IN SEARCH OF NON-IDENTITY:
ADORNO'S CRITIQUE OF HEIDEGGER

By

Andrea Walsh

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Philosophy—Doctor of Philosophy

2018

ABSTRACT

IN SEARCH OF NON-IDENTITY:
ADORNO'S CRITIQUE OF HEIDEGGER

By

Andrea Walsh

This dissertation explores Theodor Adorno's career-long critique of Martin Heidegger's Fundamental Ontology toward understanding how the latter may be inherently supportive of a negative dialectical approach to social critique and change. Adorno's negative dialectics is motivated by the assumption that ethical rationality is primordially rooted in *non-identity thinking*, and it proposes that three basic conditions must be met for non-identity thinking to be truly engaged: the subject must acknowledge that the object takes socio-epistemic priority in constructions of meaning; she must attend to the object's particular qualities that resist circumscription by the totalizing concepts of modern autonomous reason; and she must resolve to relate to the object through a "mimetic" form of rationality, which is passively attuned to the playful and unfinished elements of experience as much as it is inclined to critically interpret the particular socio-material conditions that shape consciousness and its environments.

Without meeting these conditions, rationality tacitly sanctions subjects to reify experience as it takes an idealist form. While emphasizing that the problem of reification is endemic to public life at large, Adorno foregrounds its correlation with the persistence of philosophical idealism within the academy, leading him to target the phenomenological and existential traditions in general, and Heidegger's Fundamental Ontology in particular, as inherently antagonistic to what he deems is philosophy's central mission of normalizing non-identity thinking in both theory and praxis. Fundamental Ontology, he alleges, celebrates identity thinking, thus betraying its own endeavor to overturn traditional philosophical principles.

Adorno locates the repercussions of this purported failure not only within theoretical understandings of how rationality and meaning are constituted, but within mundane forms of intersubjective relations that determine the ethics, discourse, and well-being of social collectives. He charges Fundamental Ontology with promoting an ethos in which subjects contribute to their own deprivations of the social conditions that, toward garnering robust understanding of how objectivity restrictively mediates subjectivity, would encourage recognition of new possibilities for subjectively mediating social conditions by amplifying individual and collective agency for de-normalizing identity thinking. This is largely because Adorno deems Heidegger's concept of "authenticity" - an existential modality designated by recursive engagement in practices of disillusionment and self-actualization - to contradict itself by reaffirming atomization, alienation, and reification as social norms.

Given that the majority of Adorno's objections to Fundamental Ontology are briefed by his broader belief that it eschews non-identity thinking, the central task of this dissertation is to search for exceptions, that is, to ask after the plausibility of interpreting essential components of the Ontology so that non-identity not only "appears," but assumes a critical position. This foremost involves examining the meaning of Being as a lived hermeneutic, the role of existential analysis for rediscovering what I call "authentic non-identity thinking" and its vitality to immanent social critique, and the possibility that a template for ethical relations inheres in or can be extrapolated from the Ontology. While the focus of the dissertation remains with Adorno and Heidegger, this is also to advance a more extensive understanding of the complex relationship between the First Generation Critical Theory and Existential Phenomenological traditions, including how they may be mutually supportive as they aim to negate ideology in both the academy and broader public life.

To Sarah and Ava

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

> God could create only by hiding himself. Otherwise there would be
> nothing but himself.
>> Holiness should then be hidden too, even from consciousness in a
> certain measure. And it should be hidden from the world.

> — Simone Weil, *Gravity and Grace*

The history of the relationship between First Generation Critical Theory[1] and existential phenomenology has been fraught with times of unyielding animosity, and times of reserved indifference. While some scholars within each tradition have attempted to traverse what has often been regarded as an irreparable rift,[2] many have also straightforwardly denied that the traditions are able to support each other in any significant way. Despite how complex and sensitive this relationship has proven to be throughout and beyond the twentieth century, and despite its periods of popular neglect, exploring the potential intersections of the two traditions deserves and continues to receive attention in scholarship today.[3] The difficulty of engaging in such exploration finds one main reason in the fact that, while the traditions have developed alongside one another and appear to be aimed toward many common ends, they also appear to diverge greatly in regard to the particular questions each has claimed to be philosophically primary and the particular approaches each has established to pursue them.

---

[1] First Generation Critical Theory is otherwise known as The Frankfurt School. I will refer to the tradition by both names.

[2] Looking at it more broadly as the relationship between First General Critical Theory on the one hand, and phenomenology *and* existential phenomenology (or existentialism) on the other, there is, on the side of phenomenology and existential phenomenology, for example, the later Sartre, the later Husserl, the later Merleau-Ponty, de Beauvoir, Hermann Mörchen (1981), and Oliver Garbrecht (Garbrecht 1999); and on the side of critical theory there is, for example, Marcuse, Paci (Paci 1972), Kosik (Kosik 2012), Lucien Goldmann, and Trần Đức Thảo (Trần 1986). I would also argue that Nietzsche had long obscured the boundaries between the two traditions.

[3] Fred Dallmayr's compelling book, *Between Freiburg and Frankfurt: Toward a Critical Ontology*, is one notable example (Dallmayr 1991). More recently, Iain MacDonald's publications on Adorno and Heidegger, with his co-edited 2008 collection in particular, have helped to renew interest on the topic (MacDonald and Krzysztof 2008;

Having witnessed an increasing gravitation toward logical positivism (in the academy) and institutionalized, systematic thinking (in society as a whole), both traditions emerged from out of concern over the advancement of a form of rationality characterized by quantification and universalization, and, subsequently, from within recognition of the need to liberate philosophical and social consciousness from doctrinaire, reductionist worldviews [Weltanschauungen]. Today, each continues to seek to challenge a fused philosophical, scientific, and cultural milieu governed by what Adorno named "autonomous reason," a notion that he and Horkheimer, and also Marcuse, later recast as "technical" or "instrumental rationality," and which Husserl and Heidegger each belatedly diagnosed as "natural-scientific" and "calculative thinking."[4] For these thinkers that still widely represent their respective traditions, this contorted idea of what constitutes *true*, *critical* rationality has, alongside the growth of commodification and technology, progressively permeated all corners of socio-cultural life.[5] The dangers of such growth, becoming most evident during and in the aftermath of the World Wars, signaled an urgency to untether the philosophical canon from Enlightenment ideals, which First Generation Critical Theory and existential phenomenology have mutually understood as championing the reification of mind and world.[6]

For both traditions, the most pressing demand of endeavoring to critique the conditions and implications of rationalist systems is controverting the dichotomized subject-object structure that specifies Cartesian-based thinking. As we know, approaching questions of truth, knowledge, and identity within such thinking involves presuming that subject and object are to be analyzed as

---

[4] Adorno 2000; Horkheimer and Adorno 2007; Marcuse 1991; Husserl 1970; Heidegger 1998.

[5] Husserl does not explicitly point out the relation between rationality and the socio-material until *Crisis*. Moreover, while the relation is already insinuated in *Being and Time*, Heidegger does not explicitly mention it until after his "turn," and even then he very rarely discusses capitalism directly.

[6] While Husserl and Heidegger use the term "reification" far less than often Adorno et al., I argue that they clearly shared the latter's concern. For example, see Husserl 1983: 125/§104 and Heidegger 2008a: 72/47, 486/436-488/438.

discrete entities. Rationalist systems (most notably Kant's and Fichte's) have engendered a variety of subjectivist and realist theories that, mimicking the reductionist and deterministic approaches that remain so engrained in the natural sciences, generally misrepresent the subject to be self-constitutive and self-determinative, and the object to be utterly dependent upon or independent from the inner workings of both individual and collective consciousness. In professionalized philosophy but also in public life overall, this presumption has propelled pervasive non-responsiveness to how meaning and identity are always contingent on dialogical relations of consciousness and "objective"[7] conditions (whatever these may turn out to be). The traditional metaphysical idea that rationality in a "pure" and impartial state is what drives critical epistemic activity curtails in these formations the significance of the sensuous and affective dimensions of experience, which point to the discrete social contexts that subjects embody and are embedded in. Accordingly, this frame of reference abstracts human experience from its intricately particular qualities, to conceive of the subject as not "always and already" reciprocally impacted by intersubjective, historical, and material dynamics. Within it, philosophical thinking becomes synonymous with the abrasive fiction of autonomous reason.

 In but only seeming paradox, this binary opposition between an absolute ego, and "worldly" conditions that are deemed inessential to meaning and identity formation, culminates in an imagined unification of the two "realms." Reduced to those of its properties that can be channeled through universal representations, the object is manipulated to fit within concepts that are decidedly conditional on neither the fact that the subject's interpretations of that object, as evolving over time, are always incomplete, nor the fact that the subject relates in part *non-*

---

[7] Following Marx and Adorno et al., by using the term "objective" (or "object" or "objectivity") I do not mean to reinforce the traditional subject-object dichotomy, and rather to reference socio-historical and material things, structures, events, and effects that ineluctably participate in processes that cultivate mutual relations between consciousness and reality. "Objectivity" comprises (non-absolute) subjectivity along with other material entities.

conceptually to the object's unique features and historically complex meaning(s). The (outwardly discrete) object is reified when it is presumed to be impervious to more than that which autonomous reason can logically contain. For Adorno, this manufactured and alienating structure is always destined to terminate in licensing subjects an assumed metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical priority over objects (others, things, and, importantly, even oneself). The mind "usurp[s] the place of something absolutely independent - which it is not; its claim of independence heralds the claim of dominance. Once parted from the object, the subject reduces it to its own measure; it swallows the object, forgetting how much it is an object itself."[8]Adorno reserves the term *identity thinking* to denote this equation of immediate, uncritical experience (irrational, instrumental rationality) with "objective" reality.

The two-pronged message to be retrieved here - (1) that autonomous reason, as identity thinking, demotes the object to a categorical set of judgments while promoting the subject to a position of absolute self-sufficiency, and (2) that the most urgent goal of philosophers should be to critique identity thinking - is echoed in various ways throughout much of earlier phenomenology. Brentano, drawing on Aristotle and the Scholastics of the Middle Ages, adapted the idea of intentionality to reintroduce how "[e]very mental phenomenon includes something as an object within itself,"[9] and, thought the other way around, that all inner presentation, perception, and feeling "is fused with its object and is included in the object itself."[10] Husserl, of course, carried this reformulation into the center of his own phenomenology, insisting that, when undergoing the phenomenological reduction (the epoché), the ego (the noesis) is understood to exist as a co-relation with the phenomenal world, and the object (the noema) is understood to be encircled by horizons that delimit what will or can be revealed about its meaning in a given

---

[8] Adorno 2000: 139.
[9] Brentano 2015: 92.
[10] Ibid: 151.

experience. Together with Husserl's conclusion that "as intentional, [consciousness] reaches out beyond the isolated subjective processes that are to be analyzed," these claims have served as a substratum for subsequent frameworks in the continental canon.[11]

While commending Brentano and Husserl for their advancements over German Idealism, the Frankfurt School still deemed the idea of intentionality to misrepresent the subject-object relation and phenomenological thinking in general to be unable to rear the conditions for genuine social critique. One pillar of Adorno's framework is that philosophical *methods*, and methods fixated on so-called "immediacy" in particular, inevitably develop into dogmatic systems, disempowering subjects to recognize the need and possibility of critically negating the structural processes that are responsible for the problem of *false consciousness*; that is, of exposing contradictions between how reality, specifically as it is institutionally managed, appears (typically, as operating autonomously and in the subject's best interests) and how it "really" is (as rooted in values and practices that give rise to alienation, exploitation, and reification, and which are molded mutually by the subject).[12] The phenomenological reductions, Adorno contends, fail to account for the most basic condition of engaging in such critique and thus too of aiming to overturn the subject-object dichotomy; namely, that the subject recognizes interpreted experience to always be dialectically *mediated*. Taking Husserl to presume that "bracketing" involves a willing disregard of mediation altogether, he rejoins that "ostensible originary concepts - in particular those of epistemology, as they are presented in Husserl - are totally and necessarily mediated in themselves, or - to use the accepted scientific term - 'laden with presuppositions.'"[13] The majority of Adorno's and the Frankfurt School's polemic against existential phenomenology

---

[11] Husserl 1977: 48. Moreover, here in the *Cartesian Mediations*, Husserl foreshadows how he will ultimately shift his analyses to focus on the role of the socio-historical within experientially immediate formations of meaning (as he does in *Crisis of the European Sciences*) (Husserl 1970).
[12] See, for example, Adorno 2000: 131-4.
[13] Ibid: 116.

and Heidegger in particular can be traced back to this key charge against Husserl for having allegedly set the stage for reinforcing false consciousness in the academic philosophical sphere.

. . .

Adorno's criticism of Husserl also pivots more broadly on the fact that, despite their shared mission to remodel the subject-object structure by anchoring meaning formation in dialogical events, the critical theory and phenomenological traditions quickly diverge in what they each identify to be the most fundamental and pressing of philosophical issues. In general, whereas the latter advances an open-ended approach into what experience is like by prioritizing questions regarding the essences of consciousness and being, the former is expressly concerned with renewing questions of how the socio-material interacts with consciousness in ways that yield reification and fetishism as both conceptual and practical norms. While Husserlian and existential phenomenology is not primarily or overtly interested in investigating those dynamics per se, this dissertation argues that Heidegger's Fundamental Ontology provides an onto-existential infrastructure that, while rooted in phenomenology, is nevertheless supportive of, if not also preparatory to, Adorno's negative dialectical approach. This will entail confronting the challenge that phenomenology's digression from the Hegelian-Marxist framework poses to the potential of Fundamental Ontology to complement Adorno's agenda. Similarly, it will entail examining how both traditions sustain a heavy Kantian influence. In Adorno, this influence manifests mostly as criticism of Kant, which advances his critique of idealism more generally.[14]

Against Kant, and, by virtue of this, against phenomenology, Adorno follows Hegel to accept thinking as a dialectic, and follows Marx to affirm that, within that dialectic, the object, or that which is socio-material, takes metaphysical and epistemic priority, a point he effectively

---

[14] Although Adorno critiques Kant largely by criticizing his theory of judgment, he also adopts much of Kant's thinking on aesthetics.

summarizes in his claim that "society comes before the individual consciousness and before all its experience."[15] For dialectical materialism, properly investigating the conditions and possibilities of human experience within late capitalist society or "the administered world" first and foremost means investigating the ways in which the institutional conventions that characterize this world habituate subjects to identify themselves, others, things, and events with definitive concepts that operate against the values of openness to experience, subjective agency, and social change. In doing so, these investigations must also critically evaluate how subjects themselves participate in perpetuating "damaged life."[16]

In partial criticism of Marx, Adorno builds on dialectical materialism to articulate and emphasize what he calls the *"negative moment"* in identity (i.e., in the concept). For, if mediation is the essence of the subject-object relation, and if it is socio-material "objectivity" that predominantly shapes meaning, then it must be the case that the concept always contains a "blank space," so to speak, in which the particularity of the object resists total conceptualization (and, to be sure, that particularity, as it resists the concept, simultaneously shapes the concept/identity).[17] It is broadly by this fact that the term "*non-identity*" (or, alternatively, the "non-identical") receives its meaning in Adorno. While non-identity thinking is primordial to the human condition, it has been repressed over time by the appearing social "totality" that distorts subject-object relations, impressing onto subjects the belief that identity thinking is naturally predetermined and a lack of critical awareness of the conditions, need, and possibility of non-identity thinking.

Moments of non-identity thinking occur when the subject recognizes that the meaning of the object, especially in its layering by historical activity, is contingent on relational contexts,

---

[15] Adorno 1990: 181.
[16] Adorno 2005.
[17] See, for example, Adorno 1990: 173-4.

granting it a complexity that is missed in non-critical confrontations with the subject and her tendency to arrange phenomena according to familiar codifications. This means that non-identity thinking depends on the subject's analytically discerning her embeddedness in a social "totality," the very essence of which is to remain hidden to her as a host of socio-material mechanisms that distort perceived reality. Characterized by its falsely appearing to consciousness as ahistorical, sovereign, inevitable, and transparent yet also impenetrable, "totality" is, simply put, a lattice of interlacing ideologies that contradict the very principles on which they are ostensibly established, and that direct social experience. To reveal it as such, the subject must construct what Adorno, taking over from Benjamin, calls "constellations" among points of meaning that she otherwise perceives to exist in socio-historical isolation. These points correspond to changing collections of interrelated concepts and socio-material conditions that, together, constitute subject-object relations, which remain mostly concealed within immediate, uncritical experience (in this way, Adorno is indebted to Kant's notion of the thing-in-itself),[18] and which the subject, as interpreter, must piece together by trial and error. As what we might call "the ultimate object," this monolithic "totality" carries priority in formations of meaning, and consequently, Adorno claims, critiquing it should be the priority of all philosophical pursuits. For, even though this distorted "objectivity" too is mediated, "it is not so thoroughly dependent on the subject as the subject is on [it]."[19]

The historical damage suffered by the subject-object relation speaks to the need to recover the negative element of dialectical thinking that Adorno finds wanting in Hegel. While thinking *with* Hegel particularly for his appeal to critique "immediate, naïve, unreflective" consciousness and its "unharmonious" relation with the state (its "evil intention[s] by which the

[18] Adorno's first use of the term "thing-in-itself" in reference to his own framework appears in his inaugural lecture "The Actuality of Philosophy" (Adorno 2000: 32).
[19] Adorno 1990: 183-6 – my brackets.

general mass of the people is befooled"),[20]Adorno rebukes the very precept that founds the

Phenomenology: that rationality is the truth of "pure Insight," which is always evolving toward

total unification with "the Real."[21] Hegel deifies a universal synthesis of consciousness and

actuality through which the former "seeks in the world only its rational, conceptual self"[22] and

the latter "should possess no essential objectivity apart from the subject and the individual."[23]

Despite correcting ascertaining that object determinacy presupposes conceptual negation, he

remains entrenched within the Enlightenment ideal of progress toward absolute identity between

concept and object, as he unrealistically understands critical rationality to transcend material

(including psycho-social) conditions.[24] For Adorno, among the most troubling implications of

Hegel's framework are how it (1) neutralizes the potentially transformative power of rationality

to negate the contradictions of exchange society, as it betrays its own aim to preserve non-

identity by indeed affirming identity,[25] (2) does not oppose "totality" by "convicting it of

nonidentity with itself - of the nonidentity it denies, according to its own concept" (i.e., by way

of immanent critique),[26] and (3) forestalls actual recognition of the object's particularity and

priority.[27] Altogether, this means that it (4) grants "ontological precedence" to "identity, as

---

[20] Hegel 1977: 330.
[21] "In pure Insight… the Notion is alone the actual…. Pure insight is not only the certainty of self-conscious Reason that it is all truth: it knows that it is" (ibid: 326). Also see, for example, ibid: 567.
[22] Ibid: 529. Phenomenological consciousness "actively determines what it shall observe and experience."
[23] From Hegel's *Aesthetics*, in Marcuse 1999: 89-90.
[24] "For since [the Enlightenment's] essence is pure insight, what is universal[i] in and for itself, its true relation to the other extreme is that in which it concerns itself with the common and identical element in both" (Hegel 1977: 330 – my brackets).
[25] "His own concept of nonidentity - to him a vehicle for turning it into identity, into equality with itself - inevitably has its opposite for its content; this he brushes aside in a hurry. What he explicitly stated in the tract on 'difference,' and promptly integrated in his own philosophy, becomes the most serious objection to that philosophy" (Adorno 1990: 120).
[26] Adorno 1990: 147. Also see, for example, ibid: 140-142; 170-172; 182.
[27] See, for example, ibid: 173.

totality," as it promotes "the indirectedness of the nonidentical," or the elements of "objectivity" to which the subject relates non-conceptually, "to the rank of its absolute conceptual Being."[28]

Inheriting Marx's and Lukács's ideas of fetishism and reification respectively, Adorno's negative dialectics is concerned with remodeling or returning to critical reason in a way that empowers subjects to challenge the exchange structure ("totality") and its co-conditionality on identity thinking, which is intrinsic to the "spirit" of the Enlightenment. For, critiquing identity thinking begins by critiquing the subject's "second nature," or the subject's having been subliminally coerced to understand conceptuality as always able to exhaust the meaning of objects, and thus to repress her primordial instinct to think non-identically. In comparison, Hegel fails to prioritize critique of concrete social conditions that have given rise to such an ethos distinguished by what is the subject's proclivity, as grounded in "objectivity," to reify consciousness, things, their relations, as well as those very conditions themselves. Phenomena are rendered "thing like," abstracted from their immanent contexts, and stripped of their perceived potential for experiencing change.[29] Normalizing reification secures the fulfillment of late capitalism's need to preempt subversion of the exchange system and its appropriation of socio-cultural power. The tangible repercussions of reification, as they manifest in commodification, alienation, and exploitative domination, indicate how Enlightenment rationality foils its own ambition to culminate in a collectively "free and happy consciousness."

