one’s being in the world*. He continues to state

¹²⁰ Ibid, p. 161.

¹²¹ Ibid, p. 162.

¹²² Ibid, p. 162.

¹²³ Ibid, p. 163.

¹²⁴ Ibid, p. 157.

that Dasein would see Others as numbers when it were in a world of independent and isolated subjects:

This cannot be conceived as a summative result of the occurrence of several 'subjects'. Even to come across a number of 'subjects' [*Einer Anzahl von "Subjekten"*] becomes possible only if the Others who are concerned proximally in their Dasein-with are treated merely as 'numerals' [*"Nummer"*]. Such a number of 'subjects' gets discovered only by a definite Being-with-and-towards-one-another. This 'inconsiderate' Being-with 'reckons' [*"rechnet"*] with the Others without seriously 'counting on them' [*"auf sie zählt"*], or without even wanting to 'have anything to do' with them.¹²⁵

Seeing each other as numbers by making calculations on each other would occur in a world that lacks the awareness of being-with others. Conversely, Heideggerian world of "being-with" brings an ontological grounding that one Dasein dwells in the world of being-with-one-another. Thus, alienation from self and from society is not possible in these modes of Being of Dasein. Only in deficient modes of solicitude can Dasein be alien, alone and away from Others.

In authentic care for others, there is a transcendence of self and helping others to realize their existence. This authentic care is described by Heidegger as helping others to become free for their existence:

There is also the possibility of a kind of solicitude which does not so much leap in for the Other as leap ahead of him [*ihm vorausspringt*] in his existentiell potentiality-for-Being, not in order to take away his 'care' but rather to give it back to him authentically as such for the first time. This kind of solicitude pertains essentially to authentic care – that is, to the existence of the Other, not to a 'what' with which he is concerned; it helps the Other to become transparent to himself in his care and to become free for it."¹²⁶

¹²⁵ Ibid, p. 163.

¹²⁶ Ibid, pp. 158-159.

Perry also discusses the importance of living with other human beings in moral laws: “The moral world is a world in which we reproach ourselves and others for what has taken place, and urge ourselves and others to a more resolute performance of duty in the future.”¹²⁷ In this context of interaction of human beings in their daily lives, Being-with involves both domination and liberation at the same time: “Everyday Being-with-one-another maintains itself between the two extremes of positive solitude – that which leaps in and dominates, and that which leaps forth and liberates [*vorspringend-befreienden*].”¹²⁸ In these structures of care, it is not care that is free, but it is the foundation that makes freedom in human lives ontologically possible. He states: “In pure urge, care has not yet become free, though care first makes it ontologically possible for Dasein to be urged on by itself.” That is, care is bounded to only Dasein itself in its mode of “urge” similarly to addiction. This boundedness limits the capacity of care as care belongs to a world of being-with Others. Heidegger writes that care is bounded when “addiction and urge are possibilities rooted in the thrownness of Dasein.”¹²⁹ However, this boundedness in falling of Dasein can be changed through care, since care is authentic.¹³⁰ Thus, care itself is not always free, but care allows passage to freedom, since it is authentic. Heidegger states that: “only because this being [the being of Dasein] is, in its essence, defined by selfhood can it, in each case, as factual, expressly choose itself as a self” and freedom “is the origin of ‘possibility’ as such. Only through freedom, only a free being can, as transcending, understand being – and it must do so in order to exist as such, i.e., to be ‘among’ and ‘with’ beings.”¹³¹

Heidegger discusses “authentic care” for Others in relation to solicitude: “solicitude pertains essentially to authentic care – that is, to the existence of the Other, not to a ‘what’ with which he is concerned; it helps the Other to become transparent to

¹²⁷ Ralph Barton Perry. “The Practical Consciousness of Freedom”, *International Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Oct. 1902), p. 42.

¹²⁸ *Ibid*, p. 159.

¹²⁹ *Ibid*, p. 240.

¹³⁰ *Ibid*, p. 240.

¹³¹ *Parmenides*, p. 189.

himself in his care and to become free for it.”¹³² Dasein’s being free and transparent to himself in its care to Others is authentic care of Dasein. Accordingly, political implication of such a care for Others could be the devotedness of Dasein to the community for the sake of the good of Others and of the world.

The concept of being-with is bound to worldview of Dasein in sight [*Sicht*], where understanding is existentially related with the sight of Dasein.¹³³ The sight belongs to Dasein in its being-with [*Mitsein*] others in a community and it is related to the primordially of their understanding and sight is constitutive for their existence as it is the way of living of Dasein: “In existing, entities sight ‘themselves’ [*sichtet ‘sich’*] only in so far as they have become transparent to themselves with equal primordially in those items which are constitutive for their existence: their Being-alongside the world and their Being-with Others.”¹³⁴ These statements imply together-living of social human beings. In everyday life, Dasein’s existence is in Being-with Others. Heidegger discusses that “when we are with one another in public, the Others are encountered in activity of such a kind that one is ‘in the swim’ with it ‘oneself’.” He continues with the everyday experiences of Dasein: “One is acquainted with it, discusses it, encourages it, combats it, retains it, and forgets it, but one always does so primarily with regard to what is getting done and what is ‘going to come of it’ [*was . . . “herausspringt”*].”¹³⁵ Heidegger also discusses that all of the experiences have an ontological ground and we should be interested in this ground, rather than individual actions of each Dasein.¹³⁶ Thus, Dasein’s existence is bounded also in its relation to Being. Heidegger asserts: “Being with one another is based proximally and often exclusively upon what is a matter of common concern in such Being.”¹³⁷

¹³² *Being and Time*, pp. 158-159.

¹³³ *Ibid*, p. 186.

¹³⁴ *Ibid*, p. 187.

¹³⁵ *Ibid*, p. 440.

¹³⁶ *Ibid*, p. 440.

¹³⁷ *Ibid*, p. 159.

Heidegger's assertions on his concept of "being-with" can be interpreted that all human beings live with one another and their existence are bound together. He discusses that freedom of Dasein is possible in this together-existence, not in an isolated stance. This understanding of "living together" in the world and also shaping the world together can lead Heideggerian philosophy to be a communitarian philosophy. Even if Heidegger discusses that each Dasein decides for its own life, especially in its mode of authenticity, he also states that Dasein is authentically bound together. Therefore, the authenticity cannot be understood as leading to an isolated asocial philosophy, which is away from community. But what are the relations of these communitarian thoughts to Dasein's individual choices in life? Each Dasein has an ability to understand the world with anxiety towards its death and this capacity of awareness belongs to each member of the community. This awareness of community also binds the members to each other in their anticipatory resoluteness, which is related to Dasein's authentic existence in the world through its authentic care for each Other and, for entities and for its own Self. Dasein is resolute and committed to the world as this is the way of existence of Dasein which forms its world, culture and history.