Here we begin to see just how transparent the inextricability of social and epistemological critique is in Adorno. Positing distinct rationales for why he views (non-traditional) epistemological questions as bearing philosophical precedence on the one hand, and is concerned by the problem of reification on the other hand, would be an error, for it would

---

[28] Ibid: 120.

[29] "The only way out of the dialectical context of immanence," Adorno contends, "is by that context itself. Dialectics is critical reflection upon that context" (ibid: 141). Genuine immanent critique is not possible in Hegel's universe.

ignore the reciprocal relationship between knowledge production and social situations. "Social critique is a critique of knowledge, and vice versa."[30] Adorno's project renounces neither rationality nor the virtues of (negatively dialectical) epistemology as a style of thinking rather than an insular system of thought. Although the object is by no means a mere product of the concept, understanding the ways in which it resists absorption under categories requires overcoming non-primordial impulses to surrender to irrationality. "He who wants to know [the object]," Adorno contends, "must think more, not less." To "think more," coming to know the object must be intentionally regarded as a moment of "non-identity through identity," wherein confronting the object motivates the subject to recursively refine her understanding of her relation with it alongside recognizing the contribution of non-conceptuality to that understanding.[31] Fundamentally, to engage critical rationality is to "strive, by way of the concept, to transcend the concept."[32] The richest knowledge of the mediating object surfaces when the subject is rationally (which, as we will see in Chapter One, also means when she is mimetically) responsive to the particularity of that object, to the particularity of her given experience with it, and, for these reasons, to the particularity of her own identity.[33] She thereby comes to terms with the concept as the *"limit-concept"* that, as non-identical to the object, is always and necessarily incomplete.[34] Actively thinking non-identically is a route toward regenerating rationality so that the subject recognizes her conceptual limitations while still remaining committed to exploring, by means of immanently-contextualized concepts, the relational mechanisms that undergird institutionalized reality and that remain largely veiled within any presently immediate

---

[30] Adorno 2000: 143.
[31] Ibid: 189.
[32] Ibid: 15.
[33] Adorno 1990: 14.
[34] Ibid: 27.

experience.[35] As a corollary, then, Adorno calls for a subject-object division to be maintained, just not the traditional division that results in a conflation of the two spheres to the extent that the idea of constitutive subjectivity is upheld (which, for him, phenomenologists and especially Heidegger do uphold).[36]

With this, it is clear that Adorno is concerned above all with the alterity of experience. Intellectual empathy for the "otherness" of the object - how it both supplies meaning and eludes total understanding - is basal to his negative dialectics, in which "it is not total identification that has the last word, because dialectics lets us recognize the difference that has been spirited away."[37] Examining the various sites at which Adorno detects the non-identity of identity is one primary purpose of this dissertation. A second purpose is to present his broader critique of existential phenomenology, which had earned his attention not only for its contemporaneousness with First Generation Critical Theory, but for its approaches (e.g., the epoché, the existential analytic), its assumptions (e.g., regarding free will and the significance of materiality), and the questions it finds most necessary (e.g., what is the ego, or being, in itself?), all of which, Adorno argues, precludes it from successfully overturning the traditional subject-object division, and thus from genuinely considering the possibility of recovering a form of rationality that directs itself toward negating ideology and nurturing non-identity thinking. A third purpose, which will account for the majority of this dissertation, is to examine Adorno's more pointed objections against Heidegger, whom throughout his career he perceived as the antagonist-in-chief to philosophy's mission of disillusioning consciousness.

[35] Of course, non-identity thinking can only become truly manifest once the contradictions of late capitalism are reconciled with it. And, upon reconciliation, non-identity would no longer necessarily correspond to critique. For it is "[i]n the unreconciled condition [that] nonidentity is experienced as negativity" (ibid 31 – my brackets).
[36] Unsurprisingly, Adorno, while acknowledging Heidegger's general divergence from the Hegelian dialectic, also claims that the notion of "Being" in Fundamental Ontology reproduces the *Phenomenology's* notion of "Spirit." "Heidegger repeats the Hegelian slight-of-hand maneuver, except that Hegel's is practiced openly while Heidegger, not wanting to be an idealist, shrouds and beclouds the ontologization of the ontical" (ibid: 121).
[37] Ibid: 172.

. . .

That Heidegger, considerably more than any other figure, is a recipient of Adorno's chronic, scathing criticism, is of course unsurprising. Heidegger's anti-Semitism had become publicly evident as early as 1933 when he officially joined the the Nazi Party (NSGWP) shortly after being elected Rector of the University of Freiburg. But it is also detectable in areas of his texts, speeches, and letters at least until 1945,[38] making Heidegger a clear mark for Adorno, a philosopher who had been personally affected by, and in his work, especially attentive to critiquing the historical conditions and staying power of the Party. Even in 1966 (which also happened to be the publication year of *Negative Dialectics*), Heidegger remained ambiguous about the extent of his earlier allegiance to the Party, assumed little culpability,[39] and declined to directly confirm how that allegiance had informed and whether it continued to inform his philosophical thinking.[40] However, for Adorno, one need not even thoroughly interrogate that allegiance to observe how deeply Heidegger's Ontology is erected upon autocratic and fascist ideals. For example, he finds Heidegger's insistence, in response to the "nihilism" of Western modernity, that "the people" [Volksgemeinschaft], specifically "the German people," is on a "spiritual mission" toward redefining science and creating a new Weltanschauung,[41] to mirror the notion of authenticity as described in *Being and Time*.[42]

---

[38] For instance, in his 1945 *Letter to the Rector of Freiburg University,* Heidegger lamented what had been his previous public distance from the Nazi Party, for example "by not participating in its gatherings, by not wearing its regalia, and, as of 1934, by refusing to begin [his] courses and lectures with the so-called German greeting [Heil Hitler!]" (Wolin 1993: 66). However, in the letter Heidegger refrained from remarking on whether he had by then relinquished his partisanship for the Party.

[39] To my knowledge, Heidegger had assumed candid culpability on only one occasion. In a letter to Marcuse, he wrote: "You are entirely correct that I failed to provide a public, readily comprehensible counter-declaration; it would have been the end of both me and my family. On this point, Jaspers said: that we remain alive is our guilt" (Wolin 1993: 162-3).

[40] Examples of Heidegger's declining to confirm are abundant in *Der Spiegel* interview (Wolin 1993: 91-116).

[41] See Heidegger on Nietzsche; *The Self-Assertion of the German University*; *Introduction to Metaphysics* (especially pp. 34-56). Also see p. 103 of the 1939-1941 volume of the *Black Notebooks* (Heidegger 2016).

[42] See, for example, Adorno 2003: 104.

Despite what are now the widely recognized fascist implications of his framework,[43] Heidegger was apparently and far more generally unconcerned with the mutual relation between philosophical consciousness, social consciousness, and institutional mandates,[44] exemplifying his absent attention to analyzing *concrete* instances of socio-material mediation. This signals one strand of Adorno's more extensive objection that Heidegger's language expresses "Being" and "authenticity" in a series of "empty" words, lifting the notions into a "special domain" that Heidegger thought to be immune to criticism;[45] "the jargon of authenticity is ideology as language, without any consideration of specific content."[46] Overall, Adorno's critique of Heidegger is concerned with his alleged failures (1) to consider the socio-material conditions that, in dialectic with social consciousness, have engendered conventional philosophical assumptions, (2) to articulate how the subject-object relation in late capitalist society is both a product of and reinforces reification, and thus (3) to acknowledge how reification primes the possibilities and realizations of social injustices. Although Heidegger upholds the Ontology as aiming to "overcome" traditional, reifying thinking, Adorno interprets it to propagate the very ideology that should be the target of philosophical critique.[47]

As I have preliminarily explained, Adorno situates the essence of identity thinking in the ideology of exchange, which discourages subjects to interpret experience in terms of moments of

---

[43] The first publications of the *Black Notebooks* have reanimated interest in the relation between Heidegger's philosophy, anti-Semitism, and allegiance to the Nazi Party. In Chapter Four, section four of this dissertation, I will recount key themes from the notebooks as well as a few popular responses to them.

[44] Here are two examples. (1) In the *der Spiegel* interview, Heidegger is asked, "Isn't one justified in expecting a philosopher to give us some indications as to how he perceives the possibility for life?" to which he responds, "So long as it takes itself serious vis-à-vis the great tradition, it would be asking too much of thinking to have it set about giving instructions." (Wolin 1993: 114). (2) In the *Das Fernseh-Interview*, Richard Wisser asks: "Do you see a social mandate for philosophy?" Heidegger replies: "No! In this sense, one cannot speak of a social mandate" (Wisser 1990).

[45] Adorno 2003: 54, 101; Adorno 1990: 76-87.

[46] Adorno 2003: 132.

[47] Given that Adorno's objections are almost exclusively targeted toward the earlier Heidegger, this dissertation, with a few exceptions, does not consider Heidegger further than the late 1940s.

negative mediation. That Heidegger represents subjectivity (Being) as autonomous and self-enclosed, so Adorno argues, is symptomatic of his negligence to seriously consider the role of non-identity within meaning and identity formation. By "enhancing subjectivity [Being] into the absolute that precedes all subject-object dualism,"[48] i.e., by making it "pure," Heidegger depicts it as shouldering onto-epistemic primacy, where this sets the tone for a project that is oblivious to mediation, materiality, and the non-identical object.[49] At the heart of Heidegger's Ontology, Adorno claims, is a "program to distinguish Being from entity and to explicate Being itself."[50] Indeed, Heidegger often (and, I will argue, misleadingly) describes his project in a similar vein: "Being, as that which is asked about, must be exhibited in a way of its own, essentially different from the way in which entities are discovered."[51] Throughout this dissertation, I will assess from within a variety of approaches the legitimacy of arriving from this premise to Adorno's first conclusion that the Ontology is only "disguised idealism," which serves as a sub-conclusion for the majority of his other charges.[52]

Adorno declares the phenomenological tradition as a whole to be marked by repeated failures to think beyond egological experience.[53] Intentionality, as interpreted by Brentano and especially Husserl, who, Adorno says, puts "pure method before any content," originates in the ego's precedence.[54] "Thoughts - which are no longer, in Husserl's word's, 'straightforwardly'

---

[48] Adorno 1990: 105 – my brackets.
[49] Ibid: 74.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Heidegger 2008: 26.
[52] Adorno 2003: 99. Idealism, of course, has many markedly different forms. What ties them together is the general precept that experienced reality is dictated either primarily or solely by the mind; a knower cannot know any object that cannot be grasped through the knower's own, direct perceptions and judgments. Initially, it is important to use only this as a criterion for determining whether Heidegger's project is idealism, as it is often unclear whether Adorno aims to simply liken Heidegger to transcendental idealism (a claim that bears plausibility), or to subjective/metaphysical idealism (a claim that does not). This issue is further problematized by Kant's influence on Adorno's work.
[53] Even Kierkegaard, within whose writings Adorno perceives a capability to overcome idealism, ultimately abstracts the individual from the socio-material.
[54] Adorno 1990: 26.

(*geradehin*) executed, but rather turned back upon themselves—seal themselves off more and more from whatever does not emanate from them and their jurisdiction, the immanence of the subject."[55] In each case, it is non-responsiveness to the primacy and particularity of the object that impedes recognition of there always being "more" meaning in any given experience than can be codified by even "true" rationality. (To be sure, "true" rationality, as non-identity thinking aimed toward determinate negation, is constituted largely by such recognition itself.) That Heidegger refigures subjectivity as Dasein, or as being-in-the-world (a participle implying dynamism), may initially demonstrate that the Ontology sufficiently disconnects from both traditional metaphysics and earlier phenomenology by conjoining (1) reflection on the essential structures of subjectivity with interpretations of the subject's everyday practical relations to the world, and (2) questions of lived existence with questions of the nature of time, where this entails overriding traditional metaphysics' identification of "what is" with sheer presence and actuality. These acts would seem to satisfy Adorno's appeal for critical attention to mediation, materiality, objectivity, as well as potentiality, and hence for discerning moments in which the negativity of identity "appears."[56] However, for Adorno, Heidegger's attempts not only are unsuccessful in correcting the subject-object binary, but they strengthen its appeal. This is especially as he reads Heidegger to give up on rationality and epistemology altogether rather than attempt to pull them out from their roots within metaphysical (Cartesian, Kantian) principles and the identity thinking they reflect.[57] By contrast, this dissertation poses arguments for many of Heidegger's successes to these ends.[58]

---

[55] Adorno 2000: 129.
[56] On the priority of possibility in Adorno and Heidegger, see MacDonald 2011. However, I will draw on this work in many areas throughout the dissertation.
[57] Adorno 1990: 70, 114.
[58] I will often justify my arguments by teasing out the *implications* of Heidegger's Ontology. However, Heidegger also often offers more explicit remarks in favor of those interpretations. For instance, against Adorno, I contend that

Heidegger's purported "irrationalism" and withdrawal of concern from the conditions of knowledge motivates what I identify to be Adorno's second major objection; namely, that Heidegger contains his investigations to the realm of "unreflective immediacy," in which the subject (Dasein) is limited in her ability to adjudicate between "what things are" and "what they claim to be."[59] Not simply maintaining but fortifying the assumption that the subject takes onto-epistemic precedence, the Ontology is unable to recognize how the meaning of an object is shaped by relations of conceptual negativity. While concurring that attending to the "how" of immediate existence is a crucial component of critical theory, Adorno emphasizes that this alone is hardly sufficient for critically theorizing the conditions of knowledge and experience (with this, I will argue, Heidegger agrees). Heidegger's disapproval of theory-based investigations originates in caution against methodology (of which Adorno, too, is highly critical), but, on Adorno's count, this disapproval leads him to lose sight of what is most dangerous about methodology after all: i.e., how it tends to generate categorical orders of thought that, while not necessarily neglecting the historical, social, and material contexts of lived experience, inadequately connects them with consciousness.[60] Seemingly for Adorno, Heidegger's resistance to theory paradoxically makes him *more* susceptible to the philosophical limitations that he believes are internal to theory-based approaches themselves.

the Ontology *is* in part an endeavor in epistemology, but, in most areas of his work, Heidegger appears indifferent to its function as such, and very rarely does he candidly admit or even tacitly suggest it. The strongest response he offers is in *Towards the Definition of Philosophy*: "we are practicing epistemology…. Epistemology arouses us out of this slumber [proffered by philosophies, and especially idealisms, that do not identify the need to question assumptions] and points to problems. These cannot be seen by clinging to immediate life-experience. One must rise to the critical standpoint. One must be free and able, in a progressive age of reason and culture, to place oneself over oneself. In this way one enters a new dimension, the philosophical" (Heidegger 2000: 63 - my brackets for clarification). Aside from this one of two examples, I will read between Heidegger's lines to interpret his Ontology as ultimately grounded in epistemological concerns. Similarly, I will interpret it as grounded in concerns of sociality and, to some extent, ethicality, and I will often follow the same approach.

[59] Ibid: 62, 167.

[60] For example, Heidegger claims that it is "the general dominance of the theoretical" that "deforms the genuine problematic" (of philosophy). "[A] deeply ingrained obsession with the theoretical greatly hinders a genuine survey of the prevalent domain of environmental experience" (Heidegger 2008b: 68-9).

Adorno faults phenomenology more broadly for what he alleges is its satisfaction with

mere descriptions of what one thinks one already knows,[61] rather than evaluating, through

discerning "constellations" of meaning, how this knowledge is mediated by social "totality."[62]

Thought more simply, he finds phenomenologists to ask questions of "how" without asking the

equally important questions of "why," or questions that are conducive to critical (negative)

thinking and which efforts toward theorization can provide. Within forms of idealism, thought

"hide[s] the fact that it does not generate" and instead "merely returns what it already has as

experience."[63]Although theory on its own is also insufficient, "[it] and mental experience need to

interact" toward (re)cultivating consciousness' powers of negation. For, "the force that liberates

the dialectical movement in cognition is the very same that rebels against the system."[64] Lacking

this interaction, Fundamental Ontology confines thinking to a "one-dimensional Now,"

sanctioning it to reify consciousness and "totality" and to fetishize things and others.[65] Adorno

argues, for example, that Heidegger's stopping short at mere descriptions of "readiness-to-hand"

designates it as an ahistorical and inevitable phenomenon. (In Chapter Three, I will propose that

Heidegger only inadequately expresses its historicality and mutability.) Adorno also accuses him

of reifying "the They," as he does not ask after the precise conditions that are historically

responsible for its character as "equipmentality," nor does he explore the conditions of the

possibilities for favorable social change. "What dissolves the fetish is the insight that things are

---

[61] In *Being and Time*, Heidegger writes: "Like any ontological Interpretation whatsoever, this analytic can only, so to speak, "listen in" to some previously disclosed entity as regards its Being" (Heidegger 2008a: 179). Juxtapose this with Adorno's remark in *Minima Moralia* that "the castration of perception by a court of control that denies it any anticipatory desire, forces it thereby into a pattern of helplessly reiterating what is already known" (Adorno 2005: 123).

[62] See, for example, Adorno 1990: 47, 63; Adorno 2003: 97, 114; Adorno 2000: 32. Adorno emphasizes that Heidegger's philosophy was intended "to be no theory of knowledge but a position to be assumed at will," and that this "relieved the phenomenology of the need to think through the interrelation of its categories" (Adorno 1990: 114).

[63] Adorno 1990: 63.

[64] Ibid: 31 - my brackets.

[65] Ibid: 53.

not simply so and not otherwise, that they have come to be under certain conditions," something

for which he finds Heidegger is entirely unprepared (also given what is his visible indifference to

questions of normativity).[66] Adorno determines that, without facilitating the potential of thinking

to transform both the conditions and possibilities of sociality, Fundamental Ontology simply

perpetuates the problem of reification.

Bearing in mind that he deems reified consciousness to be average consciousness within

contemporary capitalist society, Adorno contends that part of the "ontological need," to which he

says Heidegger unwittingly responds, is a need to encourage "only the normally functioning

intellect and the corresponding view of reality." "Heidegger," disappointing his responsibility as

philosopher, "still opts for the 'normally' thinking human being."[67] This quotation from *Negative*

Dialectics motivates the third main objection at stake in this dissertation, which pertains to the

intellectual coherence and ethical implications of Heidegger's notion of authenticity. Here I will

briefly summarize the primary elements of this objection, to which Adorno devotes nearly all of

The Jargon of Authenticity, before revisiting them in the following chapters.

Adorno's contention above alludes to his claim that the notion of authenticity is the

culmination of Heidegger's failure to account for the (non-conceptual) negativity in mediation

and identity, and to properly identify the conditions of both "the They" (which I will compare

with "totality") and the possibility of the subject's liberation from it. On these grounds, he

professes that individuals believing themselves "authentic" à la Heidegger trade the prospect of

achieving critical consciousness, realizable only through consistent critique of ingrained

cognitive patterns, and through which one aims to enact positive social change, with a resolve to

affirm an absolute will that "transcends" actuality. Liberating oneself within Heidegger's

---

[66] Ibid: 52.
[67] Ibid: 72.

universe is as undemanding as carrying on with false consciousness of and apathy for the "real"

conditions and effects of "administered thinking."[68] Under the jurisdiction of the exchange

system, no one today can truly claim to have reached a state of "liberation,"[69] and yet

Heidegger's Dasein enjoys a sense of agency that is invulnerable to its social environment(s).

Thus, Heidegger must understand the sole condition of liberation to be a matter of autonomous

choice: "Until further notice, authenticity and inauthenticity have as their criterion the decision in

which the individual subject chooses itself as its own possession."[70] That Dasein is able to

earnestly present and make this choice at all reflects Heidegger's understanding authenticity to

be "a manner of behavior that is ascribed to the being-a-subject of the subject, not to the subject

as a relational factor," Adorno claims.

> The category of authenticity, which was at first introduced for a descriptive purpose, and which flowed from the relatively innocent question about what is authentic in something, now turns into a mythically imposed fate.[71]

Interpreting authenticity to be "automatically" granted,[72] Adorno argues that, as an idea, it

reinforces the assumption that consciousness is or can be thoroughly sovereign; it takes no regard

of mediation, the priority of the object, and non-identity in identity formation. As I have

intimated, for Adorno true efforts toward realizing one's agency depends on critiquing one's

immanent social contexts, where this includes consideration for the particular ways in which

relationality is constituted by that which is alterior or non-conceptual to the (absolute) concept.

> What is decisive in the ego, its independence and autonomy, can be judged only in relation to its otherness, to the nonego. Whether or not there is autonomy depends upon its adversary and

---

[68] For existential phenomenology overall, Adorno insists that ideas of authenticity or "freedom" emanate from and encourage utter self-involvement within socio-cultural political life, which adds sense to the disciplinary term "egological."

[69] See, for example, Adorno 1990: 95.

[70] Adorno 2003: 92.

[71] Ibid: 104.

[72] Ibid: 3.

> antithesis, on the object which either grants or denies autonomy to the subject. Detached from the object, autonomy is fictitious.[73]

In contrast, authenticity is quite simply voluntarism, and in effect, it sanctions Dasein to reify its consciousness and, with it, its inherent powers for determinate negation (in the fashion of negative dialectics). Unaware of the extent to which it is a victim of the exchange system, authentic Dasein self-identifies as free from all socio-material constraints, it confuses freedom with autonomous reason, and it is susceptible to remaining content with the increasing supervision and systematization of its dealings.[74] In this way, Heidegger "becomes the advocate of the unfulfillment of life."[75]

Adorno finds this problem to also be an inevitable upshot of interpreting anxiety as an absolute (existential) concept rather than as historically and materially rooted in capitalist exploits, where this demonstrates Heidegger's indistinctness from what Adorno perceives is existential phenomenology's preoccupation with moods or attunements that repel the social.[76] Understanding Adorno's rationale for these accusations should be advised by the reminder that, for Heidegger, authenticity, which is preceded or accompanied by anxiety, necessitates Dasein's embracing itself as essentially being-toward-death and wresting itself away from the They, whose "idle talk" obstructs it from this point of existential discovery.[77] "Saved from the They," Adorno puts it, "it [Dasein] becomes the authentic. Authenticity is death." In consequence, Heidegger incentivizes Dasein to valorize the prospect of its death because, as he stresses in Division II of *Being and Time,* it is the temporal connectedness between Dasein's present and

---

[73] Adorno 1990: 223.
[74] See, for example, Adorno 2003: 66, 105, 116-7.
[75] Adorno 1990: 92.
[76] Adorno 2003: 27, 92, 97. For Adorno, the existential concept of anxiety should be reconceived as the contemporary subject's experience of alienation. Senses of meaninglessness are precipitated primarily, if not solely, by social oppression (see, for example, Adorno 2003: 27-8, 126; Adorno 1990: 24). It is worth noting that Paul Tillich adopts and expands on this reading while remaining within an existentialist framework.
[77] Ibid: 125- my brackets.

future (as ending in death) that provides the possibility of authentic Being. What inspires

individuals to join the "cult" of authenticity is the "refrain that nothing would be worse than the

disappearance of death," Adorno claims[78]; death becomes something "artificially beyond the

existent," an intellectual focal point abstracted from the They,[79] and, specifically, Heidegger

praises death "as a cure for exchange."[80] In consequence of all this, he concludes that

authenticity is not only metaphysically impossible; it is ethically dangerous. Among its

implications are that Fundamental Ontology celebrates and "cleanses" death, promotes

indifference to and disdain for others, and validates domination and violence.[81]

What we should ultimately gather to be Adorno's most basic grievance against

authenticity is that Heidegger disassociates its capacity from Dasein's ordinary situations within

public life.[82] Even if unintentionally, he helps to fulfill late capitalism's need for social

atomization and de-normalizing the subject's inclination to critique ideological, identity thinking.

In the Ontology, "the societal relation, which seals itself off in the identity of the [authentic]

subject, is desocietalized into an in-itself" that is not liable to critical reflection[83] (whereas for

Adorno, it is in fact engaging with "the They" as "totality," and not intending to escape it, that

yields true transcendence as liberation from false social consciousness). Adorno construes

Heidegger to express authenticity as mere self-reflexivity, by which "[he means] to distinguish

subjectivity from all other existent being."[84] This crucial instance of identity thinking, Adorno

concludes, evinces a correlation between authenticity and a deficit of concern for the well-being

of, and cultivating meaningful relationships with, others; as authentic, Dasein's disposition is to

---

[78] Ibid: 129.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Ibid: 125- my brackets. The full quote reads: "Only ideology praises it as a cure for exchange."
[81] Ibid: 129.
[82] Ibid: 121.
[83] Ibid: 95—my brackets.
[84] Ibid: 93 – my brackets.

maintain "hygienic," "purified encounters"[85] in which it regards others as mere things or instruments on which to capitalize. Particularly, Adorno finds its purported self-absorption to thwart the possibility that its "fundamental" way of being - as *care* - can encompass care for the other's suffering. "Only a solipsistic philosophy," he affirms, "could acknowledge an ontological priority to 'my' death over and against any other."[86] It is by reinforcing the egoism of Dasein, and by reifying and fetishizing the other, that Heidegger's notion of authenticity culminates in a project that "always and already" eliminates the non-identical.

Adorno's combined claims that authenticity is an elite "cult" in which only certain people are or can be members,[87] and that it inevitably precludes concern for others, largely establish his final conclusion that the notion of authenticity inevitably legitimizes social inequality, domination, and violence. He renders Heidegger to be an apologist for suffering, for, "as it runs in the jargon" of authenticity, "suffering, evil, and death are to be accepted, not to be changed."[88] Once "achieved," authenticity, upheld as the preeminent mode of consciousness, pardons social and ethical irresponsibility, and it offers no incentives to effort toward social critique, care, and change, Adorno maintains. Accordingly, he finds that embracing the notion only leaves Dasein more defenseless against dictatorial powers, as it fortifies what has already been Dasein's however inadvertent belief (while it was modally inauthentic) that Being, or what Adorno interprets as an absolute concept, is at one with the "ontic" realm. The jargon "reproduces on the level of mind the curse which bureaucracy exercises in reality. It could be described as an ideological replica of the paralyzing quality of official functions."[89]

. . .

---

[85] Ibid: 129, 64.
[86] Ibid: 123.
[87] Ibid: 3.
[88] Ibid: 53.
[89] Ibid: 67.

It is striking that, despite the level of scrutiny that Heidegger received from Adorno

throughout their coinciding careers, he never once offered a substantial response. When pressed

during interviews on his reactions to Adorno's criticism, he rejoined only by questioning the

credibility of Adorno's expertise and at one point even claimed that he had never read Adorno's

work.[90] Nevertheless, Heidegger clearly rejected dialectics, calling it an "embarrassment" to

philosophy.[91] Given the close resemblances of dialectics and hermeneutics (which I will

inspect),[92] it is also striking that Adorno, once admitting in a correspondence with Benjamin that

he had adopted a "materialist hermeneutic," soon abandoned the term.[93] The broader intent of

this dissertation is to set the hermeneutic and dialectical approaches side by side, and to do so by

exploring its more specific interest in putting Heidegger's Fundamental Ontology and Adorno's

Negative Dialectics in dialogue, in light of Adorno's critique, and toward assessing what I

hypothesize are several of their shared, foundational ideas pertaining to meaning, identity,

experience, knowledge, and how these are formed. Its leading aim is to help fill in the blanks

wherein Heidegger's responses to Adorno might lie. By both challenging areas of Adorno's

interpretation of Heidegger and elaborating on aspects of Heidegger's Ontology that seem to

promise discoveries of the significance of non-identity, I will propose that we view the two

thinkers as having more in common than they have been, and many of their readers may be,

inclined to admit. With that said, I do not intend to justify the Ontology against each and every

one of Adorno's objections, nor do I presume that, in order to accept some of those objections,

one must be anti-Heidegger, or that, to dispute them, one must be anti-Adorno. And, finally, it is

---

[90] This was during the *Das Fernseh-Interview* (Wisser 1990). In that interview, Heidegger mainly restricts his response to Wisser's question of what he makes of his reception by Adorno by questioning with whom Adorno had studied.

[91] Heidegger 2008a: 47.

[92] I do this intermittently throughout the dissertation, but especially in Chapter Four.

[93] Axel Honneth brings this to attention in *Pathologies of Reason* (Honneth 2009), citing in a footnote Benjamin's "On the Program of the Coming Philosophy" (Benjamin 2004).

certainly not in my interest to defend Heidegger "the person"[94] against Adorno's politically-charged objections. While often criticizing, with Adorno, some of the limitations of the Ontology, I will also advise against uncoupling the fact of Heidegger's anti-Semitic fascism and allegiance to National Socialism with interpretations of his philosophical work.

In view of how the majority of Adorno's objections are briefed by his wider idea that Fundamental Ontology eschews non-identity thinking, we may regard the central task of this dissertation as searching for exceptions, that is, as asking after whether it is not often plausible to interpret essential components of the Ontology in such a way that non-identity not only "appears," but assumes a critical position. Given that Adorno's socio-epistemological analyses are deeply intertwined with and motivated by an interest in the relationship between metaphysical and ontological assumptions on the one hand, and social and ethical issues on the other (and, similarly, between issues that are either descriptive or normative in nature),[95] part of this task will involve examining the possibility that an ethical template inheres in or can be extrapolated from the Ontology. The following chapters are organized as follows.

Chapter One will present a general overview of each Heidegger's Fundamental Ontology and Adorno's Negative Dialectics, it will give nuance to Adorno's founding objection that the Ontology is idealism, and, particularly by reviewing the meaning of Being or Dasein as *lived hermeneutics,* it will introduce several, initial responses to that objection. This will lay the groundwork for the subsequent chapters, which will explore in three primary ways how recognition of non-identity appears to be central to the Ontology.

---

[94] Preliminarily distinguishing Heidegger "the person" from Heidegger's Ontology per se is done in anticipation of Chapter Four, section four's response to the "philosopher/thinker versus person" question. I articulate this question more fully on the next page.

[95] For example, Adorno writes: "Once critical theory has shown it up for what is is - an exchange of things that are equal and yet unequal - our critique of the inequality within equality aims at equality too" (Adorno 1990: 147).

Chapter Two will propose that non-identity thinking is an onto-existential condition regardless of whether Dasein is modally inauthentic or authentic. To motivate this, it will examine the hermeneutic not just of Dasein per se, but of the existential analytic, Heidegger's heuristic for authentic self-discovery. Further, it will argue that the very nature of Being as a hermeneutic necessitates repetitive *rediscovery* of non-identity thinking.

Chapter Three will sketch out just how Heidegger's existential analytic engenders Dasein's anticipatory or *authentic resoluteness*, as it will also argue that, when Dasein is authentically resolute, it is resolute for critically interpreting the social conditions in addition to the onto-existential conditions of its factical "situation(s)." There readers will also find an argument for why "the They" should be interpreted as akin to "totality" and why this problematizes multiple areas of Adorno's polemic.

While building on these claims, Chapter Four will focus more specifically on how authentic resoluteness entails Dasein's consistently renewed resolve to engage in *immanent social critique*. It will advance this proposal by examining more carefully what it means to participate in such critique per Adorno (and per the critical theory tradition more broadly), and it will suggest that Heidegger's and Adorno's interpretations of "transcendence," as they pertain significantly to critique, are mutually supportive. Finally, with concern for the meaning of *authentic care*, the closing section of that chapter (and this dissertation) will confront several key passages from the *Black Notebooks*, and in doing so it will pose challenges to many of the dissertation's preceding interpretations and arguments. This confrontation, however, will also advance tentative responses to the perennial question of whether it is ethically rational to distinguish an intellectual work from the personal and political engagements of its author - a question which is all the more

26

precarious when it comes to Heidegger - and these responses will suggestively temper the magnitude of those identified challenges.

CHAPTER ONE:

Laying the Foundations for a Critically
Fundamental (and Fundamentally Critical) Social Ontology

I.   Fundamental Ontology in overview

This chapter presents and juxtaposes the primary elements of Adorno's and the earlier

Heidegger's frameworks - Negative Dialectics and Fundamental Ontology - to explicate and then

call into question Adorno's contention that Fundamental Ontology is a form of idealism, or that

Heidegger conceives identity and meaning formation to be a mere self-reflexive operation.

Although for Adorno it is a vital project in itself to empty remnants of the metaphysical tradition

from the philosophical canon once and for all, ultimately of concern to him are the broader

repercussions of the assumptions of that tradition for everyday, practical life.[96] Identity thinking,

upon which all variations of metaphysics rest, he argues, is far from a parochial problem of the

academy. Reflecting and fostering the normalization of institutional ideologies, those variations,

and those with an idealist bent in particular, inevitably help to distort consciousness of socio-

cultural reality overall.

As noted in the dissertation's introduction, Adorno finds metaphysical and

epistemological commitments to be inextricable from ethical and normative commitments and

the social realities toward which they point. His fusion of metaphysics, epistemology, ethics,

social theory, aesthetics, sociology, among other contiguous "disciplines" is clearly in its own

---

[96] However, Adorno, like Heidegger, desires not to overcome metaphysics entirely as a host of philosophical concern, and rather to remodel it by expunging its tradition of granting primacy to an insular ego and detaching itself from neighboring disciplines and subdisciplines. Adorno and Heidegger share an objective to preserve attention to metaphysical problems while destabilizing the metaphysical subject-object structure. (A notable quotation in this regard belongs to Richard Lee and Christopher Long: "If one sees positing of the abyss as the end of metaphysics (recognizing that metaphysics is inherently hegemonic), then all talk of such an end annihilates the possibility of critique" (Long and Lee 2001: 106).

right an act of resistance against the institutionalized specialization of modern intellectual labor.[97] It is not only that these commitments dialectically condition one another, however crucial it is to Adorno's project to emphasize the historical mirroring of the arrangements of social realities on the one hand, and the assumptions, aims, and methodologies or approaches of philosophical frameworks on the other.[98] This inextricability is also a clue for how Adorno wants philosophy to function as a guiding tool for both diagnosing and remedying systematic injustices. Nevertheless, coherent throughout his writings is an insistence that, if we are truly to advance the mission of philosophy in this way, we must begin by problematizing idealism, as this will concurrently aid us in facilitating critiques of late capitalist institutions and resistance to the structural oppressions they produce and amplify.

Adorno's avowal that Fundamental Ontology is ranked high, if not highest among the most irrational and dangerous of philosophies, is largely embedded in his interpreting Heidegger's notion of *Being* as serving to vindicate identity thinking. In the end, it is for the sake of underlining Heidegger's allegedly absent attention to the role of the object in constructions of meaning-full experience that Adorno justifies why he views the Ontology as untied from

---

[97] "The occupation with things of the mind has by now itself become 'practical', a business with strict division of labour, departments and restricted entry," Adorno writes in his dearly-held *Minima Moralia* (Adorno 2005: 21). Heidegger also intermittently bespeaks this progressive problem. For instance, in *Ontology: The Hermeneutics of Facticity*, he notes: "The sterile excitement of past philosophy and specialized branches of knowledge has long ago fallen silent. Since then, everyone has been secretly at work 'capitalizing on it' from all angles" (Heidegger 2008d: 29).

[98] For example, Logical Positivism's, and later, Critical Rationalism's contention that knowledge/truth is wholly objective (read: unmediated) has for The Frankfurt School emulated the direction of capitalist society toward the commodification and reification of socio-cultural life. Altogether, Adorno argues that "no theory today escapes the marketplace" (Adorno 1990: 4). Intellectual life is far from immune from an exponentially increasing pressure to corroborate bureaucratic divisions of labor and production processes that prioritize quantity over quality, immediacy over unhurried meditation, and thus marketability over intellectual and activist pursuits (see e.g., Adorno 2005: 21-29). Adorno conveys that, when philosophical inquiry is not first nested in the practice of immanent critique, its findings are destined to involve neglect or distortions of what is our pressingly real "damaged life." As devotee of Kant's transcendentalism and forerunner of Fundamental Ontology, Husserl's phenomenology (which Adorno often intimates to be the contrary of immanent critique) for Adorno represents a category of intellectualism that most markedly echoes the coldness, rigidity, and egocentrism of the capitalist ethos: "Its authority resembles that of the bureaucratic world which rests on nothing except the fact of bureaucracy itself"; "Socially, enthroning the completed abstract also enthrones sheer organization regardless of its social content, which is neglected for good reason" (Adorno 1984: 34).

Husserlian Phenomenology in which the subject-object relation aligns far too closely with Cartesianism.[99] That Heidegger begins by "prioritizing" Dasein purportedly commits him not only to idealism but, alongside this, to neutralize the possibility of social critique. This is because, for Adorno, programmatically prioritizing an illusory, abstracted subjectivity ensures an erasure of non-identical relations, and it is with this sense of subjectivity that Dasein is quite literally exchangeable. From his perspective, transcendental approaches of the Kantian tradition ineluctably generate unrealistic narratives about what it is or should be like to be human, especially in their disregard for that which is "other" to absolute concepts.

To test my conjecture that Adorno's interpretation is misguided, the overall task of this dissertation is to search for how non-identical relations, insofar as they are demonstrated through subject-object mediation and the particularity and priority of the object, may in fact ground the meaning of Being in Heidegger. In this chapter and the next, I focus on how these relations are apparent when the object of concern is an inanimate thing or a phenomenon of Dasein's immanent thought processes. These chapters are inverse to Chapters Three and Four, which will extrapolate from these earlier reflections to consider how non-identical relations may be revealed to be primordial to Dasein when the objects of its *socio-ontologically critical* experience are "real" social-historical, material conditions.

I begin this chapter by reconstructing the gist of each thinker's position, particularly as these pertain to the rift between them, so as to lay the foundations for my main challenges to what I interpret are Adorno's two chief reasons for why he thinks Fundamental Ontology annihilates non-identity. These are, first, that the subject's mediation by the object is itself a moment of non-identity and Dasein is unmediated, and second, while the possibility of engaging

---

[99] See, for example, Adorno 1990: 61-76.

critical reason depends on acknowledging and nurturing non-identity thinking, Heidegger neither

depicts nor encourages Dasein as readily able to actualize this capacity. These charges appear

throughout Adorno's polemic under the guise of more specific objections, many of which will

not be reviewed until the subsequent chapters. Moreover, while it is in those chapters that I will

argue specifically for each of my responses to Adorno, I devote the majority of sections three

and four of this chapter to presenting a tentative, general overview of those responses.

. . .

For Adorno, what above all maintains the "illusion" of the idea of intentionality in

Brentano's and especially Husserl's phenomenologies is the expectation that induction from that

which is immediately "given," to a transcendental notion of the nature of the subject-object

relation, can occur "purely," from an ego deliberately dispossessed of habits and presuppositions.

The aim of the Husserlian epoché - namely, to thematize lived, first-person experience by way of

gathering intuitive evidence of the "given" and towards discerning the essences or conditions of

intentional acts - requires an onto-epistemic bracketing of the subject from "*the actual world*"

that is of concern to the scientific, psychological and socio-cultural disciplines and the everyday,

public attitudes their assumptions mutually reflect.[100] Phenomenologically reduced, the ego is

discovered to be established by an inherent noetico-noematic structure in which the noema (not

to be confused with the metaphysical "object") "belongs to the essence of the mental process of

perception."[101] As the "stuff" of noetic content, the noema contributes to sense constitution, but it

is ultimately the noesis, or that by which "stuff" is "animated," which *appears* to lend the

predominant hand in these processes.[102] (Naturally, Husserl's interpretation of the status of the

---

[100] Husserl 1983: 106.
[101] Ibid: 237.
[102] Husserl 1983: 238.

31

noema has become a point of great contention.[103]) This suggests, Adorno is certain, that Husserl

assumes an idealist ego as the epoché's starting point and thus that the noetico-noematic

structure (that is, the intentional ego itself) is unmediated and ahistorical. In this way, the

however much inadvertent import of the phenomenological reduction is the reification of both

subject and object, he claims.[104] He locates the origins of this problem in Husserl's turn from

Hegel to affirm,[105] as Steven Crowell points out, the Kantian notion of synthesis as holding the

answer to issues concerning transcendental logic while also "enriching [the notion] with a

'Cartesian' theory of evidence."[106] For Adorno, Husserl errors by not actually revolutionizing

Kant's "Copernican Revolution" and instead intimating an abstracted subjectivity (which is now

the noesis) to be the founding source of meaning and judgment. Alongside this, Husserl's error is

motivated, he argues, by a neglect to recognize what he (Adorno) interprets is a primary idea

underlying Kant's *Critique* - so crucial to Adorno's negative dialectic - that rationality is "unable

to comprehend the totality."[107] Missing Kant's veiled message, Husserl allegedly confers on the

noesis a quality of absolute transcendence, while robbing the noema of its particular qualities and

its equal role in the constitution of sense. The noema is not truly involved in the latter after all,

---

[103] For example, Dagfinn Føllesdal, disciple of Quine and who gives analytic interpretations of phenomenological works, (fallaciously) claims in his 1969 article "Husserl's Notion of Noema" that the noema is not the "real" material object of the noetic act and rather a mere representation through which consciousness relates to its object (Føllesdal 1969). This conclusion follows from Føllesdal's first premise that the noema of an intentional act is a generalization of the notion of meaning. The noema, in other words, is an ideal concept corresponding to the noetic structure which bestows meaning pre-predicatively. (Adorno would not follow him to this conclusion, as for Føllesdal it is not simply exegetical, but reflects his own position on the subject-object relation. Whereas Føllesdal thinks that it was Husserl's true *intent* to present the noema as a representation, Adorno does not.) Føllesdal's (rightful) critics are many, with François Lapointe offering the most extensive, contemporary critique. For example, see "The Anglo-American Response to Edmund Husserl: A Bibliographic Essay" (Lapointe 1979).