In brief, the political implications arising from the concepts of "being-with" is that Dasein is communal and devoted to Others' well being as well as itself with its authentic care, where destiny of Dasein is also designated with regard to Being-with Others:

"Destiny" is profoundly collective. It is no mere aggregate "put together out of individual fates," since individuality itself is but a one-sided abstraction from the relationships of "being-in" the world and "being-with" others.¹³⁸

The question is here if the concept of destiny would lead to an "authentic political community" or not. If this is true, he would have a political action in mind and that could also mean "people's recommitment to its destiny" in a political sense.¹³⁹

¹³⁸ Newell, p. 779.

¹³⁹ Ibid, pp. 779-780.

However, destiny can be interpreted as Dasein's ability to constitute its world by understanding in its living together in the world. The definition of any concrete destiny would be contradictory since it would limit the existence of Dasein, whereas Dasein is not finished and left as an open-project in the philosophy of Heidegger. Above all, Dasein's way of existence is at the same time historicizing of it, since the ontologico-existential structures of Dasein's living forms its world, culture and language in time which shapes the history belonging to Dasein's world. Heidegger asserts that "If no *Dasein* exists, no world is 'there' either."¹⁴⁰ Thus, Dasein forms its own history by its choices between many possibilities in the world in its temporality and finitude. Dasein's own choices in a collective world of being-with Others also contributes to the history of the world.

Dasein's existence and choices belong to a specific time and place in its "ecstatic temporality" where the "ecstasis" of time unites Dasein's past, present and future. Dasein interprets its Being in its temporality; it deals with beings in the ontical sense, since Dasein "has an understanding of them in their Being" and "disclose that Being through the horizon of the ecstasis or dimension of Time related to it."¹⁴¹ Heidegger defines his terminology about time by explaining "ecstasis", which can shortly be defined as the dimension of time belonging to the human existence. Dasein temporalizes itself in the world, as its way of living is necessarily to exist at a specific time and place. Ecstasis is derived from "ekstatikon" which is a union of *eks* (outside) and *statikon* (standing), which means that Dasein stands in relation to time, outside of its own Self and not limited by it, but in the totality of the world in history. This sheds a light onto the temporal existence of Dasein, where *ekstatikon* as *beyond itself* means that "my present has its being beyond itself in my past, to which in turn my future lends its being."¹⁴² Dasein is born to a pre-given world the structures of which are carried through language and culture, but also it contributes

¹⁴⁰ *Being and Time*, p. 417.

¹⁴¹ Michael E. Zimmerman. "Heidegger's 'Completion' of Sein und Zeit", *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Jun., 1979), p. 541.

¹⁴² Zygmunt Adamczewski. "Commentary on Calvin O. Schrag's 'Heidegger on Repetition and Historical Understanding'", *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Jul., 1970), p. 298.

to the constitution of the world through its ecstatic temporality. Cheng asserts that the “unity and mutual interdependence of the three modes of time” is temporality.¹⁴³ Hodgson explains how the past, present and future of Dasein unite in its existence through ecstasis:

Dasein’s existence is equiprimordially oriented toward the *past* (the ‘has been’), for in resolute projection (toward the future), Dasein takes over its heritage by handing it down, thus making those possibilities that have been its own in the present moment of vision (*Augenblick*). Dasein comes toward itself (as future) in the process of coming back to itself (as having been); thus it exists in the present moment as its own possibility. In other words, future comes through the past into the present.¹⁴⁴

The anticipation can not be separated from the unity of time of past, present and future of Dasein, since Dasein’s projection into possibilities in its choices depends on this unseparable unity of time in its temporal existence.¹⁴⁵ The ecstatic temporality of Dasein allows its choices in its world through projection into possibilities in mutual interdependence of past, present and future in the world and the choices of Dasein through its understanding results in the formation of history. Heidegger asserts that “self-givenness of subjectivity is for him no longer an absolute principle but rather one that has already been mediated by the ecstatic temporality of Dasein through a precursory openness – its world as history.”¹⁴⁶ Hence Dasein forms its world as history through its understanding. Newell also maintains that:

¹⁴³ Chung-ying Cheng. “Confucius, Heidegger, and the Philosophy of the I Ching: A Comparative Inquiry into the Truth of Human Being”, *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (Jan., 1987), p. 60.

¹⁴⁴ Peter C. Hodgson. “Heidegger, Revelation, and the Word of God”, *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 49, No. 3 (Jul., 1969), p. 232.

¹⁴⁵ Hefner, Philip, “The Concreteness of God’s Kingdom: A Problem for the Christian Life”, *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 51, No. 3 (Jul., 1971), p. 200.

¹⁴⁶ Ernst Tugendhat. “Heidegger’s idea of truth”, in *Critical Heidegger*, ed. Christopher Macann, Routledge, UK, 1996, p. 228.

Like the earlier German thinkers, he rejects the conception of human nature in favor of an active, historical conception of man. At the same time, he frees the historical definition of man from any need to demonstrate itself in the concrete conditions of everyday life and politics. In other words, he attempts to reject the progressive notion of history without abandoning a historical definition of man. The radical cutting edge of the demand for freedom and community thus comes close to lopping away every restraint of circumstance, unloading the burden of empirical demonstrability which Hegel and Marx had believed essential to their notions of historical change.¹⁴⁷

This approach of Heidegger which leaves Dasein and world as an open-project does not normally lead to the strict idea of a destiny of nation and an authentic mass which gives orders for the benefit of a nation. Heidegger “hailed anthropological or metaphysical determinations of our ‘human nature,’ according to which the self is characterized as an object, a thing, a *res cogitans*” and he states that “*the ‘essence’ of Dasein lies in its existence.*”¹⁴⁸ The human nature is not defined by Heidegger as being an ideal for what Adorno calls “authentic masses.”

Heidegger does not define human nature; however, his philosophy also does not lead to a “liberal” conception of self. Polt discusses Heidegger maintains that “the liberal emphasis on individual rights and liberties rests on a naive conception of the individual ‘I.’”¹⁴⁹ On the contrary, Dasein’s existence cannot be regarded independent from Others ontologically.

In *Being and Time*, the concept of destiny is not limited to the destiny of a nation, as destiny is related to Dasein’s ability of covering the truth of its life in being-with. Heidegger asserts that “resoluteness implies handing oneself down by anticipation

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 784.

¹⁴⁸ Jonathan Salem-Wiseman. “Heidegger’s Dasein and the Liberal Conception of the Self”, *Political Theory*, Vol. 31, No. 4 (Aug., 2003), p. 537.

¹⁴⁹ Richard Polt. “Metaphysical Liberalism in Heidegger’s *Beitrag zur Philosophie*”, *Political Theory*, Vol. 25, No. 5 (Oct., 1997), pp. 668.

to the ‘there’ of the moment of vision; and this handing down we call ‘fate’. This is also the ground for destiny, by which we understand Dasein’s historizing in Being-with-Others.”¹⁵⁰

Heidegger also discusses that destiny is what Dasein forms for itself as a community and generation in history: “But if fateful Dasein, as Being-in-the-world, exists essentially in Being-with Others, its historizing is a co-historizing and is determinative for it as destiny [*Geschick*]. This is how we designate the historizing of the community, of a people.”¹⁵¹ Destiny is related to truth which Dasein’s existence reveals by its understanding. Truth is thus interpreted as the truth of existence as Pöggeler asserts: “As the disclosedness of Dasein [arises] in its authenticity, truth is the ‘truth of existence.’”¹⁵² Hence the destiny of Dasein is to reveal the truth in its way of existence.