[104] For example, see Adorno 1983: 4-8, 37; Adorno 1990: 53-4; Horkheimer and Adorno 2007: 63.

[105] However, Adorno of course faults Hegel in the debate for not utilizing his (Hegel's) objections against Kant to provide for a *negative* dialectic that would (and that in Adorno does) problematize metaphysical notions of absolute, unmediated transcendence. "Through his critique of Kant," Adorno writes, "Hegel achieved a magnificent extension of the practice of critical philosophy beyond the formal sphere; at the same time, in doing so he evaded the supreme critical moment, the critique of totality, of something infinite and conclusively given" (Adorno 1994: 86).

[106] Crowell 2001: 58 - my brackets.

[107] Adorno 2002: 178.

just as Adorno ultimately finds the Kantian synthesis to not truly involve the active participation of the object. Both noesis and noema, stripped of their onto-epistemic differences *and* their reciprocal relation at the same time, are subjectivized in the traditional metaphysical fashion, whereby socio-material mediation is lost. Cheekily alluding to Kant (and also generally to the Peripatetic), in *Against Epistemology* Adorno asserts that, through the reductions, "acts become the organon of knowledge. Husserl can bestow upon the absolutely isolated the dignity of overreaching only because he forces it into original correlation with something already reified whose synthetic moments are invisible."[108] This "original correlation" between intentionality and what is *not* actually (Adorno's precise understanding of) the object - viz., the object as *material* thing that is dynamically, *dialectically* engaged with the subject in formations of meaning - evinces the failure of the phenomenological reductions to detach from and controvert identity thinking.[109]

With Adorno, Heidegger's Fundamental Ontology is greatly precipitated by an interest in splintering Husserl's supposed, covert equation of intentionality with subjectification, something that Adorno himself at one point concedes: "Heidegger, of course, saw through this [intentionality's] illusion."[110] While attending to the immediately "given" certainly remains pivotal in Heidegger, it is not from the perspective of a reduced consciousness that Heidegger thinks such attention should be employed. "The idea of grasping and explicating phenomena in a way which is 'original' and 'intuitive,'" he writes in tacit reference to his predecessor, "is directly opposed to the naiveté of a haphazard, 'immediate', and unreflective 'beholding.'"[111] While sharing Husserl's concern with the "how" of sense constitution (which Heidegger recasts

---

[108] Adorno 1984: 107.
[109] For additional remarks on why "bracketing" is a pretext for reifying reality, see Adorno 2003: 75-77.
[110] Adorno 1990: 63 - my brackets (no pun intended).
[111] Heidegger 2008a: 61.

more widely as the question of Being), Heidegger finds the capacity of the phenomenological

reductions to properly address it all too limited. Lacking in Husserl's concept of "evidence," he

contends, is a clear purpose for the subject's critical faculties, which, so long as the project of

interpreting Being retains top philosophical priority as it does in the Ontology, must be exercised

together, in dialogue with intuitive perception. For, "an interpretation is never a

presuppositionless apprehending of something presented to us."[112] This is not to suggest that

Heidegger finds significant fault with Husserl's particular descriptions of the conditions of

immediately given content. Rather, it is to underscore his divergence from Husserl by

prioritizing inquiry into the *hermeneutic* nature of meaning formation and therefore of what it

means *to be* at all. As Crowell points out, Husserl "remains a significant element of

[Heidegger's] thinking to the end of his life," not the least insofar as "Heidegger challenges

Husserl's view of evidence in various ways - challenging the reliance on visual metaphors,

bringing out its interpretative structure."[113] This move away from earmarking phenomenology

but for the purpose of reflective description requires that we not put in parentheses those

mundane assumptions that actually serve as signposts along the path of understanding Being - an

impossible feat, according to Heidegger, so long as the idea of intentionality as it has been

traditionally construed (by Husserl, and also especially Brentano and Scheler) remains the

linchpin of phenomenological investigation. The central problem of the idea is its failure to

correlate with what for Heidegger is the central problem of philosophy: discovering the

transcendental conditions of Being *itself*. This problem results straightaway in a damning,

twofold effect: (1) contrary to the general objective of *Lebensphilosophie*, which is for

Heidegger to situate the subject in her naturally "environing world" [*Umwelt*], Husserl's subject

---

[112] Ibid: 192.
[113] Crowell 2001: 228 - my brackets.

self-reifies as she imagines herself to have become removed from that world; in turn, (2) the

world is subjectivized, while the subject reinforces her tendency to fetishize objects. Negating

the subject from her typical consciousness as it "really is" experienced, Husserl negates any

sincere possibility of dismantling the traditional subject-object dichotomy in which (the myth of)

a constitutive subject is preserved.[114] Altogether, these inaccuracies leave Husserl with a

framework in which he would be hard-pressed to interpret, ontologically, the subject as she *is* in

her mundane relations with the world, and in which he is instead readily inclined, as Dermot

Moran specifies on Heidegger's behalf, "to treat human beings as present-at-hand entities."[115]

To emphasize, since it is through the phenomenological reduction that the idea of

intentionality is originally produced, the reduction is what essentially must be problematized.

In *History of the Concept of Time*, Heidegger summarizes its disadvantages as follows:

> In the reduction we disregard precisely the reality of the consciousness given in the natural attitude in the factual human being. The real experience is suspended as real in order to arrive at the pure absolute experience. The sense of the reduction is precisely to make no use of the reality of the intention; it is not posited and experienced as real. We start from the real consciousness in the factually existing human, but this takes place only in order finally to disregard it and to dismiss the reality of consciousness as such. In its methodological sense as a disregarding, then, the reduction is in principle inappropriate for determining the being of consciousness positively. The sense of the reduction involves precisely giving up the ground upon which alone the question of the being of the intentional could be based.[116]

---

[114] Husserl's abbreviation of the subject from her everyday, pre-theoretical understanding of the world often steer him to misplace his phenomenological efforts in justifying that mind and world interact at all - a philosophical problem long considered in the contemporary continental canon as obsolete, and, for Heidegger specifically, as detracting attention from what is the most elemental problem of laying bare what are the simultaneously immanent and transcendental conditions of Being itself. For instance, the epoché Husserl undertakes in his *Fifth Cartesian Meditation* ultimately serves as an anticipatory defense of his framework against epistemic accusations of solipsism, where the question of solipsism, aside from being ultimately unsolvable, distracts us from the project of locating these very conditions (a project that I concur lays the necessary groundwork for all further philosophical inquiry, especially that pertaining to the social, cultural, and material). In his writings on intersubjectivity such as in the *Fifth Meditation*, Husserl is fundamentally concerned less with detailing the *how* of intersubjective interactions and more with *why* the existence of intersubjectivity (other minds and the ego's "objective" relation to them) should be validated at all. In this way, he mimics the traditional argument from analogy, the structure of which was standardized by Descartes and Mill. The structure of the argument permits only "logical reasoning" at the expense of neglecting what is by our sensuous, intuitive faculties immediately understood to be likely or true. (See, for example, Mill's *An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* (Mill 1865) and Descartes' *Second Meditation* (Descartes 1999).
[115] Moran 2014: 493-94.
[116] Heidegger 1985: 109.

Heidegger does not, however, regard complete abandonment of the idea of intentionality to be a necessary consequence of omitting from Fundamental Ontology the phenomenological reduction in its distinct Husserlian form. Nor does he desire to entirely reinvent the phenomenological wheel when for him it is clear that "only as phenomenology, is ontology possible."[117] What he finds necessary, rather, is to transfigure the idea of intentionality so that it becomes "grounded in the ecstatic temporality of Dasein."[118] Phenomenology must be established in an approach of concern for the meaning of Being, which must entail that the nature of human being be investigated from the standpoint of lived, hermeneutic time. Heidegger's changing the fundamental concern and approach of phenomenology in these ways is what predominantly accounts for his profound break with Husserl.

Thus, while phenomenology, including this amended version of the idea of intentionality, is the correct approach for pursuing ontological questions, its strategy must be remodeled if it is to fully succeed in transgressing both Cartesian and Kantian metaphysics, Heidegger claims. What he wants phenomenology to do is to regard the subject's truly visceral, typical experiences of being-in-the-world as the touchstone for all philosophical critique. This shift requires the (re)introduction of a deeper level of inquiry. Heidegger beseeches that, prior to undertaking something like the phenomenological reduction, we must first acknowledge how in our everyday intentional acts we always and already understand on an intuitive, non-thematic level of consciousness what it means *to be*. There we find the first "step" of his existential analytic, which we should treat as a radical reformulation of the reduction. This originary assumption cannot be "bracketed" if we are to inspect the essential conditions of sense constitution most successfully, since it is just this assumption that provides us with an initial "ontological clue" for

---

[117] Ibid: 60.
[118] Heidegger 2008a: 401-403.

36

the meaning of Being, answers to which would incidentally encompass the conditions that are of concern to Husserl. Foreboding the existential analytic's self-defining circularity, early on in *Being and Time* Heidegger declares that philosophy "is universal phenomenological ontology, and takes its departure from the hermeneutic of Dasein, which, as an analytic of *existence*, has made fast the guiding-line for all philosophical inquiry at the point where it *arises* and to which it *returns*."[119] The message thrusting this passage is that, even to identify *the need* for responding to the question of Being (or, in Husserl's case, of sense constitution), one must already bear an innate, "pre-ontological" understanding of Being per se: "Understanding of Being is itself a definite characteristic of Dasein's Being."[120] As a result, questioning Being both "arises" from a pre-ontological understanding that has yet to be directly examined, and "returns" to it through hermeneutic realizations motivated by Heidegger's style of existential analysis.

This ordinarily implicit and peripheral understanding of Being is co-conditional on Dasein's essentially *being as "care"* (a term to be progressively unpacked), and yet, so long as Dasein remains absorbed in its everyday mentality and projects, the need to discern what this understanding itself means about the onto-existential structure of Dasein goes unnoticed. Understanding Being, then, is that which is simultaneously nearest and most unfamiliar to Dasein's immediate experience.[121] After identifying the question of Being to be most philosophically primordial, the next step in the analytic is to make this pre-ontological understanding interpretable on a thematic level.[122] "Our investigation itself will show,"

---

[119] Heidegger 2008a: 62.
[120] Ibid: 32.
[121] This already reveals one basic instance of non-identity in Dasein. The meaning of Being is non-identical to Dasein's concepts in its average everydayness.
[122] We can anticipate how there are yet still two more "levels" of interpretation on this new "level" of philosophical reflection. The first applies to disclosing the conditions and inner-workings of pre-ontological understanding, and the second to critically interpreting what these disclosures entail. For the purpose of identifying the crux of Heidegger's project, differentiating while also acknowledging the relationship between the two is of much importance, and will return as the next chapter's guiding theme.

Heidegger explains, "that the meaning of phenomenological description as a method lies in *interpretation....* The Phenomenology of Dasein just is a hermeneutic whereby it designates this business of interpreting."[123] By synthesizing ontology, phenomenology, and his own reconstruction of hermeneutics, Heidegger devises a distinct approach for defining and addressing this most basic and elusive of philosophical problems.[124] Remodeling philosophy as a "hermeneutics of facticity," he defines its purpose as one of conscientiously pursuing our innate solicitude for the meaning of Being (ontology), through attending to how meaning emerges immanently within familiar experience (phenomenology), which requires onto-epistemic interpretation to disclose the transcendental conditions of those emergences (hermeneutics).[125] Like Adorno, Heidegger repudiates approaches that maintain covert allegiances to dogmatic, metaphysical assumptions that undermine our liberty to think with critical imagination. The existential analytic carries a diminished risk of stifling our creative faculties in philosophical practice, particularly because, *as* a hermeneutic, its open-endedness relieves those who engage it from "[having] to measure up to the tasks of some discipline that has been presented beforehand," and thus from committing to immutable conclusions about the meaning Being that would be diametrically opposed to Being, as it *is* essentialized by its indeterminacy for the concept, itself.[126]

 As a being that is naturally curious to ask what it means to be, Dasein is naturally equipped to partake in this threefold venture of gaining *existential* - a richly thematic -

---

[123] Ibid.

[124] Turning away from Schleiermacher and Dilthey, Heidegger uncouples hermeneutics from its strict focus on language (where the word "language" is there not signified in the way that it specifically is for Heidegger). On his reception of Dilthey see, for example, ibid: 450-51.

[125] Adorno rejects the idea of transcendental conditions, as for him the Kantian tradition has excluded the historical and material from considerations of them. On the other hand, one of the threads ultimately holding this dissertation together is the claim that Heidegger (albeit there is much to say on this topic about Husserl too) at least tacitly assumes the subject's historicality and materiality - terms both to be taken in Adorno's sense of them - to be included among these conditions. I will flesh out this claim in parts of Chapters Two and Three.

[126] Ibid: 49 - my brackets.

understanding of the meaning of Being and the conditions by which that meaning is revealed to it. In only apparent contradiction, this venture, to be clear, is possible just by way of being-in-the-world as one so far familiarly *is*. Heidegger takes the phenomenological reduction deeper to draw out for interpretation how we *existentielly*, or pre-thematically understand ourselves as we are immersed in our most mundane, practical relations. Reminding that "Dasein always understands itself in terms of its existence," he construes his project, in contrast to Husserl's, to begin from the more primordial standpoint of one who *already* understands something about Being; Fundamental Ontology zooms in on what has (arguably) been discarded in the epoché.[127] "The task of an existential analytic of Dasein," Heidegger continues, "has been delineated in advance, as regards both its possibility and its necessity, in Dasein's ontical constitution."[128] Dasein's ontological "essence," as shaping the *fore-structures* of its ontic existence, can only be apprehended by scrutinizing the latter.[129] How one is concerned with one's being while going about one's ordinary life must be unveiled.

For this reason, it is Dasein's dealings with (non-human) entities in which Heidegger is initially interested. Although it is certainly not the disclosure of the being of entities that he is fundamentally after, it is in this way that Being (as the meaning of Dasein) becomes prepared for unconcealment. Corroborating this rationale for taking attention to entities as the next "step" in existential analysis, Heidegger explains that "whenever an ontology takes for its theme entities

---

[127] Ibid: 33.
[128] Ibid.
[129] By the term "essence," Heidegger does not intend to ascribe Dasein an ahistorical set of attributes that would render it akin to a metaphysical substance: "man's '*substance*' is not spirit as a synthesis of soul and body; it is rather *existence*" (ibid: 153). We have reasonable cause to speculate whether, while at least Dasein's temporal, hermeneutic "way" of existing and tendency to identify with Das Man are immutable structures, Dasein's everyday dealings with entities as equipment, and with others per the dynamic of being-with, may be historically specific. To be sure, however, the topic of history in its own right is of course sorely neglected in *Being and Time*. Heidegger uses the term "historicity" to refer to Dasein's ontological "stretching" between the past and future, but, as he himself points out, "the assertion [that "Dasein is historical"] is far removed from the mere ontical establishment of the fact that Dasein occurs in a 'world-history'" (ibid 381- my brackets). In Chapters Three and Four, I address both issues.

whose character of Being is other than that of Dasein, it has its own foundation and motivation in

Dasein's own ontical structure, in which a pre-ontological understanding of Being is comprised

as a definite characteristic."[130] Through onto-phenomenological interpretation of the ontic, the

understanding of Being that Dasein sustains intuitively and in advance starts to slide from a pre-

ontological to an ontological level of awareness. Thus, for the purpose of confronting the

question of Being, the ontic and ontological are granted equal significance, while the relationship

between entities and Dasein is nevertheless marked by ontological difference.

Since Dasein's existence both is a manifestation of and is indivisible from its essence,

implied by the everyday covering over of Dasein's understanding of Being is that Dasein's

understanding of the being of entities with which it deals *too* lies in the backdrop of awareness

and must be identified and teased out for interpretation. This does not involve, of course,

recounting the properties of entities in the way that the natural sciences, or any other attempt

toward "knowing the 'world' theoretically," would do.[131] Rather,

> the achieving of phenomenological access to the entities which we encounter, consists ... in thrusting aside our interpretative tendencies, which keep thrusting themselves upon us and running along with us, and which conceal not only the phenomenon of such 'concern', but even more those entities themselves *as* encountered of their own accord *in* our concern with them.[132]

Instead of objectifying entities in removal from their relational contexts of mundane Dasein's

pre-ontological interpretations, Heidegger surveys those contexts and interpretations precisely.

Summarizing why he problematizes the natural sciences as starting points for questioning the

nature of *anything* that *is*, Wanda Torres Gregory explains that

> None of these sciences [biology, anthropology, and psychology in particular] gives an ontologically adequate answer to the question concerning Da-sein's being. Their empirical findings never disclose existential-ontological foundations; rather, these foundations are 'always "there" already'.... Heidegger claims that biological investigations of the human *Umwelt* 'must

---

[130] Ibid: 33.
[131] Ibid: 95.
[132] Ibid: 96.

presuppose and continually make use of' the concept of Da-sein's being as an '*a priori* condition'.[133]

Fundamental Ontology is the proper path on which to pursue these questions because it "[radicalizes an] essential tendency-of-Being, which belongs to Dasein itself - the pre-ontological understanding of Being," a tendency always posterior to and informing all of one's practical endeavors.[134] Its preliminary task must therefore be to inspect those relations and interpretations defining Dasein's endeavors that are "proximally given," that is, those which are nearest given their habitualness, but also farthest given their tendency to conceal themselves (largely because they just are habitual).[135] Dasein is "disclosed" - its ordinary, inconspicuous interpretations are discerned - by interpreting on a speculative level what those interpretations are exactly like. Straightaway found given are Dasein's *pragmatic* relations with and hence its pragmatic interpretations of entities; entities typically show up to Dasein immediately as already generalized or readily generalizable, and as things to be manipulated for the sake of fulfilling day-to-day projects.

Though it is toward the end of this chapter that I begin to argue for the success of Heidegger's efforts toward establishing an anti-idealist, critical ontology, it is worth underscoring now that the very premise of Fundamental Ontology should already provoke Adorno's pertaining charge. Naming the subject as being-in-the-world, and searching to answer the question of Being by looking to Dasein's hermeneutic facticity, is Heidegger's response to phenomenology's disappointment to truly upset the subject-object dichotomy. To recall our earlier observation, Heidegger, echoing Adorno, resists phenomenology as it is fully construed

---

[133] Gregory 2016: 120 - my brackets.

[134] Heidegger 2008a: 35.

[135] Ibid: 96. Heidegger's claim here resonates with Adorno's insistence that "[t]he utmost distance alone would be proximity"; i.e., that consciousness knows its object most fully when the object's concept-resisting particularities are recognized as mediating it (Adorno 1990: 57).

by Husserl, who, even while distinguishing his phenomenology from psychologism, reduces the act of judgment to ideal psychic processes and, in consequence, neglects determinations of the "real" content of judgment, which in truth cannot be extracted from the subject's actual life for confinement to the noetic realm.[136] Additionally, like Adorno, Heidegger concentrates on the temporal modality of experience; each thinker prioritizes absence and potentiality in the formation of meaning of that which is presently and actually "there" - a theme that will be picked up again and heavily in this chapter's last section and throughout the dissertation.[137] "*Time,*" Heidegger proclaims, gaining on the nub of his tome, "needs to be *explicated primordially as the horizon for the understanding of Being, and in terms of temporality as the Being of Dasein, which understands Being.*"[138] In contrast, Husserl speaks to horizons (a notion that Adorno too finds problematic)[139] only in terms of the subject's "original intuition" within *particular* experiential acts - not in broader terms of what it utterly means to be - and he does not sufficiently explicate how the meaning of Being is conditional on aspects of experience that are perceptively absent from any immediately given moment.[140] In his *Forward* to the 2008 translation of *Being and Time,* Taylor Carman concurs that, indeed, "[i]f we had to define Phenomenology as a study of *appearance*, in some sense of that word, we would have to add that the relevant contrast is not between appearance and *reality,* as it was for Husserl, but between appearance and *disappearance*—showing up and hiding, revealing and concealing."[141] These distinctions between Heidegger and Husserl help to signal an alliance, soon to be broached,

---

[136] See, for example, Heidegger 1985: 114-6.
[137] Iain MacDonald's essay, "What is, is more than it is: Adorno and Heidegger on the Priority of Possibility" (MacDonald 2011), greatly solidified my interest in this topic, and when pertinent I will refer to this text throughout the next chapters, expanding on parts of his argument.
[138] Heidegger 2008a: 39.
[139] For example, see Adorno 1984: 9-14.
[140] See Heidegger's *History of the Concept of Time*, §10-13 (Heidegger 1985).
[141] Heidegger 2008a: XVIII.

between Adorno's discerning a primordially "negative moment" in the concept, and Heidegger's

construing lived Dasein as a primordially hermeneutic relation.

II. *Adorno's Negative Dialectics and charge of idealism*

Adorno's most critical objection, which should be read as priming the remainder of his polemic, is that Heidegger's prioritization of Dasein is straightaway incompatible with the possibility that fundamental to what Dasein *is* are relations to phenomena that are non-identical to the meaning that Dasein finds immanently in experience. One of the two major contributors to this problem for Adorno is Heidegger's contravening the significance of the non-conceptual in meaning formation. Despite accentuating that the ontic and ontological are equiprimordial, as well as speaking to the historicity and teleology of Dasein, Heidegger, Adorno alleges, continues to sanction a constitutive (and, as I will address in the last chapter, socially authoritative) subject.

To be sure, Heidegger is careful to confirm that Dasein "takes priority over all other entities in several ways."[142] The Ontology *just is* an onto-existential analytic of what it means "to be there," as human, and at least initially as just *the* particular human who is investigating (they slowly broaden out the analysis to identify *a priori* ontological structures). However, he is equally emphatic that Dasein's "priority has obviously nothing in common with a vicious subjectivizing of the totality of entities," and that it "possesses—as constitutive for its understanding of existence—an understanding of the Being of all entities *of a character other than its own*," there hinting at one way in which non-identity may be a crucial factor in the meaning of Being.[143] Moreover, in anticipation of the worry that the intertwining of the ontic and ontological - existence and essence - results in a constitutive subject, he clarifies that "to be a self is admittedly one feature of the essence of that being which exists; but existence does not consist in being a self."[144] A crucial set of premises underlying this claim is that Dasein's essence

---

[142] Ibid: 34.
[143] Ibid - my italics.
[144] Heidegger 2008b: 285.

implicates Dasein's interpretative way of relating to entities (as well as to others and itself), that interpretations are inevitably to be amended, and that at least half of what makes that amenability possible are changes within entities themselves. Simply put, Dasein is dependent for its way of being on other entities, which, as the penultimate quotation insinuates, are irreducible to its frame of understanding at a given time. Adorno's negative dialectic also rests on these premises, and I suggest that this preliminarily rationalizes the need to call at least this of his objections into question.[145]

With these qualifications in mind, what, then, are the precise reasons for Adorno's charge that Fundamental Ontology is a form of idealism? To begin, it is important to interpret just what Adorno means by the term, for this may prompt misgivings about his pigeonholing Heidegger into such a sweeping category to which the term seems to refer. While his charge clearly speaks to an idealism in its transcendental versions as is found in Kant and Husserl, the latter he largely traces back to versions of subjective or metaphysical idealism indebted to Plato and variations of metaphysics in earlier modern thought. That being said, it is clear that Adorno's main concern is to problematize Heidegger as a transcendentalist thinker, a project that frequently allows him to problematize the 19th and 20th Century transcendental tradition as a whole, above all for its departure from Hegelian thought. As Axel Honneth recounts in *Pathologies of Reason*, Adorno perceived all of post-Hegelian Western Philosophy to be burdened with the task of navigating a way out of a "crisis of idealism," a crisis that Hegel had ushered to its apogee while all the same accentuating it as a historical turning point.[146] And, for Adorno, as we know, any philosophy that is truly capable of turning the course of this history must retain Hegel's broad framework while also disrupting its systematic character, where such disruption involves imbuing that framework

---

[145] See "The Actuality of Philosophy," which speaks to each point made per Heidegger here (Adorno 2000b: 24-39).
[146] Honneth 2009: 74.

with heavier concern for negativity and materiality, tightly related elements that bear at least

proportionate roles to positivity and subjectivity in formations of meaning. On his count, any

philosophy that does not swim in this stream must be judged unable (1) to recognize the role of

non-identical relations in experience and cognition; on that basis, (2) to fail to detect and fulfill

the need to establish non-identity thinking as a practical norm; and, consequently (as it seems),

(3) to be categorized straightaway under the heading of "idealism."[147]

Given this, my aim here is not to defend Heidegger's Ontology from a precise brand of

idealism, despite its ties to Kant and Husserl. Instead, and following Adorno's lead, what I find

relevant is to measure the Ontology against the broader conditions for identity thinking that

Adorno has set, which include above all the presentation of a constitutive subject. What I am

initially looking to propose are responses to whether the Ontology accounts or has the capacity to

account for the kind of subject-object relation that Adorno broadly construes, and which would

thereby leave the accusation of idealism unsustainable. The key question, then, is whether Dasein

is only a "tautology" as Adorno claims, or is rather essentially defined by non-identical

relations.[148]

To contextualize my responses more thoroughly, I turn now to reconstruct the main

components that serve as pillars of Adorno's thought, many of which I have gestured toward in

the dissertation's introduction. I offer this caveat to begin: like Heidegger's texts (the earlier ones

especially), the main components in Adorno all mutually imply one another, and thus it is

difficult to do justice to any without having already broached the others. We cannot sufficiently

grasp what is meant by the "priority of the object," for instance, unless we have already grasped

---

[147] In at least one area of his writings, Adorno equates the structure of naïve realism with that of idealism, insofar as naïve realism claims that there exists a direct correlation of truth between the subject and the object "as it really is" (Adorno 1990: 78-80).
[148] Adorno 1990: 70.

the meaning of "mimesis," and vice versa. Likewise, the descriptive (metaphysical/epistemic) and normative (ethical) dimensions of Adorno's framework are mutually entailing. His objection of idealism germinates from the standards that his negative dialectic poses for philosophy, and as a result it faces the same difficulty: the objection all motivates, is deeply intertwined with the foundation of, and is a chief normative upshot of the dialectic. Yet, at the risk of passing over many of its nuances, I suggest that the objection be dissembled into what I find are its two predominant, albeit closely related elements, which are that Heidegger (1) neglects the mediative relationship between subject (or Dasein) and object (or world), which entails that the object is not on equal footing with the subject in the formation of meaning, and (2) fails to address how the concept is intrinsically limited in the scope of its ability to capture the meaning of its intended object.

I mentioned in the introduction that the final upshot of Adorno's critique is to justify why Fundamental Ontology echoes and promotes the hegemony of modern reason. At the deepest root of this problem (and here I am putting Heidegger's personal politics to one side)[149] Adorno locates Heidegger's refashioning the traditional subject-object relation into being-in-the-world, which he argues forecloses the possibility of maintaining a subject-object structure, wherein some quality of distance between the two "realms" would be upheld at all. Attending to the arrangement of this structure (and, vis-à-vis, co-prioritizing the epistemological; this is the kind of philosophical inquiry that Adorno wants) preserves the possibility for the inquiring subject to recognize the object's both primacy and particularity, and hence its distinction from the concept as it is for instrumental rationality. The concept, which "needs a change in its function" as it stands in the exchange structure, could find that need met in "the idea of the infinite," which

---

[149] Chapter Four, section four is where I address Heidegger's personal politics more directly and how this figures into Adorno's polemic.

47

signifies the object's heterogeneity to subjectivity.[150] The infinite in the object is conserved in the

"negative moment" of conceptuality, which slips from alignment with identity thinking. Failing

to account for this moment in Dasein, Fundamental Ontology allegedly parallels bureaucratic

control, sanctioning in society interpretations of mutable, *contingent* socio-material situations as

expressions of natural, *absolute* ingredients of thinking and experience.[151]

This is the first major way, I argue, that Adorno justifies his charge of idealism. In its

effort to overhaul the traditional subject-object dichotomy, Fundamental Ontology throws the

baby out with the bathwater by dispensing with a sufficiently significant distinction between

mind and world. The bedrock of the Ontology's deficiencies (and dangers), I take Adorno to

claim, is its oversight in acknowledging that a subject-object dichotomy must not be dissolved,

but instead reworked in a way that protects the object from submission to a "pure" idea of

subjectivity. This reworking, of course, is the central drive of Adorno's critical materialism, in

seeming contrast to the Ontology, which, Adorno supposes, "was to be no theory of knowledge

but a position to be assumed at will."[152] If the function of philosophy is to be a critique "of the

constitutive consciousness itself,"[153] constructing yet another ontology with the hope of

revolutionizing the canon betrays its own motive, for the assumptions of ontological (including

phenomenological-existential) approaches in general inevitably result, Adorno is sure, in the

reduction of experience and meaning to totalizing concepts.[154] Pursuing philosophy through

Adorno's *particular* epistemological lens (as I have intimated, he is careful not to treat

---

[150] Adorno 1990: 13.
[151] However, this parallel discloses how idealism is descriptively *both* correct *and* incorrect for Adorno. It is correct because it is patterned after the reality that the commodity structure has shaped (it involves false consciousness, etc.). It is incorrect because such reality is "distorted" (consciousness is indeed *false*), getting wrong the ways in which experience/concepts are contingent on relations of non-identity. (See, for example, Adorno 2005b: 142-5; Adorno 1990: 10-2, 20-2).
[152] Adorno 1990: 114.
[153] Ibid: 148.
[154] Ibid: 136.

epistemology as an independent sub-discipline) is mandatory for the chance of adequately

accounting for non-identity, and that Heidegger (allegedly) refuses the approach already

promises that the Ontology's chance to do so will be left unfulfilled.[155]

The Ontology's apparent inability to account for subject-object mediation and the priority

of the object, problems that follow from its wider neglect of the socio-material, leads it to reify

the subject-object relation.[156] It does not and cannot accommodate, Adorno contends, the "non-

identical within the identical," or the ways in which phenomena, which bear their own particular,

historical coming-into-being and are non-subsumable under universals, mediate the evolving

constitution of the concept. The ontic, which Adorno (he does not endorse the term) would

designate as materially responsible for the role of the non-identical in conceptuality, is in

Heidegger ultimately indistinguishable from the ontological and, as a result, disappears within an

ideal subjectivity:[157] Heidegger leaves us with only "an ontological precedence of 'Being' pure

and simple over all ontical and real things."[158] For example, that intersubjectivity for Dasein only

emerges from within the structure of "being-with" seems for Adorno to be erroneously

ontologized as an innate feature of sociality. He argues that Heidegger transposes the subject's

instrumental engagements with others - engagements mediated by the commodity structure - into

part of an immutable schema of consciousness.[159] Heidegger's extraction of the social away from

the capitalist mode of production mimics the modern subject's false consciousness, a problem

---

[155] I add "allegedly" in parenthesis for, as I hope will become transparent, through his concern for uncovering the hermeneutic nature of Dasein, Heidegger implicitly and inevitably holds concern for the epistemological. Questions pertaining to the latter are part and parcel of his vision for a radicalized ontology.

[156] For example, see ibid: 79-88.

[157] To be clear, I do not think that Adorno wants to close Heidegger's at least initial distinction between the ontic and ontological, given that Heidegger ultimately (for Adorno) conflates the two spheres, and that Adorno aims for the maintenance of (his specific idea of) a subject-object division. Noting Adorno's materialism in comparison to Heidegger's ontical sphere is here just for programmatic purposes. As I mention above, the theme of materiality will be brought into discussion in the dissertation's later half.

[158] Ibid: 67.

[159] This objection will be given extensive treatment in Chapters Three and Four especially.

that is unavoidable so long as Heidegger discounts an essential feature of Adorno's thought; namely, that "sociality" cannot truly be understood if one does not, via immanent critique, effort toward understanding the specific society under one's examination. To harken Nietzsche, such an extraction would, as coinciding with historical idealisms, be none other than a "regulative fiction" - a *real* and yet *false* "condition of life,"[160] an idea that Adorno maintains in some form so as to emphasize how "dialectics is the ontology of the *wrong* state of things."[161] Adorno's negative dialectical ontology, as we might put it, is needed to reveal the artifice of what are nevertheless very real socio-historical conditions.[162]

I will return to these specific themes (being-with-others, instrumentality, Adorno's call for immanent critique) in the following chapters and most heavily in Chapter Four. For now, my concern is with accentuating Adorno's claim that Heidegger's failure to differentiate between unconditional features of the subject-object relation on the one hand, and aspects that are conditional on its definition by the commodity structure on the other, depends on the more basic mistake of eliminating dialectical mediation - specifically, the perpetual *negative* dialectic between the concept and its object - from the Ontology.

This is one way in which non-identity, *as* it constitutes identity (conceptuality), is purportedly neglected by Heidegger. Another way, Adorno thinks, and which I do not read as pertaining to the socio-material necessarily, pivots on "the concept of the limit," or the *limit-concept*.[163] All concepts are limit-concepts insofar as they are inherently unable to codify objects entirely; the latter are just epistemically antagonistic to the former. Modern rationality, and thus Heidegger, Adorno reasons, errors in presupposing that the object, as it is judged by the concept,

---

[160] From *The Gay Science* §344 (Nietzsche 2009: 200).
[161] Ibid: 11 - my italics for emphasis.
[162] See Chapter Four, section four (the final passages) for remarks on why we should read Adorno's negative dialectics to be, among many other things, a form of ontology.
[163] Ibid: 27.

does not still preserve particularities resisting judgment's circumscription, when in truth "what we mean in the judgment is always the entity due to be judged *beyond* the particular that is included in the judgment."[164] The object as such is both identical *and* non-identical to the concept, giving it a rather enigmatic status to which Adorno refers in his well-known claim, "What is, is more than it is."[165] As it seems, what it "is" that remains precisely as other or "more" in the conceptualized object is left premeditatedly and unavoidably vague in Adorno, for the "more" must be distinct to each individual object of judgment as well as ever-shifting within the object itself. Furthermore, upon attempts to capture it in reductionist language - where "names stand only in a representational relation to that which they intend" - the "more" of this non-conceptual content by which the concept is shaped, is suppressed; the object's universal form, not its particularities (cultural and historical contexts, physical differences, etc.) is alone given expression.[166] This reification of the object preempts the possibility of recognizing the limitedness of the concept, a possibility that, as I will explain to some extent in the next section and more substantially in Chapter Three, is necessarily tied to the possibility of genuine social critique.

Aside from observing Adorno's own style of philosophical language, there are but few "criterion" he provides that would assist our efforting to ensure "the aesthetic dignity of [our]

---

[164] Ibid: 152.

[165] Ibid: 161. Since helping to revive interest in juxtaposing Adorno and Heidegger in 2009, MacDonald has drawn heavy attention to this quote (MacDonald and Ziarek 2009; MacDonald 2011).

[166] This passage draws from Adorno's "Theses on the Language of Philosophers" (Burke 2007: 35). There Adorno faults idealism, including Heidegger, for annihilating "the *aesthetic* dignity of words" by diminishing language to the mere function of classifying and representing a system of fixed signs rooted in the traditional subject-object and form-content dichotomies (ibid: 38). "The demand for the 'understandability' of philosophical language - for its societal communicability - is idealist, necessarily predicated on the significative character of language. It posits that language is separate from the object, insofar as the same object could be adequately given in various ways" (ibid: 36). I will return to Adorno's use of and philosophy of language, as it relates to Heidegger and Adorno's critique of the Ontology, occasionally throughout the following chapters.

words."[167] (Would not offering such provisions be to operate at odds with his renouncement of conceptual and social systematization?) The perhaps starkest clue we receive is his avowal that "history and truth meet in the word," or that truth is only spoken when the historically-charged meaning of the intended object of expression is relayed in the expression itself.[168] Thus Adorno takes care not to address the "more" of the object while not also addressing, if even often by intimation, its suppression by both the idealist tradition and modern autonomous reason, the historical frameworks that must always inform philosophical inquiry today. He describes how the "more" is preserved in the subject-object relation when the subject is affectively open to the object, letting it be what it "is," and hence "more than it is," to cognition. This is the contemporary subject's space of recoil from the principles of autonomous reason. Passively deferring to the object in spite of a collectively passive deference to institutionally-abetted identity thinking, the subject rebuffs the priority of an (imaginary) absolute will.[169] Acknowledging and giving expression to the fact that the "more" of the object points to the object's unique socio-cultural history - its particularities that escape calculative attention; its position in a grand, referential context that, despite one's best efforts, cannot ever totally be grasped - is this attempt to let truth and word coincide.

In general, then, the subject honors the concept as a limit-concept when she refuses to ascribe to it an immutable identity lacking reference to the discrete qualities and referential contexts (the non-identical) that compose its meaning (its truth). This refusal and accompanying openness to the object intimates the development of a *mimetic* mode of experience for which Adorno advocates against autonomous reason, as it defies Enlightenment (including idealist and

---

[167] Burke 2007: 38 - my brackets.
[168] Ibid: 36.
[169] The "passivity" of experience in Adorno does not, of course, bear on what are for him traditional connotations of the term: idealist and empiricist philosophies, social indifference, lack of subjectivity or agency. As the dissertation unfolds, his specific interpretation of passivity in terms of an active, yet non-conceptual relation will become clearer.

late capitalist) thinking's compulsory need for identification with and domination over the natural world. Tuning in to her instinctive mimetic faculties, the subject enacts resistance to the institutionally managed assumption that "anything which cannot be resolved into numbers, and ultimately one, is illusion," and, in consequence, she relinquishes the object from its typically perceived status as mere property (of the ego, of society).[170]

The capacity to experience the world mimetically, Adorno emphasizes with Horkheimer, has been made taboo, increasingly repressed throughout the growth of commodity culture. For, mimesis evokes a submission of oneself to one's pre-cognitive impulses and intuitions, features of human experience that are adversarial to the quantifying mentality that such culture demands.[171] What must be recovered in experience is a childlike "play" that inspires responsiveness to the non-conceptual - a spontaneous relationship with this something "otherwise" than the ego that the object of intention obliges one to accommodate in one's day-to-day experiences. It is the object, then, that is primarily responsible for facilitating the conditions in which this kind of responsiveness by the subject is made possible. This points us toward another interpretation of the object's priority, per Adorno. (To note before moving forward: while I do not have room here to discuss Adorno's *Aesthetic Theory* at all with the attention it

---

[170] Horkheimer and Adorno 2007: 4-5.

[171] See, for example, Adorno 2005: 122-3. Furthermore, a fairly popular point of contention among critical theorists is whether Adorno conceives of our *primary* mimetic faculties, as opposed to our merely "mimicking" the standards and practices of commodity culture, to belong primordially to the human condition, and, if they do, just *how* Adorno thinks one should go about recovering one's repressed, rational impulses. That Adorno provides an insufficient template for advancing this kind of recovery is held among other objections to the positive role of mimesis for critical social thinking, which are well laid out in Ernesto Verdeja's 2009 essay "Adorno's Mimesis and its Limitations for Critical Social Thought" (Verdeja: 2009). I find it quite clear that Adorno regards this form of mimesis as inherent to the meaning of being, but I also find, with others, that his account his sorely wanting for more specific explanations of how recovering mimesis is possible. In other words, I would like to see Adorno identify a more comprehensive approach that not only aims to facilitate meaningful engagements in social critique, but which helps to cultivate the conditions for existential modal shifts; i.e., an approach like Heidegger's existential analytic. Although the hypothesis that Adorno's negative dialectic and Heidegger's existential analytic are mutually supportive is a large part of what I will continue to work out over the course of this dissertation, it is in Chapter Four, section four, that I speak most directly to this need in Adorno's approach for encouraging, à la Heidegger and existential phenomenology more broadly, modifications to the core of one's very way of being.

deserves, I rely on a few of its key passages to motivate the topic at hand. The notion of mimesis is also taken up in *Negative Dialectics*, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, and *History and Freedom,* but not as heartily.) The subject engaged in this mimetic play is passively affected by the object to a great degree; the "aesthetic experience," which encompasses Adorno's understanding of mimesis, "is the *irruption* of objectivity into subjective consciousness."[172] Within it, the subject experiences a simple sensation of being "touched by the other."[173] This irruption produces a "shock" or "shudder" that cannot be willed either to arrive or pass away.[174] Not simply a moment of being emotionally moved, the shudder incites the dissolution of a third-order ego: "recipients forget themselves and disappear."[175] Recipients experience ineffably in this moment a breakdown of concepts and their replacement with a non-representable sense of awe. There arrives a feeling of powerlessness against the perceived entity and the ways in which it rouses her, as well as her own inability to interpret the experience in an ordered, linguistically coherent way. As Fred Dallmayr puts it, Adorno's aesthetics grants a special role of the capacity to "communicate through non-communication."[176] Within that space, experience and its predications can escape, at least for a period of time, routinizations of commodified life.

Expanding on this, I suggest that the aesthetic experience, while still oriented by a certain object of attention, motivates the subject to release a more comprehensive sensation of wonder of the world, something accompanied by an instinct of the limitations of her faculties to respond to the most basic, and simultaneously most impenetrable, existential concerns. In this way the shudder is, as Adorno explains it for relations with particular aesthetic objects, "colored by fear

---

[172] Adorno 1997: 332 - my italics for emphasis.
[173] Ibid: 437.
[174] Here, Adorno is greatly indebted to Schopenhauer, in whom meaningful experiences with art and especially music involve a necessary fading away of willful conceptual control.
[175] Ibid: 332.
[176] Dallmayr 1991: 63.

of the overwhelming."[177] Of course, there are different qualitative levels, so to speak, of mimetic relations. While it is the connection in the production of or with a work of art that can most powerfully impel the subject to transcend modern rationality and, alongside this, to experience (what I wish he would go ahead and phrase as) existential overwhelm, I understand Adorno to mean that this can be precipitated by what are often more readily available experiences, from something as simple as feeling a cool breeze, to the more intricate state of being in love. The aim is to recover mimesis from within all corners of mundane life.