Vattimo explicates “destiny” as being “*Ge-schick* in the sense of a *Schickung*, a sending” in the disclosive process of understanding of truth by Dasein.¹⁵³ The destiny is Dasein’s destiny of existence which discloses the truth of Being in the ontological sense: “Destiny does not compel, it calls. Human freedom is evidenced in the listening and responding to the destining of Being, which calls us actively to participate in revealing. There is no question of blind obedience, nor is resignation our appointed lot.”¹⁵⁴ Dasein’s destiny is not releasing itself to a destiny which comes through an external Being, but Dasein’s Being is related to its ontic-ontological existence. Dasein’s destiny is itself; it is its way of living in the world.

¹⁵⁰ Being and Time, p. 438.

¹⁵¹ Ibid, p. 437.

¹⁵² Otto Pöggeler. *Martin Heidegger’s Path of Thinking*, trans. Daniel Magurshak & Sigmund Barber, Humanities Press International, USA, 1990, p. 71.

¹⁵³ Gianni Vattimo. *Beyond Interpretation – The Meaning of Hermeneutics for Philosophy*, trans. David Webb, Polity Press, UK, 1997, p. 109.

¹⁵⁴ Leslie Paul Thiele. “Heidegger on Freedom: Political not Metaphysical”, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 88, No. 2, June 1994, p. 285.

Heidegger continues that destiny is not something individual, but belongs to all Daseins living together with each other:

Destiny is not something that puts itself together out of individual fates, any more than Being-with-one-another can be conceived as the occurring together of several Subjects. Our fates have already been guided in advance, in our Being with one another in the same world and in our resoluteness for definite possibilities. Only in communicating and in struggling does the power of destiny become free. Dasein's fateful destiny in and with its 'generation' goes to make up the full authentic historizing of Dasein.¹⁵⁵

To sum up, Dasein lives together with Others and historizes authentically with Others. In Heideggerian philosophy, alienation to society is described as deficient modes of Being of Dasein, since Dasein's way of living is being-with Others as it makes empathy in understanding Others in solicitude and in authentic care for Others which makes the worldhood. Marxist analysis regards the alienation to society as an effect of capitalism. On the other hand, both Heideggerian and Marxist philosophies constitute a common world with Others ontologically, which prevents alienation from Others at the beginning.

¹⁵⁵ *Being and Time*, p. 437.

CHAPTER IV

ALIENATION FROM BEINGS IN THE SENSE OF NATURE AND ITEMS OF USE

4.a Marxist Alienation from Object (Product) and Labour

Dasein loses the meanings of the objects by alienation from objects and it arises mainly from the process in which Dasein's self-understanding becomes deficient. This is described in Marxism as the fetishism of commodities in capitalist modernity. According to Marx, the price is itself formed by alienation in the process of production, where he asserts: "A common standard in the price of anything presupposes its frequent and familiar alienation."¹⁵⁶ Marx also quotes from Steuart that "Money... an adequate equivalent for any thing alienable" (J. Steuart)."¹⁵⁷ The alienation as sale [*Veräußerung*] occurs in any exchange in the market under capitalist production, leading to workers' alienation from products and labour.

Marx asserts that this appropriation of alien labour is not an illusion but a real process, by writing that it "is a real [phenomenon], not a merely *supposed one* existing merely in the imagination of the workers and the capitalists."¹⁵⁸ The alienation process that shapes and affects the lives of the workers shows itself in reality of the conditions of their lives.

The Frankfurt School emphasizes the growth of false consciousness which is a result of culture industry and the resultant mass culture that is produced. They imply that the change is only possible through an analysis and reconstruction of false consciousness of society which is formed by culture industry. The culture industry and false consciousness block human liberation; therefore, the critical theory of

¹⁵⁶ Marx, p. 192.

¹⁵⁷ Marx, p. 778.

¹⁵⁸ Marx, p. 831.

Frankfurt School advocated the emancipation from the obstructions against the truth of critical theory.¹⁵⁹

Karl Marx analyzes the production process in capitalist society with regard to alienation and false consciousness. The material which is shaped by the worker is alien to the worker as well as the instruments are alien instruments, thus labour itself is alien to the production process. The labourer alienates its labour capacity from itself “as a being for others,” becoming “a mere other-being [*Anderssein*].” This is the “de-realization process of labour” under the alien reality that is formed by the conditions of capitalist production.¹⁶⁰ As a result of these, alien property is formed in the production process, being separated from its “life expression [*Lebensäußerung*].¹⁶¹ There is a false recognition [*Erkennung*] of the products as if they are capital’s property, which is a resulting “awareness [*Bewusstsein*]” produced by capitalism.¹⁶² This false reality and false awareness which states the capitalist has property right since he has material and instruments as well as his buying the worker’s labour is formed in the process of capitalist production.

In the exchange process, everybody buys some products which are not produced by their own labour and there is alienation between the buyer and the product, resulting from alienation to the production process. Marx implies this alienation of property and labour as a natural conclusion of exchange that takes place in a capitalist economy, where large masses of wage labourers are made to work, but production decisions are made by private individuals. In such conditions, all exchange depends on the form of objectified labour. He asserts that in the exchange value’s change and development in time, it “will be transformed, and it will ultimately be shown that private property in the product of one’s own labour is identical with the separation of labour and property, so that labour will create alien property and

¹⁵⁹ Adorno, p. ix.

¹⁶⁰ Marx, p. 454.

¹⁶¹ Ibid, pp. 462-463.

¹⁶² Ibid, p. 463.

property will command alien labour.”¹⁶³ Therefore, labour and property separate from each other in the alienation process.

The labourer exchanges his labour in the process of production and it is one of the conditions of bourgeois society. Karl Marx examines that “it is the elementary precondition of bourgeois society that labour should directly produce exchange value, i.e. money.”¹⁶⁴ He explains the living labour as “use value for *value*” and the objectified labour as exchange value, adding that the first is subjective and the other is objective. Therefore, their exchange is not the exchange of different forms of use values but they are separate as use value and exchange value. That brings the result of the process of exchange which is not value-giving for the exchange of use values but only relates to the “*content of the exchange itself.*”¹⁶⁵ So, they become abstract and only objectified relations occur in the exchange process.