So as to anticipate Adorno's objection (explicated further in Chapter Three) to Heidegger's notion of anxiety [Angst], which I read Heidegger to depict as stimulating an "overwhelm" akin to Adorno's description of the mimetic shudder, Adorno's indebtedness to Kant throughout *Aesthetic Theory* should be noted. Not only does this evince what is unique to Adorno's construal of mimesis, it conjures up what Adorno traces to be a fundamental problem in the transcendental tradition. While Kant's idea of the sublime helps to inform what Adorno means by the "shudder," what Adorno finds missing in Kant is a dialectical connection between aesthetic experience and historical, socio-material conditions. Because it would demand a more thorough explication of Adorno's aesthetic theory than is warranted by the topic here at hand, I bypass the text's evaluations of how works of art in the last few centuries have tended to reflect the commodity structure and thus do not provoke the shudder. What is immediately pertinent to consider, rather, is Adorno's claim that not only does aesthetic/mimetic experience bear the capacity to motivate the individual and collective transformations required to de-normalize identity thinking, but that these transformations find in such experience a necessary and

---

[177] Adorno 1997: 332.

sufficient condition: "Consciousness without shudder," he affirms, "is reified consciousness."[178] Experiencing the world mimetically is imperative to the maturation of non-identity thinking.

However, non-identity thinking cannot germinate from mimesis alone, and, in addition, the "natural" experience by which mimesis is defined must be qualified.[179] For, while negative dialectics certainly does not aim to sow "contemplative looks" that inhibit this playful approach toward the object, neither does it endorse fully unreflective experiences.[180] Embracing one's "childlike" faculties without also allocating a place in oneself for critical reflection runs the risk of regression to a blind acceptance of what is impressed upon one pre-cognitively. Analogously to how children tend to trust in and comply with the social authority of their elders, adults readily tend to conceive the exchange system as ineluctable, and to be indoctrinated by institutional rhetoric that operates to escalate injustice and domination. Here, Freud's heavy influence on Adorno is most apparent: suffering psychically on the plane of the id, individuals living within societies that fundamentally operate according to systematic exchange (where efficient labor, commodification, and market price are ruling values) have lost touch with their mimetic impulses, and in their place are constituted impulses that heedlessly help to buttress the rationale and effects of socially-prescribed identity thinking. The latter corresponds to the subject's *second nature*, a term adopted from Hegel by Lukács to convey how when "the natural science's ideal of knowledge ... is applied to society it turns out to be an ideological weapon of the bourgeoisie."[181] Simply put, to have adopted the sort of second nature that is historically specific to late capitalism (and as it is mutually informed by ideals implicitly held by the natural sciences) is to have societal dynamics and concerns *appear* to be ahistorical and ineluctable. Systematically

---

[178] Ibid: 437.
[179] Adorno typically relies on the broad terms "nature" and "natural" to refer to instincts that have been repressed within late capitalist society.
[180] Adorno 2005: 89-90.
[181] Lukács 1972: 10.

disguised to individuals is the objective reality that these are appearances are illusory. They are only *not* illusory (they are "objectively real") so long as we begin to recognize how widespread is this distortion for socially collective consciousness.

What Adorno thinks must constitute non-identity thinking is an amalgam of mimetic experience and a form of critical rationality that is capable of ascertaining this real distortion of thought. The negative moment in the dialectic is underpinned by a braiding together of reason and non-reason, or "original" human intuition. Far from being independent of mimesis, the development of critical reason advances through it; their relation, once again, is dialectical. Hegelian approaches to social theory as illustrated by the Frankfurt School can prompt recognition of the need to cultivate mimetic, and not instrumental engagements with the world. The identical, which presupposes sole reliance on reductive concepts, guides the individual to the non-identical as experienced and potentially expressed by way of mimetic encounters. Nurturing these encounters engenders more negative moments that challenge the exchange system; it helps to correct the deficiency in modern reason of imagining alternative ways of being. This increase in one's critical, imaginative capacities promotes the possibility of further mimetic experiences. And so on. Given this dialectic, mimesis and critical reason join together as "mimetic rationality."[182] The subject must continuously slide between her passivity as she mimetically defers to the object, and her activity through which immanent experience is made critically intelligible. While phenomenology endorses attention to the subject's passive experience, for Adorno this isn't the right kind of passivity, as it does not also entwine with critical reason: "the

---

[182] A potentially interesting paper would be one that argues for conceiving Adorno's framework (and Marcuse's to boot) as lying in a position halfway between, on the one hand, philosophies that rest on the Kantian precept that knowledge is mediated, and on the other hand, *Lebensphilosophies*— à la Nietzsche, Scheler, Levinas, etc. —that describe knowledge, or at least its chief preconditions, as an innate, loving "openness" to the world. This is to say more generally that Adorno shares with each style of philosophy their concerns with the essences of rationality and emotionality/affectivity, respectively, albeit he integrates those concerns into a framework that is directed specifically toward the material elements of identity thinking (uncritical institutions, critical embodiment).

objectivity of dialectical cognition needs not less subjectivity, but more," and phenomenology does not and cannot fulfill this need.[183]

It is this "new" kind of experience and knowledge that Adorno has in mind when he writes that "[t]he utmost distance [between subject and object] alone would be proximity."[184] Commonplace ideas of what it means to "know" an object are situated within the exchange system's need for the belief that individuals enjoy unfettered access to objects under scrutiny. Paradoxically, however, this approach guides us further away from (Adorno's understanding of) truth, which "depends on the tempo, the patience and perseverance of lingering with the particular."[185] Solely theory-based engagements with the world create *more* of a distance between subject and object, as the subject's relation to the latter is then belied. While one must indeed theorize to reveal an object's hidden process of production and to identify the object as a commodity, reliance on theory alone yields desensitization to the object's distinctive presence in the here and now. The kind of distance that Adorno *does* want hinges on retaining the object's *infinity*, its uncodifiable particularity in the subject's judgment, which secures in the judgment maximum truth-value. "We cannot, by thinking," he continues, "assume any position in which [the] separation of subject and object will directly vanish, for the separation is inherent in each thought; it is inherent in thinking itself."[186]

The shudder is what brings this realization to the fore, as it "cancels the distance held by the subject" precisely by prompting the subject to experience the object non-conceptually ("proximally").[187] It compels her to acknowledge that a reductive conceptuality is only a specific mode through which to know "what is" and thereby also to register the possibility of non-reified

---

[183] Adorno 1990: 42.
[184] Ibid - my brackets.
[185] Adorno 2005: 77.
[186] Adorno 1990: 85.
[187] Adorno 1997: 333.

experience. Becoming "proximate" with the object by virtue of letting the latter assume priority in the subject-object relation sanctions a more conscientious relation with it as a singular and mutable being. Following J. M. Bernstein and Lambert Zuidervaart, I suggest interpreting mimetic experience as akin to an acute empathy - an "empathic experience" - with an object (a term that, again, for now encompasses "the other");[188] the subject releases her grip on predetermined expectations of what a given experience will or should be, to approach phenomena as stripped of their generalized meanings by the status quo.[189]

To be clear, for Adorno, what ultimately is at stake in non-identity thinking and its facilitation through mimetic experience is concession of the temporal and thus open-ended constitutions of a mutually mediated mind and world. Correcting the subject-object relation as negatively dialectical and therefore in part non-conceptual prepares anticipation of the feasibility of individual and collective transformations in thought and praxis. Individuals may then cognizantly discern their reified consciousness that the exchange structure, and the traditional subject-object dichotomy underlying it, has molded, and come to understand instead that "mobility is of the essence of consciousness."[190] Radicalizing one's understanding in this way in turn enables one to perceive others, entities, and worldly conditions as capable of significant change; for, "whatever is, is experienced in relation to its possible non-being."[191] This is more precisely because non-identity thinking demonstrates the priority of absence over presence, and possibility over actuality.[192] Essential to the identity of the object is that it is always transcending that identity. This is a descriptive, though also normative claim, and this aspect of Adorno's

---

[188] Bernstein 1992; MacDonald and Ziarek 2008.
[189] We can see how this line of thinking proceeds Schopenhauer, harbinger of the contemporary idea of morality as based less on laws and principles and more on feelings of compassion/pity for the suffering.
[190] Adorno 1990: 31.
[191] Adorno 2005: 79.
[192] See, for example, Adorno 1990: 53.

framework is what I want to begin to underscore here so as to prepare the basis for my closing arguments in Chapters Three and Four. According to Adorno, understanding that the only essence of the subject-object structure is its contingency helps to reveal how commodity culture patterns one's concepts and experiences, and, eventually with others in new kinds of critical social spaces, to imagine alternative modes of relating to the "non-I." Reviewing and undermining one's own philosophical assumption of the priority of presence and actuality quite simply is the key weapon against the ideology of exchange.

Of course, on Adorno's count, the earlier Heidegger's apparent disregard of history and the socio-material in formations of meaning contributes significantly to his apparent disregard of the negative moment in his characterizations of Dasein. For Adorno, what is structurally flawed about any "first philosophy" is that it purports what it finds fundamental to first-person experience to be "unmediated and immediate,"[193] and it treats the historical and socio-material as but topical addendums to be addressed in inquiries independent from those concerned with metaphysical and epistemological questions.[194] Compartmentalizing philosophical questions into narrow disciplinary branches reflects the commodification of the remainder of socio-cultural life.[195] It is inevitable for phenomenology to do this, Adorno argues, and not just because it clings insensibly to the ideal of a constitutive subjectivity. That phenomenology remains "in idealistic bonds" hinges on a methodological failure to push its inquiries beyond mere descriptions of patterns of consciousness that are discovered in attention to immediate experience.[196]

---

[193] A popular question about/objection to Adorno is that, by prioritizing the material in philosophical investigation, he seems to contradict his own insistence that philosophical "firsts" are chimeras and that positing them yields irrational, if not also frequently dangerous conclusions. As this dissertation continues to accentuate the role of temporality and non-identity in Adorno and Heidegger (separately and at their intersections), I trust that this concern will incidentally begin to subside. All the same, it is an important concern, one deserving of its own manuscript, and I welcome the opportunity to speak to it more directly during the defense.

[194] See, for example, ibid: 62.

[195] See, for example, Adorno 2005: 21.

[196] Adorno 1990: 49.

Phenomenologists cut their inquiries short per their own refusal to "step out" of the meaning of the object that is immanently perceived, to consider how that meaning is informed holistically by its connections to the meaning of other phenomena. In other words, what is for Adorno of considerable indifference to phenomenologists and Heidegger especially is how the "general" - the relational, contextual, and negative totality of meaning - mediates the particular.[197] By reason of this indifference, social reality is inevitably and wrongly delineated to be in a state of reconciliation between nature and culture, object and concept, where the two "realms," by virtue of preservation of their difference, enter a relation of so-called "harmony" rather than domination. While posing the "how" question is absolutely imperative to Adorno's project, the (transcendental) phenomenological approach does not proceed to question the "why," and, for him, this illustrates its inability to help spur on the possibility of the kind of social critique and transformation demanded by reconciliation's need. Thus, to be clear, the approach's turn from a third-person to a first-person perspective is something Adorno not only refuses to censure, but embraces. How phenomenologists subsequently explicate, or more exactly do not explicate the *correct* (read: social, historical, material) conditions under which meaning is produced, however, illustrates, for Adorno, their mirroring of capitalist ideology, which preempts this still deeper mode of questioning the structures or modes of productions of meaning. Reliance alone on what everyday appearances reveal to a single subject, he is sure, is just how modern society's contradictions have remained hidden to phenomenological inquiry. "Considerations which start from the subject remain false to the same extent that life has become *appearance*," whereas in our current social *reality*, dialectical mediation, conceptual negativity, and contradictions between consciousness and the "totality" of the world are shrouded by ideological precepts.[198]

---

[197] Ibid: 28.
[198] Adorno 2005 - my italics for emphasis.

This error among phenomenologists to conflate the apparent (ideological) and real

(contradictory) worlds is, on Adorno's count, most glaring in Heidegger's notion of readiness-to-

hand, which expounds on Dasein's pragmatic dealings with objects in its average everydayness.

Far too abstract, Heidegger's treatment of this phenomenon lacks consideration of at least how,

even if readiness-to-hand *is* ultimately independent from the exchange structure, our situation

within the latter amplifies the tendency to relate to objects in a purely instrumental way. Absent

in Heidegger is the question of whether or how we experience objects as products of the relation

between the exchange structure and reified knowledge and, accompanying this, the question of

whether readiness-to-hand should be interpreted in the Ontology as an ahistorical, essential

structure of existence (a topic to which I will return in Chapter Three).

To clarify the problem further, while Adorno finds it vital to go "back to the things

themselves," he certainly does not want us to think of this call in the strict Husserlian sense.

Following Husserl, Heidegger, he argues, confuses a "second immediacy" with a "first

immediacy," suggesting that the discoveries made by each thinker presuppose that the sense of

intended objects (for Heidegger, found objects of meaning as one dwells artlessly in-the-world)

are not already dialectically mediated.[199] Expanding, he claims that

> By the demand which Husserl set forth and Heidegger tacitly adopted ..., that mental facts be
> purely described—that they be accepted as what they claim to be, and as nothing else—by this
> demand such facts are so dogmatized as if reflecting on things of the mind, re-thinking them, did
> not turn them into something else. The unhesitant supposition is that thinking, an inalienable
> activity, can really have an object that will not be made a product by the mere thought.[200]

On that basis, Adorno concludes that Husserl and Heidegger overlook the true purpose of

phenomenological description, which should be *for the sake of critiquing the social* (this is what

Adorno is referring to as the "second immediacy"), to instead misinterpret such description as a

---

[199] Adorno 1990: 80-1.
[200] Ibid: 81.

62

complete end in itself (it merely recapitulates what is familiar to us from within the purview of our "first immediacy"). "He who wishes to know the truth about life in its immediacy," he expounds, "must scrutinize its estranged form, the objective powers that determine individual existence even in its most hidden recesses," and this is a project that bears little to no magnitude for the phenomenological tradition.[201] While restricting one's efforts to analyses of this "first immediacy" results in designating phenomena under immobile concepts - that is, in reifying them - when one utilizes one's prior analyses of factical life to then decipher the underlying conditions that configure how phenomena meaningfully appear - to construct a *constellations* of concepts that help to situate a phenomenon in the context of its historical relations - one is on the correct path toward self-understanding as suffering from false consciousness. Such understanding is prerequisite for all possible social critique and resistance.[202] By way of limiting its inquiries to the level of "first immediacy," the phenomenological approach in general, and Fundamental Ontology in particular, "sanction what simply exists;" for Adorno, there is no room in it for the possibility of true, historically generative thinking.[203] At the end of its investigations, the Ontology can only "return to what it knows."[204] This leads us to Adorno's pinnacle

---

[201] Adorno 2005: 15.

[202] If it is vital to Adorno's condition of truth that rationality refers to phenomena that are non-identical to concepts, then Heidegger, so Adorno claims, must be committed to jettisoning truth, and rationality, in regard to their (both descriptive and normative) roles in mundane life and their significance for philosophical inquiry. "Heidegger's moment of truth levels off into an irrationalist weltanschauung," he insists. "Today as in Kant's time, philosophy demands a rational critique of reason, not its banishment or abolition" (Adorno 1990: 78). Although like transcendental idealism (despite Kant's intentions, which Adorno praises, he cannot fulfill Adorno's standards for truth) Husserl's ego-oriented depiction of the structures of experience is unsuccessful in providing a foundation for (Adorno's understanding of) critique, it at least preserves admission of the need for a rational, reflective subject. Heidegger, allegedly discarding Husserl's "rational moment," reinserts the subject as determinatively given over to the socio-material conditions by which she finds herself oppressed. Adorno finds a necessary correlation among (1) Heidegger's restriction of attention to immediacy, (2) an inability to consider underlying processes and conditions that are unapparent to the consciousness of present experience, and (3) a failure to align consciousness with its capacity for rational judgment. In this way, Heidegger imitates commodity culture's existential need to enervate critical reason. I offer an initial response to this claim at the end of this chapter, as I work toward a more thorough response that will take firmer shape in Chapter Three.

[203] Adorno 1990: 85.

[204] Ibid: 63.

grievance, towards which the previous objections I have articulated have been working. At worst the Ontology inadvertently vindicates and at best it produces apathy toward instances of suffering and injustice, inexorable manifestations of the reified subject-object structure.[205] To this, Adorno gestures (quite unfairly to Husserl, we might so soon add):

> Mediately to affirm immediacy, instead of comprehending it as mediated within itself, is to pervert thought into an apologia of its antithesis, into the immediate life. This perversion serves all bad purposes, from the private pigheadedness of "life's-like-that" to the justification of social injustice as a law of nature.[206]

My position on whether it is inevitable that the Ontology echoes the exchange structure, and thus acquiesces in the exploitation of the natural world and the dehumanization of others, will begin to take shape in Chapter Three. My first rejoinder to Adorno's critique pertains more fundamentally to whether we can locate in the Ontology exemplifications of mediation, the priority of the object, and perhaps even a kind of materialism. I ask after whether the Ontology accounts, or given its premises can account for instances of non-identity in a way that meets Adorno's criteria for properly interpreting conceptuality and experience. In the last section of this chapter, I highlight a few broad features of the Ontology that most promisingly indicate to these questions affirmative answers.

---

[205] This alleged danger in Fundamental Ontology of hypostatizing and normalizing injustice is ascribed to the accompanying problem of late capitalism's rhetoric about the state of individual freedom. Mirroring commodity culture, the ontology "make[s] people who are no more than component parts of machinery act as if they still had the capacity to act as subjects" (Adorno 2005: 15). I return to this theme more directly in the last chapters.
[206] Adorno 1990: 73-4.

III.   *Dasein's lived hermeneutic*

To test Adorno's charge that Fundamental Ontology is "fundamentally" idealism, what must be looked for above all are ways in which the Ontology might preserve subject-object mediation and the object's priority in constructions of meaning. This means that what we should seek in the Ontology is whether or how non-conceptual negativity mutually informs Dasein's experience and cognition. While the next chapter is devoted to exploring this question carefully in the context of what it means to dwell inauthentically (and not yet authentically) as Dasein, here I lay the initial groundwork for that undertaking by outlining more generally what Heidegger describes being-in-the-world, as distinguished by its hermeneutic character, to be like.

Before moving on to this, let us briefly reiterate where this dissertation is organizationally headed. We recall that the ultimate upshot of Adorno's negative dialectic is to explore structures of injustice that are organic to identity thinking, and, therefore, that the dialectic is from the start deeply entangled with social and ethical concerns. In parts of Chapter Three and then throughout Chapter Four, I evoke this entanglement that in Adorno includes a normative dimension, which takes aim at counteracting identity thinking beyond the institutionally academic sphere. While what follows until then does not abstract away from this primal ground of Adorno's project, it does withhold from focusing on the Ontology's potential favorability to nurture the capability of rationality to diagnose and defy institutional oppression, and ethical relationships that fight shy of reification. In this section and in Chapter Two, I largely confine my attention to how Being may be informed by non-identical relations to phenomena that help to comprise the meaning of

Dasein's "worldhood" and, accordingly, to the primary onto-existential conditions of "being there."[207]

My opening thesis is that Heidegger's vision of Fundamental Ontology as a "hermeneutics of facticity" straightaway signals that relations of non-identity are by which the meaning of Being is principally comprised. As I have already encouraged earlier in this chapter, we should detect in the Ontology two layers of hermeneutical thought, even aside from the fact that *Being and Time* as a manuscript is inevitably a hermeneutical project in itself (one only can comprehend the whole once one has comprehended the parts, one only can comprehend the parts once one has comprehended the whole, and as a matter of course this at least for a time renders readings of the manuscript incomplete; in fact, in Heidegger's case, because it is the question of Being per se that is of concern, interpreting *Being and Time* seems all the more to be a necessarily incomplete affair). While the first layer pertains to Dasein's pre-ontological interpretations of its being-in-the-world - to the Dasein who understands the world while not also harboring "explicit ontological insights" - the second is upon which Dasein is able to elicit these interpretations from a more thematic standpoint.[208] The presentation of Adorno's critique conveys that it targets *both* factical Dasein *and* Heidegger as philosopher as unwittingly locked within a form of false consciousness that, like modern forms of idealism, reifies the subject-object structure. In contrast to the earlier interests of this chapter, it is this first layer that is now of chief regard. Notwithstanding certain features of Chapter Two, my comprehensive intent from here forward is to justify how greatly the meaning of Being is defined by Dasein's innate openness to the non-conceptual. To reiterate, my rationale for this features how Heidegger's descriptions of Dasein

---

[207] In this fashion, the dissertation moderately mirrors the organizational pattern of *Negative Dialectics*, which in its first half mostly analyzes the shortcomings of traditional metaphysics and especially existential phenomenology by outlining what is involved in non-identity thinking, and in its second half uses this as a basis upon which to rest more candid social critique.