He further clarifies the subject of equivalence when he asserts that “the exchange between the worker and the capitalist is a simple exchange; each obtains an equivalent; the one obtains money, the other a commodity whose *price* is exactly equal to the money paid for it.”¹⁶⁶ The commodity “whose price is exactly equal to money paid for it” is of course labour capacity. Even though this seems to be a just transaction where equivalents are exchanged, it is not because labour capacity is capable of producing more than its exchange value – i.e. what is required to maintain it as labour capacity. This is the exploitation of surplus value.

This relationship between the capitalist and worker is further clarified by Marx in dialectics. He discusses that “the worker produces himself as labour capacity, as well as the capital confronting him, while at the same time capitalist produces himself as capital as well as the living labour capacity confronting him.”¹⁶⁷ On the

¹⁶³ Ibid, p. 238.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid, p. 225.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 469.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 281.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 458.

relationship between the capitalist and labour, Marx adds that that each reproduces the other as being their negations by stating “the capitalist produces labour as alien; labour produces the product as alien. The capitalist produces the worker, and the worker the capitalist.”¹⁶⁸ The capitalist system has a dialectics inside as well as in any system in the world while it is also stated in the dialectics of Hegel.

The fetishism of commodities is the loss of the meaning of product in the market when it is fetishized in the capitalist production. This brings the false consciousness of society in alienation to products as objects.

Possessing and marking worker’s commodity which is created by worker’s own labour is a key factor in alienated labour. Marx points out that even worker himself accepts that the product that he is produced by his labour does not belong to him.

Thus, it can also be described as a kind of alienation to the aim of the commodity, that is to its instrumentality. In the desire for possessing more, the commodity itself is consumed mentally in its meaning (without having been used properly) in a constructed behaviour of “buying for buying.”

Under the conditions of capitalist production, objectified labour forms an “alien power” over the living labour by structuring itself opposite to living labour.¹⁶⁹ Eagleton comments that the human being “creates an object, which then becomes a pseudo-subject able to reduce its own creator to a manipulated thing” in the process of dead (objectified labour as commodity and capital) rules over the living.¹⁷⁰ As a result, “the labourer’s products slip from his control, assume an autonomy of their own, and come to exert that quasi-magical power over him which Marx will later term ‘the fetishism of commodities.’”¹⁷¹ The objectified labour rules over the living labour by earning the autonomy of its own and alienates the worker from his own labour and the property.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid, p. 458.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid, p. 454.

¹⁷⁰ Eagleton, p. 32.

¹⁷¹ Ibid, p. 29.

Marx implies “what the capitalist obtains from this simple exchange is a use value: disposition over alien labour.”¹⁷² But, for the worker, “it is evident that the use which the buyer makes of the purchased commodity is as irrelevant to the specific form of the relation here as it is in the case of any other commodity, of any other use value.”¹⁷³ The worker cannot buy the product which s/he produces by her/his labour back in the capitalist system.

Eagleton also comments on the abstraction resulted by exchange stating that “objects are reduced to commodities: they exist merely for the sake of their exchange-value, of being bought and sold” so that “two commodities of the same value are reduced to an abstract equality with each other.”¹⁷⁴ In the conditions of market, even people see one another as abstract beings and the capitalist conceive the workers as commodities through buying their labour power and objectifying it.¹⁷⁵ This process of alienation deteriorates the relations of individuals in the social system under capitalism as well as the personal development of human beings as free individuals.

The most harmful type of alienation is the formation of power of capital, being an oppressive power against the labourer. Worker’s own labour forms the independent externality [*Ausserihmsein*] by “self-objectification of himself as a power independent of herself/himself, which moreover rules over him, rules over him through his own actions.”¹⁷⁶ The capital is formed by the labour of the worker and alienates her/him to her/his own labour and the product at the end by the domination over her/him.

¹⁷² Marx, pp . 281-282.

¹⁷³ Ibid, pp . 281-282.

¹⁷⁴ Eagleton, p. 22.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid, p. 22.

¹⁷⁶ Marx, p. 453.

Marx explained that this “alien social power” is formed by the “collision” of individuals and “produce their mutual interaction as a process and power independent on them.”¹⁷⁷ It brings the alienation of the worker to her/his life as well as her/his labour, in the sense that Marx explains it in the process of production and exchange that the worker approaches to the “product of his labour as an alien thing, so does he relate to the combination of labour as an alien combination, as well as to his own labour as an expression of his life, which, although it belongs to him, is alien to him and coerced from him.”¹⁷⁸ It is the alien property which is separated from labour and from worker her/himself.

Labourer confronts the “abstract, objectless, purely subjective poverty” under the conditions of system of capitalism.¹⁷⁹ The labour both maintains and empowers capitalism, nonetheless the power of capital devastates the labourer. Such an oppressing power of capital on the labourer is thoroughly examined by Marx. He explores how creative power of labourer structures the power of money as capital. He asserts that “the creative power of his labour establishes itself as the power of capital, as an *alien power* confronting him. He *divests* himself [entäussert sich] of labour as the force productive of wealth; capital appropriates it, as such.”¹⁸⁰ Objectification of labour is indispensable for the process of exchange, therefore it results in the alienation of labourer to the property and to the money this property produces. He adds that: “The separation between labour and property in the product of labour, between labour and wealth, is thus posited in this act of exchange itself.”¹⁸¹ Marx makes an exploration on the process of exchange, stating its conditions and results as alienation on the worker and her/his labour.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid, pp. 196-197.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid, p. 470.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid, p. 470.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid, p. 307.

¹⁸¹ Ibid, p. 307.

The property which the labourer produces by his labour brings the wealth of society by money that is produced through the exchange. The capital is simply the “accumulated labour.”¹⁸² The capital is also described by Marx as “existence of social labour”, a combination of labour as subject and object.¹⁸³ But the property owner who has wealth is alien to the labour and thus to the labourer.

The labourer is poor in contrast to his labour’s productive power. As a result of the production process which is alienated, “the worker emerges not only not richer, but emerges rather poorer from the process than he entered.”¹⁸⁴ He adds that the worker “has produced not only the alien wealth and his own poverty, but also the relation of this wealth as independent, self-sufficient wealth, relative to himself as the poverty which this wealth consumes.”¹⁸⁵ He states that in bourgeois society both the worker and capitalist treat the “true community [*Gemeinwesen*]” as a means of subsistence and wealth (respectively). Marx expresses the situation aptly when he refers to the worker’s position before society, by speaking of the “true community [*Gemeinwesen*]”, “which he [the laborer] tries to make a meal of, and which makes a meal of him.”¹⁸⁶ He emphasizes that what is opposite to worker becomes the reality and a false reality dominates the life of worker as well as her/his labour.

Capital gains the right to possess labour in objectification process by having instruments in means of fixed capital. Marx states that fixed capital is found as machines which are “opposite labour” in the process of production.¹⁸⁷ He adds that “for capital, the worker is not a condition of production, only work is. If it can make machines do it, or even water, air, so much the better.”¹⁸⁸ The machinery as fixed

¹⁸² Ibid, p. 554.