[208] Heidegger 2008a: 102.

presuppose subject-object mediation and the mutual significance of the object in meaning formation.

A major entailment of Dasein's care for its existence (which is equivalently to say for Being as such) is that it always is "ahead" of itself as it is repetitiously engrossed in interpreting its past and present experiences in relation to the range of possibilities for its both proximal and distant futures. Belonging to Dasein's fore-structure is its *projective character*: "any Dasein has, as Dasein, already projected itself; and as long as it is, it is projecting."[209] As caring, Dasein "stands out" from itself toward a wider sense of existence that it cannot near fully prognosticate. Not solely but principally for this reason (the specifics of which will continue to be fleshed out) should we already be skeptical of Adorno's assimilating Dasein with the ideal of a constitutive selfhood to which the meaning of existence has historically been reduced. Heidegger reassures that, though "to be a self is admittedly one feature of the essence of that being which exists" - that is, to every instance that is "Dasein" there corresponds a reasonably consistent sense of self-identity - "existence does not consist in being a self."[210] This point is lost on us so long as our notions of "selfhood" fail to capture Being's complexion as a holism of relations among subjects, our primordial conditions, and the phenomena (thoughts, things, others, etc.) with which we engage, as well as so long as our conception of time follows Enlightenment thinking to be interpreted incorrectly in terms of linear progression. Dasein is *not* constitutive at least insofar as it is essentially temporal, and where temporality is treated as a circular relation between the past, present, and future, transcendentally and yet immanently conditioning constitutions of meaning and identity.[211]

---

[209] Heidegger 2008a: 185.
[210] Heidegger 1998: 285.
[211] However arguably against Aristotelian physics' conception of time, which has dominated the philosophical canon, Heidegger reconceives time as non-linear and he dislodges the priority of an ontologically/epistemologically isolated

I read Heidegger to differentiate between two still additional layers of the hermeneutic that is Dasein as a pre-theoretical, projecting subject. The first layer applies to how Dasein's care accommodates self-understanding - its "sight" for *potentiality-for-Being*. For Dasein to bear this sight innately means that "[a]s long as it is," it "always has understood itself and always will understand itself in terms of possibilities."[212] To provide a live, however much simplistic example, in the process of building this dissertation I relate to myself in the long term from within the suspense of not knowing how my "knowledge of the Self"[213]- not only in terms of my personal self-identity, but in the breadth of my more macroscopic understanding of how identities come to be formed - exactly will be refined.[214] Dasein's projective character prompts its concepts to constantly challenge and advance beyond themselves in Dasein's "here and now," toward its "what may be."[215] Its present self-understanding is driven by a tacit perception of Dasein's own potential to enter new experiences and endeavors, and of how this will steadily change as Dasein carries onward as a being "stretched" across (mortal) time.[216] Like textual analyses, understanding evolves from within what Heidegger, borrowing originally from Dilthey

present. Dasein's presence is indistinguishable from its anticipations of the future and constitution by its historicality; being in suspense of the future is fundamental to what it means *to be* simpliciter. Temporality is not (as it is, for instance, in variations on Perdurantism) compartmentalized into three distinct branches of experience. Rather, Dasein's past, present, and future mutually overlap to form the "existential totality of Dasein's ontological structure as a whole" (Heidegger 2008a: 237). With that said, I also have mentioned how meagre is Heidegger's treatment of the role of personal history in informing Dasein's present, as is his overt interest in the role of collective social history. It is Dasein's orientation by the future that takes precedence in Fundamental Ontology, reasons for which will further be explored.

[212] Heidegger 2008a: 185.

[213] Ibid: 186.

[214] Heidegger goes on to break down self-understanding into yet two other modes, which helps to serve the transition into his focus on authentic freedom in Division II. Dasein can relate to its "potentiality-for-Being" either inauthentically (it can continue to "fall" into a "leveling off" within the "They"), or authentically (it can take charge of its freedom "resolutely"). For the most part, I leave Division II to one side until Chapter Three.

[215] To take a simplistic example, while writing this paragraph my attention is in part commensurate with hoping that my meaning will take shape for my readers in a specific way, and I anticipate how my ideas will be amended in light further conversations with others and myself. In reverse: as I revise this chapter I perceive how much my present understanding of the content differs from understandings previous. By virtue of the non-identity of time, I have since disclosed to myself fresh ways of approaching the exegeses, arguments, and organizational structure that compose this project as a whole. (I pray that the hermeneutic circle which is also my dissertation is not truly destined to be so fatally incomplete!)

[216] Ibid: 462.

(whose thought Heidegger deemed the "high-point" of *Lebensphilosophie*) terms a *hermeneutic circle*,[217] which, save for death, has neither specific beginning nor end; it is inescapably indefinite and unfinished.[218] Throughout this circular process, Dasein is always negating its potential to fulfill possibilities varying from the ones that it ultimately actualizes. That "it constantly is *not* other possibilities" is a central point to bear in mind while nearing the dissertation's next chapter.[219]

On this basis rests my leading challenge to Adorno's charge of idealism. For the Ontology, understanding Being (whether implicitly and peripherally from within mundane life, or more deliberately from upon an analytic level of thinking), and its appropriation through critical interpretation, implicates a non-traditional, dynamic subject-object structure similar to that which Adorno describes as requisite if non-identity between the two "spheres" is to be accounted for and maintained. Within this structure, the meaning of the object (in this case, what "is" indiscriminately unascertainable) is always in a process of revision in its relation to Dasein. That is, what will be unascertainable for Dasein and, alongside this, what Dasein will perceive to be its "ownmost" potentialities and hence its identity, will fluctuate at differing degrees throughout the span of its existence. What should be subsequently inferred from this is that, because Dasein's potentialities co-condition Dasein's actualities, the latter cannot remain static. The practices through which one makes sense of one's relations to objects, others, and oneself, and thus one's present conceptual scope through which such practices transpire, are what we might call "existential variables" that are responsible for this impossibility.[220] Drawing on this, I

---

[217] Barash 2003: 101.

[218] Heidegger 2008a: 362. To be sure, the "circle" applies to both one's understanding while undertaking the ontological analytic, and one's understanding as it belongs to pre-thematic experience.

[219] Ibid: 331.

[220] With such a claim, we should consider this critical caveat. While it is true that, due to its projective character, Dasein's "actual" manner of thinking and acting is open to change, we also need to examine *to what degree* such

urge that, in Heidegger's description of onto-existential understanding, we should find

resounding Adorno's insistence on the adherence of the "non-identical within the identical," a

phrase that, for us at this early juncture, connotes the object's substantial role in composing the

contexts of meaning by which the subject's self-identity and comportments toward the world are

shaped and directed. This is a role that carries prime power over the subject's (the concept's)

positive constitution by *negative* relations. Heidegger goads an expressly agnate perspective in

remarks such as: "[the] truth of Being does not exhaust itself in Dasein, nor can it by any means

simply be identified with it after the fashion of the metaphysical proposition that all objectivity is

as such also subjectivity."[221] More revealingly, earlier in *Being and Time* he writes:

> But have we not confined ourselves to negative assertions in all our attempts to determine the
> nature of [the] state of Being? Though this Being-in is supposedly so fundamental, we always
> keep hearing about what is *not*. Yes indeed. But there is nothing accidental about our
> characterizing it predominantly in so negative a manner. In doing so we have rather made known
> what is peculiar to this phenomenon, and our characterization is therefore positive in a genuine
> sense—a sense appropriate to the phenomenon itself.[222]

What is *not* grasped in understanding Being is also what contemporaneously issues that

understanding its positive sense. We begin to see how Adorno's description of an onto-epistemic

negativity in the concept might resonate with Heidegger's ascribing to Being this similarly self-

constituting feature of negation.

 That said, Heidegger often seemingly articulates Dasein's projective character as self-

reflexive. If Dasein, as always concerned with its existence, is always "in-each-case *mine*"

(*Jemeinigkeit*), do not its projections after all just tautologically refer back to its own pre-

---

changes can truly occur given that all of Dasein's projections are ultimately lodged within, or confined by, certain
historical conditions; e.g., the particular social and economic conditions into which one was born, and the still
prevalent ethos of modernity and the Enlightenment. Being must disclose itself in a socio-historically specific way.
That Heidegger does not overtly discuss this appeals to the more basic problem of interpreting what roles the social,
historical, and material have to play in his story of what it means to be in-the-world. This is a laden topic that I will
address in areas throughout Chapters Three and Four.
[221] Heidegger 1998: 238.
[222] Heidegger 2008a: 85—my brackets.

established ideas and expectations, voiding the negative moments that (for now we still

tentatively propose) inform the subject's "being there" as essentially comprised of referential

networks of meaning? Especially since Adorno (unsurprisingly) answers in the affirmative, we

cannot yet be relieved of the worry that idealism, or at the very least an epistemological

egocentrism, infiltrates the Ontology.[223] While the worry cannot potentially be relieved in full

prior to the following chapters (where, interspersedly, the problem of the *Jemeinigkeit* is more

directly addressed), in these summative pages I intend to finalize some inaugural support for the

forthcoming protestations that I will pose to it. By delineating what it essentially means for

Dasein to be hermeneutical, I conclude this chapter with four related points that advocate for the

object's non-conceptual alterity and conditioning of subjectivity in Heidegger's notion of

understanding (Being).

First, I lay stress on a critical point that has been presupposed in the paragraphs above

regarding the dynamic subject-object structure in the Ontology; namely, that interpretative

appropriation of self-understanding depends upon Dasein's relations to that which is ineffable

against its own conceptual framework. Dasein's sense of its potentiality-for-Being is structurally

analogous to Adorno's limit-concept simply given that what is potential (which I hope by now

we know is really to say "what is all phenomena experienced by Dasein") eludes hypostatization;

individuals only can inch upon and not grasp it fully. To be sure, a phenomenon "is something

that proximally and for the most part does *not* show itself at all: it is something that lies *hidden*,"

and despite all best efforts its meaning refuses conclusive disclosure.*[224]* This fact nods us towards

an interpretation of Dasein as transcendentally constituted by non-conceptual modes of relation,

---

[223] I use the term "epistemological egocentrism" to distinguish the possibility that the Ontology may not be a form of idealism (if it can account for how the meaning of Dasein is constituted by ego-independent phenomena), but it still does not sufficiently prioritize and particularize the object in a way that is similar to its prioritization and particularization in Adorno's negative dialectic.
[224] Ibid: 59.

an interpretation that, if correct, would be symptomatic of instances of non-identity that are inherent to even mundane (non-thematically inauthentic or indifferent) situations of being-in-the-world.

Discriminating Dasein's inability to codify its potentiality-for-Being lends itself to discriminating other ways in which Adorno's qualifications for non-identity may be expressed in Heidegger's notion of understanding. My *second* proposal is that Dasein's existential motor of "being-towards" functions as an onto-epistemic mediator that supplicates a kind of distance that Adorno wants to see upheld between subject and object. Adorno reminds that "mediation of the object means that it must not be statically, dogmatically hypostatized but can be known only as it entwines with subjectivity; mediation of the subject means that without the moment of objectivity it would be literally nil."[225] In this instance, potentiality's (thus too read: the object's) alterity to a present individual conditions in large proportion the possibility of that individual's concepts and identity being what they particularly are or being at all. At the same time, because it exists as a hermeneutic, Dasein is blocked from truly representing, or, we can say somewhat prematurely, from truly reifying its being-toward-potentiality, whether in the manner of reducing the significance of the latter to a mere production of predicative judgment (as would occur in most idealisms), or of posing it as a metaphysically absolute feature (as would occur in most realisms). Given the more than obvious restriction of experiencing the world from the standpoint of only one certain embodied cognition, individuals of course *do* and *must* serve as mediators for our own projections toward the future (and this too is an obscure point in Heidegger warranting further explanation in the chapters to come). Of utmost importance to hold in mind, however, is (1) how our projections in turn mediate our actualities, and (2) how they originate not from an

---

[225] Adorno 1990: 186.

idealistic, quasi-omnipotent selfhood, but from a self whose identity and understanding is necessarily fractured by its "stretched" existence throughout its experience of nonlinear time. Both components of this primordial, interpretational exchange, I expect will become clear, are punctured by non-identity thinking.

If, on these grounds, we are willing to preliminarily concede that Adorno's stipulations for mediation may be satisfied by Heidegger's notion of self-understanding, we are furthermore able to recognize how Dasein's being-toward-potentiality may carry epistemological priority in the subject-object relation (this is point *three*).[226] To reiterate, Adorno's negative dialectic rests foremost on its distinction from variations of idealism that circumscribe objects to universals and thereby invalidate the object's non-conceptual particularity which otherwise bestows to it a reality independent from representations (there then invalidated is how objectivity constitutes subjectivity).[227] As opposed to Adorno's framework, in idealisms that negate the object's priority the meaning that the subject finds in her relation with an object is, whether overtly or covertly, assumed to be fully circumscribed by the preconceptions she brings to that relation in advance, and by that move the particularity of the object too goes unnoticed. The subject only perceives this prioritized particularity as affectively entering into the relation when she herself enters into it as receptive to the non-conceptual features of experience. I suggest that this particularity is

---

[226] Granted, Heidegger cannot in this way account for a *materialist* conception of mediation, an important challenge to my position. By the end of this dissertation, however, I hope to convince readers of the analytic's ready ability for precipitating awareness of how the object, where the term "object" indeed refers to the specific socio-material conditions among which one dwells, mediates subjectivity.

[227] To continue the line of thought in the preceding footnote: for Adorno, the prioritized object is material, and what he typically has in mind when he speaks of it is the subject's inability to parenthesize herself from history and sociality in metaphysical and epistemological theories and the institutionalized ideologies they tend to emulate. I recommend that what is missing from Adorno's account is the inclusion of objects of existentially thematic experiences (being-towards-potentiality and -death, fallenness, anxiety, etc.) in the definition of "material objects," where we could then accede how the meaning of those objects are referentially shaped by socio-historical dynamics. As I will argue, first here and then to greater lengths in Chapters Three and Four, the meaning of objects as they point to the temporally unknown and to which Dasein is onto-existentially tied are primordially based on the states of being thrown and fallen, where these beckon Dasein's finite existence in a *concretely material* world and its delivery over to social conventions.

preserved in Heidegger's notion of self-understanding (this is *point four*). Conveying the interconnection between the object's priority and particularity, Adorno claims that "[t]o grant precedence to the object means to make progressive qualitative distinctions between things which in themselves are indirect."[228] To heed the object's priority in formations of meaning is essentially to interpret experience as comprised by an incessant dialogue between two "channels" that guide the subject-object relation: one in which the subject attempts to make sense of the object based on her existing conceptual repertoire (and which, when utilized solely, puts the object in jeopardy of being reified), and one in which the "indirect" object, as it repels the concept's dominion, furnishes to the understructure of the subject-object relation its non-conceptual quality. As one's awareness of this condition increases, so too increases one's readiness to discern the particularities of the object that otherwise remain lost while ideologically tethered to thinking identically. I will argue that, as a heuristic tool, the existential analytic holds promise for catalyzing these critical capacities. The components of my argument derive from the more originary premises that, in Heidegger's account of onto-existential understanding, (1) Dasein's being-toward should be designated as an object of experience (and this falls in line with how most contemporary continental philosophy broadly denotes the term "object"; i.e., as any intended phenomenon of lived experience), (2) being-towards, as an experienced object in itself, is epistemologically prioritized, which is due to (3) Dasein's primordially being as a lived hermeneutic.

Prior to introducing in these last pages a few further reasons contributing to this argument, I briefly respond to the anticipated objection that, while Adorno's overarching concern is, strictly speaking, with the essence of the *concept*, Heidegger's is with the essence of

---

[228] Ibid: 184.

experience, and therefore that searching for (Adorno's idea of) non-identity in Fundamental

Ontology is from the outset an at least questionable project. If correct, this objection would entail

that the Ontology does not care for epistemological concerns. To determine its validity of course

necessitates inquiring into the nature of the concept (judgment) in Heidegger.[229] As one reader of

this dissertation has gently objected, whereas conceptuality for Adorno is a matter of *knowledge*,

experience for Heidegger is not.[230] Adorno himself accuses Heidegger's Ontology to turn against

epistemology, signaling its turn against Hegel and thus against distinguishing Being from

entity.[231] Although I am sympathetic to the reasons for this call for a tight division between

matters of knowledge and experience, I do not think this division is warranted for the topic at

hand. After all, is not the concept/judgment "at work" in (whether thematic or immediate)

experience? Is not experience the backdrop for the constitution of the concept/judgment? My

insistence on the Ontology's concern for questions pertaining to knowledge and hence rational

justifications for judgments is admittedly prompted in part by observing each Adorno's and

Heidegger's fused philosophical approaches as earlier detailed. In disquietude over the

homogeneity and hegemony of traditional metaphysical principles (which are echoed in the

specialization of intellectual affairs), each reorients the philosophical discipline to contemplate

the intersections of subjectivity and objectivity by dismantling the supremacy of the "I." In

Heidegger's case, this means re-questioning the meaning of Being, which in turn means

questioning what it is like or what it means to be mortally "there" as thrown into the situation of

being *abandoned* by Being. Revealing self-abandonment to co-essentialize Being, Heidegger

---

[229] On a related note, I suggest we consider whether a lack of popular speculation on Heidegger as (part) epistemologist is not due to "analytic philosophy's" capital on ascribing to works the area of concentration "Epistemology" and to much of contemporary "continental philosophy's" reluctance to self-identify with the term.
[230] The reader has helpfully challenged my position by pointing out that, while Adorno's limit-concept pertains to *knowledge*, Dasein's sense of its potentiality-for-Being (at least overtly) does not. The latter instead bears on the issue of the transcendental conditions of *experience*.
[231] Ibid: 74.

apophatically adjudges the essence of Dasein as *being as* a hermeneutic where the ideal ego has

no place, for it is by means of its own essence that Dasein's efforts toward a totalized self-

understanding are thwarted.[232] Although answering the question "what do we know and how do

we know it?" is not what the existential analytic putatively sets out to accomplish, this occurs en

passant as the ontological revelation it *is* intended to bring about unfolds. Put differently,

Heidegger, in as much as he, like Adorno, is concerned with *holistic* understandings of and

responses to philosophical problems, is deeply interested in the epistemological - even if this

interest is but one garnered fortuitously as he reflects on the hermeneutic character of Being. So

long as, after distinguishing Dasein as a hermeneutic, we are interested with Heidegger in

exposing precisely what this implies, we are no less than incidentally interested in disclosing the

foundations of knowledge formation. We simply cannot extricate metaphysical and ontological

from epistemological problems, and that Heidegger tacitly recognizes this is suggested by his

deliberate integration of ontology and phenomenology in a way that calls attention to how

knowledge in Dasein is constituted (for example, Heidegger does not and cannot ask after the

phenomenon of readiness-to-hand without illustrating coinciding interest in what and how

Dasein immanently knows about ready-to-hand things). In comparison, Adorno recognizes this

inextricability of the metaphysical and ontological from the epistemological at the start of his

career.[233] Inquiring into the nature of the concept, particularly from the standpoint of a social

---

[232] One way to help describe the situation of *being abandoned by Being* is to refer to Being as being *beyond* itself. Dasein, as temporalized and essentialized by its hermeneutic character, cannot understand Being without being "outstripped" by Being. Of passing but nevertheless appealing interest here are projects by the likes of Levinas, Derrida, and Blanchot to move "beyond" essence or Being, where what is projected to be moved "beyond" are traditional and still specifically Heideggerian conceptions of these terms. Far from desiring to offer extensive interpretations of those projects given the space allotted here, I rather find it relevant and important to note a perceived need for pushback on how they seem, in part and to varying degrees, to misinterpret the meaning of Being for Heidegger that ultimately is - to harken the title of Levinas's brilliant 1974 text - just this being *otherwise* than itself (Levinas 1998).

[233] Adorno shuns "ontology" altogether, but based on his texts this seems largely if not entirely based on his critique of Heidegger. And, it is nevertheless clear that addressing ontological problems - so long as we take "ontology" as

agent in contemporary capitalist culture, Adorno in one fell swoop addresses questions relevant to each "subfield" by straightaway defining subjectivity by negative dialectical interchanges with the "objective" world as it reveals by degree how it and thus also identity are constituted.