¹⁸³ Ibid, p. 471.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, p. 453.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid, p. 453.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid, p. 496.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid, p. 699.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, p. 498.

capital is also a product of appropriation of alien labour.¹⁸⁹ However, it is falsely regarded being the property of capital, belonging to it as “fixed capital.” It can also be interpreted that the worker is alien to the machinery as being an opposite kind of labour to her/him as well as s/he is alien to the production process in scientific sense. The worker who is uneducated on the process of production alienates to the production itself as whole with the rapid development of the technology. Technology increases the loss of control of the workers over the production process.¹⁹⁰

Labour is specialized in the process of production under capitalist system and division of labour comes on the scene as a necessity of production, even if the division of labour is a necessary way to develop production. It results in the worker’s alienation to the whole of the process, which harms the individual’s relation to the universal as in passing from “full potential” of labour to “single function” like a factory worker.¹⁹¹ It is a kind of alienation to the labour itself, by being alienated to the whole process of production.

Marx also finds it illogical that “the raw material and instrument create use value through their *separation* from labour. For this *separation* makes them into capital”¹⁹² He further discusses that “capital has to possess raw materials, instruments of labour and necessities of life so that the worker can live during production, before production is completed.”¹⁹³ Marx discusses that the appropriation of the labour of worker as objectified labour brings an alienation process. He also comments on the appropriation of labour of worker that “the alien

¹⁸⁹ Ibid, p. 701.

¹⁹⁰ Similarly, Heidegger discusses in “The Question Concerning Technology” that “the will to mastery becomes all the more urgent the more technology threatens to slip from human control” Martin Heidegger. “The Question Concerning Technology”, in *Basic writings: from Being and time (1927) to The task of thinking (1964)*, ed. David Farrell Krell, Routledge, UK, 1978, p. 289.

¹⁹¹ Eagleton, p. 24.

¹⁹² Marx, p. 554.

¹⁹³ Ibid, p. 504.

labour is appropriated by the capitalist without exchange by the existing values such as material and instrument.”¹⁹⁴

The money gets independent from labour by accumulation and it sets a power against the labourer. Marx writes on this accumulation of money and its getting independent from labour in addition to getting the right for its products that “this further takes the form that there must have taken place on the part of the capitalist an accumulation – an accumulation prior to labour and not sprung out of it” and this accumulation of money and labour “enables him to put the worker to work and to maintain his effectiveness, to maintain him as living labour capacity.”¹⁹⁵ He continues that “this act by capital which is independent of labour, not posited by labour, is then shifted from the prehistory of capital into the present, into a moment of its reality and of its present activity, of its self-formation.”¹⁹⁶ In the exchange process, this false right is formed and the capitalist appropriated the alien labour, when Marx disputes that “from this is ultimately derived the eternal right of capital to the fruits of alien labour, or rather its mode of appropriation is developed out of the simple and ‘just’ laws of equivalent exchange.”¹⁹⁷ As demonstrated here, Marx claims that the labour is kept in the process of production for keeping the process alive. There occurs a false right for all products of labourer by the capital, by the act of buying. The labourer is the one who keeps the power of capital alive and maintains capital’s power.

The exchange depends on circulation and the formation of use values and exchange values of the commodities. The circulation itself needs production and production needs labour. Marx distinguishes that “circulation can *create value* only in so far as it requires fresh employment – of *alien labour* – in addition to that directly consumed in the production process. This is then the same as if more *necessary*

¹⁹⁴ Ibid, p. 456.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid, p. 504.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid, p. 504.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid, p. 504.

labour were used in the direct production process.”¹⁹⁸ Therefore, the necessary labour of the labourer is used for keeping the system of capitalism working and alive. The labourer’s labour is used as a tool for system and the labourer her/himself is oppressed by the system s/he keeps alive.

4.b Alienation from Object (Product), Present-at-Hand [*Vorhanden*] and Ready-to-Hand [*Zuhanden*]

When there is concern of Dasein in one object, this object is described as ready-to-hand [*Zuhanden*]. When there is no concern of Dasein in that object, it is present-at-hand [*Vorhanden*]. Heidegger writes that: “The helpless way in which we stand before it is a deficient mode of concern, and as such it uncovers the Being-just-present-at-hand-and-no-more of something ready-to-hand.”¹⁹⁹

Heidegger implies that Dasein regards the objects mainly by their instrumentality in the world. Objects become conspicuous when Dasein runs into a problem while handling them, where “present-at-hand” objects turn to “ready-to-hand.”²⁰⁰ At the instant of unusefulness of objects, Dasein starts to think about why it does not work any more. This process brings the result that Dasein is more aware of that object now, of its instrumentality and its way of working. Awareness [*Bewusstsein*] is also discussed by Marx when the product’s life experience [*Lebensäußerung*] is lost in capitalist production as stated in the earlier part.

The alienation to the the aim of commodities as instrumentality was also discussed in previous part in discussion of Marxist alienation from object and product, where living labour is described by Marx in opposition to the alien power of objectified labour.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid, p. 548.

¹⁹⁹ Being and Time, p. 103.

²⁰⁰ Ibid, p. 102.

Similarly in *Being and Time*, only the basic instrumentality of objects takes part. To demonstrate, the conspicuousness of a chair shows the working principle of that chair. Modernity, on the other hand, gives the objects other meanings which is related to pseudo-needs of society. An object is not bought only for the usage of Dasein, since commodities in capitalism are consumed mentally, outside the meaning of their basic use. Some commodities are not produced for fulfilling the basic needs of human beings, but for the pseudo-needs which are created by capitalist modernity. They lose the natural need-use relation, thus the natural aim of the instrument (instrumentality) becomes deficient in modernity.

Heidegger basically defines ontic relations of entities with regard to their instrumentality with his concepts of present-at-hand [*Vorhanden*] and ready-to-hand [*Zuhanden*]. Hence, Heideggerian terminology describes things with their basic uses (such as in “use values” in Marxism) , not with their exchange values or not with the pseudo-needs of modernism. Adorno also regards this aspect of Heidegger’s philosophy when he discusses:

Heidegger has the praise for the “splendor of the simple.” He brings back the threadbare of ideology of pure materials, from the realm of handicrafts to that of the mind – as if words were pure, and, as it were, roughened material. But textiles of that sort are mediated, today, through their calculated opposition to mass production; and in just that way Heidegger wants, synthetically, to create a primal sense for pure words.²⁰¹

Adorno maintains that Heidegger’s aim was purification of words which does not properly address the real structures of domination in economic life. However, Heidegger did support returning to the basic needs of life, not to lose the meaning of life and nature that was threatened by the rapid development of technology. Turning back to the roots in nature and basic needs in the existence of Dasein, Heidegger supports to recover the lost meanings that are crucial to human beings. Similarly,

²⁰¹ Adorno, p. 40.

the Frankfurt School also distinguishes between what are real and what are pseudo-needs in society.

Heidegger shows a similar approach in forming his philosophy in basic needs and instrumentality of technicrafts and disregarding the complex pseudo-needs of human beings in modernism in his philosophy. Thus, his aim is not only the purification of language, but also to make people remember their basic needs and conceptions in harmony with nature.

In addition, the concept of “side by side [*Nebeneinander*]” in *Being and Time* is crucial in discussions of alienation to objects in the world, since Dasein “coexist with natural objects (and with one another) in the kind of mutual externality” and “‘side by side’ here connotes an external relation that is modeled on the one that obtains among the natural objects we perceive around us.”²⁰² It declares that existence of objects may affect one another’s existence in many ways, which is contrary to Descartes’ modeling of entities that they exist independently from each other.²⁰³ Heideggerian philosophy brings another understanding of ontology that the existence of all objects belong to each other. Thus, isolation of objects are not possible ontologically such as in the philosophy of Descartes or in monadology of Leibniz. The objects in the world and Dasein affect each other in their existence and they are in unity in nature, Dasein is not alienated to objects in its way of existence. Dasein dwells in a world of being-with Others. All the possibilities in the world (which Dasein projects itself into) stand as a whole and every detail of the structure of life is bound to every other. Thus, this feature of life makes it impossible to bracket life with theories, which is clearly asserted in Heidegger’s phenomenological method. In his ontology, all details of life belongs to a common ontic and ontological world, where it is impossible to isolate one’s being from this whole.

From the Marxist perspective, the loss of use value in the market leads to the fetishism of commodities in modern society. Heidegger uses all the instruments by

²⁰² Olafson, p. 17.

²⁰³ Ibid, p. 17.

their use values in his philosophy. His description of present-at-hand and ready-to-hand describe the objects in their instrumentality and working principles in the natural manner, not according to their market values or pseudo-needs of capitalism. Hence, Heideggerian philosophy has an opposite position to alienation to objects (product) in capitalist modernity.

4.c Alienation from Labour vs Authenticity [*Eigentlichkeit*] and Solicitude [*Fürsorge*] in Work

Marx explains the alienation of labour as “exchange of *objectified labour* as exchange value for living labour as use value, or, to express this in another way, the relating of labour to its objective conditions – and hence to the objectivity created by itself – as alien property: *alienation [Entäusserung] of labour.*”²⁰⁴ Thus, the process of alienation to product and alienation to labour occur at the same time. The result is that human beings are alienated to their labour in capitalism.

Heidegger asserts on work and authenticity that human beings make their Self in authenticity. Authentic [*eigentlich*] means “something of its own” where Heidegger interprets that it is related to “authentic” which comes from Greek term of *authos*. *Authos* means “self” and “done by own’s hand” originally.²⁰⁵ Thus, the existence of Dasein is itself a result of its labour on itself and alienation to one’s own Self means the alienation to one’s labour at the same time.

Heidegger brings a respectful understanding towards co-workers in a workplace, where nobody is seen as objectified. On the contrary, the work is “an existential mode of Being” for Dasein, which forms its existence as Dasein: “But even if Others become themes for study, as it were, in their own Dasein, they are not encountered as person-Things present-at-hand: we meet them at ‘work’, that is, primarily in their Being-in-the-world.”²⁰⁶ The workers are never objectified as

²⁰⁴ Marx, pp. 514-515.

²⁰⁵ Inwood, p. 23.

²⁰⁶ Being and Time, p. 156.

things since their existence and work belong to the way of existence of Dasein in an ontological unity of Others: “Even if we see the Other ‘just standing around’, he is never apprehended as a human-Thing present-at-hand, but his ‘standing-around’ is an existential mode of Being. The Other is encountered in his Dasein-with in the world.”²⁰⁷

Marxism asserts that human beings see one another as abstract beings and the capitalist conceive the workers as commodities through buying their labour power and objectifying it in the conditions of market.²⁰⁸ This process of alienation deteriorates the relations of individuals in the social system under capitalism as well as the personal development of human beings as free individuals by regarding them as objects. On the other hand, Heideggerian philosophy regards that Dasein does not objectify each other in work, they are bound in work in their ontological existence in Being-with [*Mitsein*].

The alienation from labour results in worker’s alienation to self since s/he regards “product of his labour as an alien thing, so does he relate to the combination of labour as an alien combination, as well as to his own labour as an expression of his life, which, although it belongs to him, is alien to him and coerced from him”²⁰⁹ Thus, the alien property separates the labour from worker and separates the worker from her/himself.

Heidegger stresses that “the Other is encountered in his Dasein-with in the world.”²¹⁰ Since he notes that the Others in the work are conceived in Dasein-with, the worker realizes that s/he is not independent from Others in work, they are in unity in their existence in the world. Also, their work together can have a mode of positive solitude in together-working for the same aim, when Heidegger discusses the terminology of “authentically-bound” in work:

²⁰⁷ Ibid, p. 156.

²⁰⁸ Eagleton, p. 22.

²⁰⁹ Marx, p. 470.

²¹⁰ Being and Time, p. 156.

A Being-with-one-another which arises [*entspringt*] from one's doing the same thing as someone else, not only keeps for the most part within the outer limits, but enters the mode of distance and reserve. The Being-with-one-another of those who are hired for the same affair often thrives only on mistrust. On the other hand, when they devote themselves to the same affair in common, their doing so is determined by the manner in which their Dasein, each in its own way, has been taken hold of. They thus become authentically bound together, and this makes possible the right kind of objectivity [*die rechte Sachlichkeit*], which frees the Other in his freedom for himself.²¹¹

The way of existence of Dasein in work is bound to each other and makes each other free in work. In addition, each person can live her/his authenticity in this together-living with others. The Being-with is grounded in people's care for each other in solicitude [*Fürsorge*] as it has been discussed in this research. Solicitude is also described as "welfare work" in *Being and Time*. It means that solicitude is for the welfare for Dasein as a whole in its being-with Others through care (for Others). Heidegger discusses that:

'Welfare work' [*"Fürsorge"*], as a factual social arrangement, is grounded in Dasein's state of Being as Being-with. Its factual urgency gets its motivation in that Dasein maintains itself proximally and for the most part in the deficient modes of solicitude.²¹²

These deficient modes of solicitude are described by Heidegger as: "Being for, against, or without one another, passing one another by, not 'mattering' to one another – these are possible ways of solicitude. And it is precisely these last named deficient and Indifferent modes that characterize everyday, average Being-in-one-another."²¹³ In contrast to these deficient modes of solicitude in life, Dasein's existence and labour works for the welfare of human beings. Heidegger writes

²¹¹ Ibid, p. 159.

²¹² Ibid, p. 158.

²¹³ Ibid, p. 158.

about the “factual urgency” of welfare work as a social arrangement in Dasein’s life. That is to say, the cooperation for welfare is needed between people whose lives are bound in being-with. However, he notes that most Dasein lives in deficient modes of solicitude, ceasing the cooperation with each other and the awareness of their together-being in the world. Thus, welfare work is described as being “urgent” in this existential analysis of Dasein.

The human beings are bound ontologically together, in their concern in Being of the world. Since their authentic selves are made by their own hands through labour as work, the being-together of world is also possible through the labour of Dasein. Heidegger discusses the ontological character of solicitude as: “Solicitude proves to be a state of Dasein’s Being—one which, in accordance with its different possibilities, is bound up with its Being towards the world of its concern, and likewise with its authentic Being towards itself. Being-with-one-another is based proximally and often exclusively upon what is a matter of common concern in such Being.”²¹⁴

In its everydayness, many choices of people are also affected by the works and labours of Others. When the consequences of human action in the world (wars, droughts, crimes) are considered as a common work. Human beings are all together makers of their shared “world”. This argument gives a huge responsibility to human beings for the destiny of the world in their authentic historizing. The human beings are themselves made by their own hands in the concept of authenticity. Thus, Heideggerian concept of labour in the concepts of authenticity and solicitude have clearly the opposite position against the alienation from work and labour in capitalism.

²¹⁴ Ibid, p. 159.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, the concept of alienation in *Being and Time* is discussed in four modes of alienation, namely alienation from own self, society and species-being, alienation from objects (products) and alienation from labour. It is stated that Heideggerian ontology can be read as consistent with what Marx implies in his explorations about alienation.

In contrast to Adorno's "external" approach to *Being and Time*, this analysis does not leave the conceptual structure of *Being and Time* aside and takes an "internal" approach to *Being and Time*. The claims of critical theory especially Adorno's *the Jargon of Authenticity* is used as a reference material which reflects the approach of critical theory to Heideggerian thought. Against many prejudices of the Frankfurt School to Heideggerian philosophy (since he was a member of Nazi Party), the ontological existential analysis in *Being and Time* is not at odds with a Marxist stance. On top of that, there are many similarities in their conceptions, especially on alienation, mass culture and fetishism of commodities.

This thesis implies that *Being and Time* reveals a ontological unity theory which calls people to become what they are in their being-with Others in the world. This work explicates that *Being and Time* has no political intentions; however, the existential concepts of Heidegger especially the concepts of authenticity, being-with, care, anxiety, death, thrownness and homelessness can be studied as bringing a revolutionary approach to self-understanding against the alienation and mass culture in modernity. Heidegger's basic approach to instruments by in present-at-hand and ready-to-hand, the objects' uses also saves the loss of original meaning of objects which is described in Marxist terminology as the "fetishism of commodities" when it prevents the passage from Marxist use-value to pseudo-needs of capitalist modernity.

The Marxist alienation consists of alienation to self, alienation to society, alienation to object (product) and alienation to labour. Heideggerian philosophy

has the potentiality of revealing the individuality of a person regardless of how s/he is determined by structures of daily life. Therefore, especially the concepts of authenticity [*Eigentlichkeit*] and freedom [*Freiheit*] show the reader of *Being and Time* the possibility to face her/his own self. The alienation to others in society is also precluded by such an understanding to life, since Dasein's existence belongs to a world which is shared with others which is asserted certainly in his concepts of being-with [*Mitsein*], solicitude [*Fürsorge*], side by side [*Nebeneinander*] and empathy [*Einführung*]. Alienation to product and alienation to labour of worker in the sense of Marxist alienation are discussed with the concepts of present-at-hand [*Vorhanden*] and ready-to-hand [*Zuhanden*] as well as being authentically-bound to each other in work. The oppression on workers and the formation of mass culture in society are a result of Dasein's domination by "they [*das Man*]" in its everydayness. In this respect, Heideggerian philosophy discloses the self-forgetfulness of the human beings in a mass culture of modernity.

The political stance of Heidegger has led to many discussions and they continue even today. An existentialist philosophy should not be necessarily discussed in its political implications; however, it is true that Heidegger's own speeches and works on metaphysics and politics lead to these serious discussions. Deconstruction of society by European nihilism holds the ground of these arguments regarding the intention of Heidegger. However, the specific relation between a work of philosophy and the philosopher should not be put aside: Even if Heidegger tried to serve his philosophy later to the use of National Socialism, a work of philosophy like any other works which are created by an author is "more than" the philosopher like any other author. The work itself becomes free of the author when it is given in lectures or published, it belongs to the interpreters not to a particular person, even to the author her/himself. The work belongs to the free interpreters of that work in the history. It is evident that any work has the traces of its historical and cultural circumstances. On the other hand, the scholars can not blame a philosophical work so easily for the political stance of the philosopher. For example, the academy can not stop studying or reading ancient philosophy since all philosophers of that time accepted the slavery and did not accept that women are equal to men. It cannot be

so easily concluded that all their writings carry the dirty stance of thought, therefore these works should be taken away from the libraries as well as they should be forbidden to read.²¹⁵

Even Heidegger as the author has not the authority on *Being and Time* to use it in purposes of a political party. The primary conception of authenticity which implies an unsharable and unique individual experience belonging to life and death cannot be so easily turned into the death of an authentic “mass” who kills or commits suicide for the sake of the Being of German nation. In this case, all his discussion on the potentiality for Being would arise from the ideal of the potentiality for nation in facing violence and death. Would all the existential analytic of Dasein which stresses also the individual choices in life and the anticipation for “owning individual life by owning individual death” be easily reduced to such a naive political slogan? Luther’s and Kierkegaard’s effect on Heidegger on choosing own path in life regardless of the path of society and inauthentic structures of daily life cannot be so easily thrown apart, even if Heidegger himself decides to no more follow the thought of Kierkegaard when he writes in his letter to Karl Löwith. He can decide to go for the hope of destruction and regeneration of European society by nihilism and can give any such speeches as a rector of Nazism. His old students who listened to his lectures of *Being and Time* can be in shock how an individual existential idea of death and authenticity in sustaining the potentiality of the self in life can turn to a slogan of “die for the potentiality of nation!” in imprisoning mass of totality.

The distortion of the philosophical work even by its author is not possible and acceptable by the interpreters of *Being and Time*. *Being and Time* is not a material property of Martin Heidegger. The reader speaks with the text itself. When s/he confronts *Being and Time*, what s/he would understand from this work of existential analytic of human beings is to “find her/his own path and follow it” regardless of anyone else or any structures of daily life. Thus, it is a revolutionary

²¹⁵ See for the recent radical debates on Heidegger’s Nazism and philosophy: Emmanuel Faye. *Heidegger: The Introduction of Nazism into Philosophy in Light of the Unpublished Seminars of 1933-1935*, Yale University Press, USA, 2009.

work. *Being and Time* does not urge reader to German nationalist ideals. *Being and Time* does not tell anybody that s/he cannot be authentic since s/he is not a German. Or, somebody could not say “I am authentic, are you also an authentic, nice to meet you!” in an “authentic mass” of elitists. This is what the text says to the reader in the totality of conceptual analysis without any political distortions in the interpretation of the text. The authentic mode of human beings in *Being and Time* is unsharable, unidentifiable and unprobable by its belonging to that peculiar person and her/his death in its peculiar path. Unprovableness and unsharebleness of authenticity does not bring us to its being only a slogan or a jargon as it is argued by Adorno.

Even if *Being and Time* is away from intentionally being political, ontologico-existential concepts of *Being and Time* can be discussed in their disclosure of a revolutionary insight to self-understanding against the alienation and mass culture in capitalism as well as its basic instrumentality against the fetishism of commodities.

REFERENCES

- Adamczewski, Zygmunt, “Commentary on Calvin O. Schrag’s ‘Heidegger on Repetition and Historical Understanding’”, *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Jul., 1970), pp. 297-301.
- Adorno, Theodor, *The Jargon of Authenticity*, trans. Knut Tarnowski and Frederic Will, Routledge, UK, 2007.
- Avineri, Shlomo, “The Grundrisse by David McLellan : Karl Marx”, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 67, No. 2 (Jun. 1973), pp. 604-605.
- Brommage, Thomas J. Jr., *A Marxist Glossary*,
brommage.freeshell.org/marx/su07/glossary.pdf
- Cheng, Chung-ying, “Confucius, Heidegger, and the Philosophy of the I Ching: A Comparative Inquiry into the Truth of Human Being”, *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (Jan., 1987), pp. 51-70.
- Coser, Lewis A., *The Grundrisse by Karl Marx : David McLellan*, *Social Forces*, Vol. 50, No. 2 (Dec. 1971), pp. 262-263.
- Dallmayr, Fred R., “Ontology of Freedom: Heidegger and Political Philosophy”, *Political Theory*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (May, 1984), pp. 204-234.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L., *Being-in-the-World- A Commentary on Heidegger’s Being and Time*, Division I, The MIT Press, USA, 1991.
- Eagleton, Terry, *Marx*, Routledge, New York, USA, 1999.
- Goldmann, Lucien, *Lukács and Heidegger – Towards a New Philosophy*, trans. William Q. Boelhower, Routledge, USA, 2009.
- Gordon, Haim & Gordon, Rivca, *Heidegger on Truth and Myth – A Rejection of Postmodernism*, Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., Germany, 2006.

Hefner, Philip, "The Concreteness of God's Kingdom: A Problem for the Christian Life", *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 51, No. 3 (Jul., 1971), pp. 188-205.

Heidegger, Martin, "On the Essence of Truth", in *Pathmarks*, Cambridge University Press, USA, 1998.

Heidegger, Martin, "The Question Concerning Technology", in *Basic Writings: from Being and Time (1927) to The Task of Thinking (1964)*, ed. David Farrell Krell Routledge & Kegan Paul, UK, 1978, pp. 283-318.

Heidegger, Martin, *Parmenides*, translated by André Schuwer and Richard Rojcewicz, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, USA, 1992(a).

Heidegger, Martin, *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, trans. Michael Heim, Indiana University Press, USA, 1992(b).

Heidegger, Martin, *Being and Time*, trans. by John Macquarrie & Edward Robinson, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford, UK, 1996.

Heidegger, Martin, *Contributions to Philosophy (From Enowning)*, trans. Parvis Emad & Kenneth Maly, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, USA, 1999.

Heidegger, Martin, *The Essence of Human Freedom – An Introduction to Philosophy*, trans. Ted Sadler, Continuum, New York, 2002.

Heidegger, Martin, *Schelling's Treatise On The Essence of Human Freedom*, translated by Joan Stambaugh, Ohio University Press, USA, 1985.

Hodgson, Peter C., "Heidegger, Revelation, and the Word of God", *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 49, No. 3 (Jul., 1969), pp. 228-252.

Hogan, Patrick Colm, *On Interpretation – Meaning and Inference in Law, Psychoanalysis, and Literature*, The University of Georgia Press, Greece, 1996.

Hoy, David Couzens & McCarthy, Thomas, *Critical Theory*, Blackwell Publishers Inc., USA, 1996.

Inwood, Michael, *A Heidegger Dictionary*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, UK, 2000.

Jay, Martin, *The Dialectical Imagination – A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research 1923-1950*, Little, Brown and Company, USA, 1973.

Löwith, Karl & Wolin, Richard & Cox, Melissa J., “The Political Implications of Heidegger’s Existentialism”, *New German Critique*, No. 45, Special Issue on Bloch and Heidegger (Autumn, 1988), pp. 117-134.

Marx, Karl, *Grundrisse – Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy (Rough Draft)*, translated by Martin Nicolaus, Penguin Books, UK, 1993.

Morrison, Kenneth L., *Marx, Durkheim, Weber: formations of modern social thought*, Sage Publications Ltd, 2006, USA.

Newell, W. R., “Heidegger on Freedom and Community: Some Political Implications of His Early Thought”, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 78, No. 3, September 1984, pp. 775-784.

Okrent, Mark, “The ‘I Think’ and the For-the-Sake-of-Which”, in *Transcendental Heidegger*, Steven Crowell & Jeff Malpas (eds.), Stanford University Press, USA, 2007, pp. 151-169.

Olafson, Frederick A., *Heidegger and The Ground of Ethics – A Study of Mitsein*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1998.

Perry, Ralph Barton, “The Practical Consciousness of Freedom”, *International Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Oct. 1902), pp. 40-55.

Polt, Richard, “Metaphysical Liberalism in Heidegger’s *Beiträge zur Philosophie*”, *Political Theory*, Vol. 25, No. 5 (Oct., 1997), pp. 655-679.

Pöggeler, Otto, *Martin Heidegger’s Path of Thinking*, trans. Daniel Magurshak & Sigmund Barber, Humanities Press International, USA, 1990.

- Salem-Wiseman, Jonathan, "Heidegger's Dasein and the Liberal Conception of the Self", *Political Theory*, Vol. 31, No. 4 (Aug., 2003), pp. 533-557.
- Schmitt, Richard, *Alienation and Class*, Schenkman Books, Inc., USA, 1991.
- Scott, John & Marshall, Gordon (editors), *A Dictionary of Sociology*, Oxford University Press, UK, 2005.
- Stecker, Robert, *Interpretation and Construction – Art, Speech, and the Law*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, UK, 2003.
- Stockhammer, Morris (editor), *Karl Marx Dictionary*, Philosophical Library Inc., New York, USA, 1965.
- Thiele, Leslie Paul, "Heidegger on Freedom: Political not Metaphysical", *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 88, No. 2, June 1994, pp. 278-291.
- Tugendhat, Ernst, "Heidegger's idea of truth", in *Critical Heidegger*, ed. Christopher Macann, Routledge, UK, 1996, pp. 227-240.
- Vattimo, Gianni, *Beyond Interpretation – The Meaning of Hermeneutics for Philosophy*, trans. David Webb, Polity Press, UK, 1997.
- Weber, Samuel, *Institution and Interpretation*, Stanford University Press, USA, 2001.
- Zimmerman, Michael E., "Heidegger's 'Completion' of Sein und Zeit", *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Jun., 1979), pp. 537-560.