With this counter-objection in mind, I propose that, in Heidegger's account of understanding, Dasein's being-toward is epistemologically prioritized. It shoulders not equal but more responsibility for the constitution of subjectivity than does Dasein's actuality, a point especially apparent when juxtaposing Heidegger with his forerunners.[234] Lacking this prioritization, Dasein's actuality would, in a manner of speaking, be inconceivable given that Dasein's thoughts and behaviors in "present" moments are ultimately oriented by anticipations that it "*can* be…" Just as for Adorno there would be no concept without its interference by the object (a material thing, or a societal norm or condition), for Heidegger there would be no experience belonging to the specific being that is Dasein were it not for the onto-existential structure of being-toward.

To magnify the gravity of this point as it helps to breach the historical boundaries between the two thinkers and the philosophical sectors they popularly have come to represent, I append it with the further (and also prefatory) claim that being-toward comprises a succession of experiences in which Dasein engages with the world in a predominantly *non-conceptual* way, where "non-conceptuality" is, for now, taken broadly to refer to elements of experience that, when traced out for existential analysis, are shown to always resist compartmentalization within

what it is: a "subfield" concerned primarily with what it means to be human by illuminating the relational properties between concepts and experiences - is included in the repertoire belonging to Negative Dialectics.

[234] Heidegger's silence on how experience and meaning-formation are framed by actual socio-material conditions is precisely Adorno's central and strongest objection. Although Adorno too prioritizes potentiality over actuality, he does so in attempt to normalize non-identity thinking; i.e., he is calling for a form of critical reason that is able to recognize the social institutionalization of reification and the need for reconciliation. The potentiality of the subject to think non-identically *as* a meaningful social agent undergirds Adorno's idea of "utopia." I remind, however, that I am working programmatically, not only to follow Adorno's pattern of thought in *Negative Dialectics,* but to set the groundwork for what will in the next chapter be a challenge to Fundamental Ontology given Adorno's critique and especially the central objection here at hand.

rigid, systematic structures of thought and language (a notion that is admittedly of far more focus for the later Heidegger, as he distinguishes the meaning of and encourages what he comes to name as "meditative thinking"). Dasein is directed toward, to repeat Adorno's word, an "indirect" object, which due to the indefiniteness and mutability of its features as they are instilled with meaning by the particular relational contexts composing Dasein's "being in" at a given time, is impossible to identify absolutely - a fact hidden to Dasein so long as its concepts are bound within the scope of autonomous reason. Dasein *does* register the particularity of the object, and not by a sheer willing to do so.[235] The object compels Dasein to relate to it non-conceptually even as Dasein remains inadvertently attached to thinking identically, as well as to amend the meaning found in this relation as it changes in conjunction with the specific unfolding of Dasein's existence (a point to be unpacked further in Chapter Three, where I discuss the idea of anxiety in Fundamental Ontology as a necessary condition of Dasein's possibility for authenticity).[236]

---

[235] As Dilthey, forerunner to Heidegger's ontological hermeneutics, points out, "the task of hermeneutic theory must be to stipulate that the subject's knowledge of the world is channeled not primarily through speculative reason, but concrete experience. Among the implications of this stipulation is a decentralization of the subject's willed cognition; knowledge instead hinges on a "givenness that binds us to an outer perception," which is here in Heidegger's case Dasein's immanent "disclosure" of the interconnections of sense within its factical world (Dilthey 2002: 28).

[236] Importantly, this hermeneutic interchange does not rest on what could otherwise be taken as Heidegger's distinction between associations of non-conceptuality, "irrationality," and unreflective, perceptual/embodied experience on the one hand, and conceptual, "rational" cognition - a removal of oneself into some dedicated sphere of abstract thinking - on the other. This is indeed Dreyfus' position as he confirms it in his 2005 American Philosophical Association Presidential Address, where in refutation to (what I also find is his misdirected reading of) McDowell he insists on what is effectively the rational mind's disappearance from all mundane, practical activity, appearing instead only in "means-ends" form. Dreyfus proposes that "according to existential phenomenologists like Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, and Todes, analytic attention brings about a radical transformation of the affordances given to absorbed coping. Only then can we have an experience of objects with properties, about which we can form beliefs, make judgments, and justify inferences. At the same time, however, this transformation covers up the non-conceptual perception and coping that made our openness to the world possible in the first place" (Dreyfus 2005: 61). Though I refer to Dreyfus's Address as but a prominent example of how Fundamental Ontology is often mistakenly interpreted to re-instigate questions concerning the relation between embodiment and cognition, and I do not have the space here to fully address what I find to be Dreyfus's very problematic proposal, I briefly push back with the following. (1) While "analytic attention" *does* help us to acknowledge and potentially transform the ways in which we are in-the-world, it is not "only then" that formations of justified beliefs/judgments occur; pre-analytic experience is a part of these formations, a point that, if thoroughly unpacked, would indicate how Dreyfus

I turn now to a second layer of hermeneutical thinking in lived Dasein, which pertains to how Dasein interprets its encounters with material entities. It is not just Dasein's implicit self-understanding as essentialized by its projective character, but also its understanding of the essence of non-human (or non-animal) beings, that is appropriated hermeneutically.[237] Analogously to how Dasein's existential interpretations of its actuality occur in necessary relation to its interpretations of its being-toward, Dasein's practical interpretations of its everyday being-in-the-world occur in relation to those of its spatial environments and temporal locations - those *worlds* "'*wherein*' a factical Dasein as such can be said to 'live'" at a specific place and time.[238] Inasmuch as Dasein's particular worlds will vary in form across its existence, how Dasein particularly understands the meaning of any given being will always, to a degree, be contingent and evolving. Here we may harken (Heidegger's) Nietzsche who famously espouses the idea of Being as a becoming: "what is essential about organic being is *a new interpretation of what happens*, the perspectival, inner multiplicity which itself is something happening."[239] Being, as becoming, fundamentally is existence as it is lived between conceptual negativity and creation, whether while one *is* mundanely, or, as I will analyze especially in Chapter Four, while

misconstrues Heidegger as participating in concerns over the traditional dichotomy between mind and world (and as endorsing traditional views about what aspects of human experience should be designated under each label). (2) Also because pre-analytic experience is a part of these formations, it cannot be the case that the "transformation" brought about by "analytic attention" at once entails a "covering up" of "non-conceptual perceptions" that have already conditioned the possibility for such attention. Why these claims and Dreyfus's overall exposition of the early Heidegger are so sorely misguided will, I hope, become clearer as I continue to explore the specific meaning and significance of the hermeneutic of Being.

[237] I leave the question of Dasein's relations with non-human animals to one side, as this warrants its own dedicated space, and I will instead look solely to Dasein's relations with non-animal beings. The former topic has been given much attention by Heidegger scholars, especially both right before and after the turn of the 21st Century. Much of the scholarship produced responds directly to Heidegger's lecture course, *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics* (Heidegger 2001), notable for its exploration of the Dasein-animal relation with a level of detail not comparably found in his other writings. Largely in response to 19th Century biologist Jakob von Uexküll (see, for example, von Uexküll 2010), Heidegger there considers the possibility that non-human animals inhabit "worlds" much like Dasein does, and his verdict is ultimately in the negative; for instance, he deems the structure and function of language for non-human animals as different than that for Dasein. For recent literature that spells out the fruitfulness of phenomenology in general and Heidegger in particular for exploring the constitution of animality in this way, see, for example, Painter and Lotz 2007, Calarco 2008, and McWhorter and Stenstad 2009.

[238] Ibid: 93.

[239] Nietzsche 2003: 63.

one, with Heidegger (and just as well with Adorno), acknowledges the need to critically interpret on a third-order level how this negative-positive exchange may cultivate more autonomous agents for whom the practice of critical interpretation in itself agitates the realization of this ideal.

Exposing Being in this way is Heidegger's overriding intention as he describes Dasein's engagements to be situated within the holism of a "worldhood," or a "primordial totality" of fluctuating, signifying contexts for phenomena.[240] When the interconnections among these contexts "light up" for Dasein around a particular being's signification, "the world announces itself" on a pre-ontological level.[241] While the ultimate announcement is the revelation of the meaning of Being itself, which occurs on a more thematic level of awareness, what Heidegger is also conveying here is how, on an unthematic level (which often implies not being deliberately concerned with ontological issues), a being's meaning for Dasein progressively opens out as the specific worlds or frames of reference within which that being is situated "light up" in the backdrop of consciousness. This "lighting up" is illustrated by how the grade of familiarity of a being to Dasein's understanding is dependent upon whether Dasein's past and present experiences have provided sufficient frames of reference. Heidegger's focal point in explaining Dasein's understanding of beings is, of course, Dasein's everyday dealings with them as equipment, or as ready-to-hand, which Dasein "circumspects" via its habitual tendency to perceive them solely in terms of their manipulability: "In terms of the significance which is disclosed in understanding the world, concernful Being-alongside the ready-to-hand gives itself to understand whatever involvement [i.e., for Dasein] that which is encountered can have."[242] That Dasein experiences a being as ready-to-hand is conditional on those of its overlapping

---

[240] Heidegger 2008a: 85.
[241] Ibid: 105.
[242] Ibid: 189 - my brackets.

worlds that furnish sources for the being's signification. This preludial point helps to signal how

dealings with beings as such demonstrate moments of non-identity thinking, principally because

those dealings too are propelled by, combined with its historicity, Dasein's projective

character.[243]

In his seminal lecture course, "Comparison of Experiential Structures. Process and

Event," Heidegger briefly describes how one's perceiving the significance of a lecturn

exemplifies how Dasein's historicity and projective character interact dialogically to lend in

conditioning the totality of Dasein's referential associations of meaning, and which thus

condition Dasein's understanding of beings "as a whole." There Heidegger implores his audience

to ponder how the seminar room lecturn, to them a familiar object, would be signified differently

or nearly not at all to an individual for whom the lecturn in this context is originally an unknown

object (albeit, given Heidegger's framework in Division I of *Being and Time*, the lecturn there

would seemingly still be explored in terms of its potential usability, hence prompting the

question, to be reviewed in Chapter Three, of whether Heidegger truly intends for us to conceive

the phenomenon of readiness-to-hand as a permanent and thus ahistorical structure of Being).[244]

The lecturn's familiarity to that individual would intensify while she, as characteristically

---

[243] Please excuse this rather hasty introduction of Heidegger's concept of "historicity." The concept will be fleshed out in the chapters to come (especially in Chapter Four), while here it appears for purposes of offering an overview of Heidegger's framework.

[244] Heartbreakingly, Heidegger designates the "other individual" for whom the lecturn may be unfamiliar as (to use language different than his) someone who is black (Heidegger 2000: 58). There he intimates how his conception of Dasein's specific "worlds" appears to be a product of normalizing the general situations of the western, white, affluent male. And, indeed, not long after *Being and Time*, in the *Black Notebooks* Heidegger proclaims that the task of Fundamental Ontology can only be truly executed by "someone who is German"; only he "can in an originarily new way poetize being and say being—he alone will conquer anew the essence of ["theory"] and finally create "logic" (Heidegger 2014: 17 - my brackets). Heidegger's insistence that a main function of the Ontology is to critically interrogate traditional assumptions thus must be heavily challenged (see Heidegger 2000: 63). This further prompts the renowned question of whether we can cogently separate the philosopher as an individual from the philosophy (and perhaps more importantly, what can be extrapolated from that philosophy) that the philosopher poses. All urgent topics warranting their own spaces of work, they will here be broached periodically, and Chapter Four, section four devotes most of its space to addressing them in more detail. (I will also go ahead and note that, had I read the *Black Notebooks* in any moderate amount of detail prior to embarking on the later stages of this dissertation, I quite likely would have directed the latter's focus elsewhere.)

projective, also comes to embody new "worlds" that would provide sense to the lecturn as a thing

to be used for assisting public speaking. It is by critically attending to these processes by which

Dasein comes to grasp the meanings of beings (and where those processes unfold unceasingly on

an unthematic level of experience) that begins a disclosure of the essence of ontic understanding

as mediated and open-ended.[245] And, as disclosing the essence of ontic understanding is a

precursor to disclosing the essence of ontological understanding, it is also in this vein that one is

initially capable of apprehending how one's "self" cannot possibly be equated with an idealist

ego for which concepts and beings are imagined to be identified wholly and across time.

While in this example the role of material beings in Fundamental Ontology is accounted

for in terms of how they mediate and in at least one way take priority in an individual's ontic

understanding of being-in-the-world, still left for further consideration is how the *particularity* of

material beings in their relations to Dasein are in the Ontology made readily apparent. Initial

evidence for such accountability can be found within Heidegger's descriptions of Dasein's

comportment toward things when the core meanings of those things as ready-to-hand are

destabilized and subsequently, if but only transiently, destabilize Dasein's typically pragmatic

way of being-in-the-world. When Dasein's typical relation with a thing "breaks down," that

thing is suddenly signified as "present-at-hand."[246] Heidegger designates three modes in which

the phenomenon of presence-at-hand can occur: a thing can appear (1) as *obtrusive*, such as

when an aspect of its ready-to-hand function suddenly goes missing from the signifying contexts

in which it is ordinarily embedded, (2) as *obstinate*, as when something unexpected (whether this

---

[245] Naturally, the possibility of *Ereignis,* the "event" of appropriation (whether of the meanings of specific phenomena or of understanding Being per se), is facilitated through lived experience, which "does not pass in front of me like a thing" as if I were always to appropriate [*er-eigne*] meaning through judgments of which I am explicitly self-aware, and rather is an unceasing, pre-thematic act which to the ego typically remains concealed (Heidegger 2008a: 63).

[246] The term "breakdown" is not from an English translation of *Being and Time*. I adopt its usage from secondary literature that takes its lead from the term's introduction by Dreyfus.

be another thing or an event) foils Dasein's dealings with a ready-to-hand thing, or (3) as

conspicuous, which happens when a ready-to-hand thing suddenly relates to Dasein as

malfunctional or unusable.[247]

> I take up the third mode as an example. On it, Heidegger writes:

> When a thing in the world around us becomes unusable, it becomes *conspicuous*. The natural course of concern is brought to a halt by this unusability. The continuity of reference and thus the referential totality undergoes a distinctive disturbance which forces us to pause.… This dwelling on such a conspicuous thing of the environing world is however not that of a starting and scrutinizing but has and retains the mode of being as concern.… This disturbance is not present as a pure alteration of a thing but as a *break in the familiar totality of references*.[248]

Note Heidegger's insinuation that the experience of a newly-conspicuous thing elicits a

conceptual shift from a pre-ontological (and what must also be a pre-epistemological) level of

awareness, i.e. the mundane mindset for which the purpose and features of the intended thing are

matters for mere *circumspection*,[249] to a level whereupon Dasein's mode of concern with that

thing is characterized by comparatively more acute observations or engagements.[250] Importantly,

and I will recurrently argue for this point, it is a change in the thing in itself that is largely

responsible for this shift, and this is one reason why we should deem *the "objective," material*

thing to be a mediator of concepts and hence to hold metaphysical and epistemological priority.

To be clear, by this I do not mean to neglect how meaning formation is a relational process

mutually involving Dasein *with* the things it encounters. What I instead want to stress is how,

---

[247] Ibid: 102.
[248] Heidegger 1992: 188.
[249] Here I use the term "circumspection" in Heidegger's sense of it; i.e., as it denotes Dasein's everyday, pre-reflective "sight" or understanding of its relational dealings with things.
[250] To reinforce an adjacent point that Heidegger makes in this passage, this more acute way of dealing with a thing does not involve, as it would in the purview of the natural sciences, Dasein abstracting itself from the relational contexts that compose its environment, subsequently reifying the thing appearing as present-at-hand. Though such reification is of course not, strictly speaking, an impossibility, it is (as we know too with Adorno) metaphysically and epistemologically (and, to be explored later, ethically) unfaithful; it is a distortion of the truth of Being. For Dasein is essentialized by its relational way of being, despite how contingent are the specific contexts that compose its environment at a given time. The "pause" Dasein experiences when suddenly confronting a present-at-hand thing yields but only a shift in the particular way that Dasein concerns itself with, or relates itself to, both that thing and its adjoining environment.

even if our interest in the phenomenon of conspicuousness is for the sake of analyzing what it means about *Dasein*, this need not commit us to claim that a thing itself does not contribute greatly to precipitating the phenomenon's occurrence. For, there is no willing on the part of Dasein that authoritatively dictates a thing's discrepancy from its usual significance - where the idea of the "will" would be cast back to much of pre-dialectical/undialectical philosophy, in disregard of the deep interrelation between rationality and hands-on experience within the world.[251] Even though a thing's appearance to and meaning for Dasein is sculpted by these interrelations, we must not ignore Dasein's considerable lack of control over whether a thing's functionality will break down, causing the thing to become conspicuous. Indeed, we must rather understand how the thing serves as mediator of Dasein and how it is prioritized in the subject-object relation in Adorno's distinct sense of object priority.

When a ready-to-hand thing becomes conspicuous, obtrusive, or obstinate, Dasein is inclined to observe it in its particularity, especially to the extent that it begins to correctly conceive the significance of the thing as it is accorded by distinct socio-material contextualization. To give an anecdotal and admittedly simplistic example, today my morning stroll lead me through an affluent white neighborhood tucked away in a lower-income, historically Black community. A street sign announcing that this was a "No Cruising Zone" between 7am and 7pm, which I normally pass by without noticing, was lying damaged across part of the road. Its function within its "*familiar totality of references*" - such as the arrangement of the street, the social edict the sign represents - having been disturbed, I perceived the sign to be conspicuously present-at-hand. This disturbance caused the physicality of the sign to appear more pronouncedly. Its surface bent and cracked and its lettering halved, the sign became a

---

[251] Adorno 1990: 240.

particular object to be distinguished from universal concepts "signaling" all signs like it. How I

was relating to nearby objects that also typically appear as ready-to-hand (e.g., the pavement, on

which I was obliged to concentrate in order not to trip) was altered in turn. Driving the

physicality of the sign and other objects in my immediate environment to the forefront of my

awareness, however, was not the only way in which, within the breakdown, *the particular*

materiality of the sign had come to emerge. The specific message of social control intended for

the sign to deliver began to fill my intentional sphere. Present-at-hand, the sign heightened my

attentiveness to its chief purpose as a tool for racial exclusion couched in systems of structural

and symbolic injustice (continuing my stroll into the surrounding, primarily white

neighborhoods, I not once saw a "no cruising" sign). In this experience, I was far more inclined

to realize the sign's "qualitative moments" - a realization that goes hand in hand with that of how

I and others are conceptually mediated by institutionalized, material norms ("objectivity").[252] For

Adorno, "[t]o comprehend a thing itself, not just to fit and register it in its [mundane] system of

reference, is nothing but to perceive the individual moment in its immanent connection with

others," or as arranged by "constellations" of concepts, materials, and conditions that configure

one's reception of a thing's meaning.[253]

In cases like this, the phenomenon of being ready-to-hand, which coerces Dasein to

equate the object with a static, ahistorical abstraction, becomes exposed, and this becoming is

propitious to revelations of the possible different ways in the object is or *can be*. As Iain

MacDonald points out, for both Heidegger and Adorno "[w]hat really matters is the

consciousness of heterogeneous possibilities and, more generally, the experience of things

viewed from the standpoint of the possibility of other possibilities, rather than in terms of

---

[252] Ibid: 43.
[253] Ibid: 25 - my brackets for clarification.

purported essences and effectivity."[254] In this dissertation's third and fourth chapters, I expand on MacDonald's reading to advance a defense of Heidegger against many of Adorno's objections as I have initially interpreted them here. Specifically, I uphold how these kinds of revelations that occur in experiences of both the present-at-hand *and* the uncanny may awaken contemporary Dasein to realize that, deep within its own fabric of "being there," lies a pre-conscious inculcation of exchange culture values. "Consciousness of heterogeneous possibilities" is the origin not only of metaphysically and epistemologically accurate portrayals of the mind-world relation, but of social critique and emancipation from lattices of injustice prescribed by dominating institutions.

Also in those chapters, I will trace Dasein's "shift" from being inauthentically resolute to experiencing moments of authentic resoluteness, toward modal authenticity. This "shift," I will argue, indicates Dasein's concern for recovering non-identity thinking as a mundane norm. In anticipation of that argument, here I turn briefly to consider the role of Heidegger's notion of *the uncanny*, which pertains to a particular kind of experience that largely catalyzes Dasein's concern for this recovery. In general, the uncanny signifies Dasein's sense-making in light of candidly confronting its thrownness and abandonment - its bare "being-there" in a universe that embodies a feeling of being "not at home."[255] Dasein's uncanniness, to be sure, is not a part of its average everydayness; it correlates with a cursory, yet always hovering "mood" that unsettles the latter: "This uncanniness pursues Dasein continually and is a constant threat to its lostness in the "anybody."[256] It interrupts Dasein's living as the They and prompts it to question human being's most basic existential concerns (*e.g., Why is there something rather than nothing? Why "am" I "there" and what does this mean?*) Such questions are ultimately unanswerable, and,

---

[254] MacDonald 2011: 30.
[255] Heidegger 2008a: 189.
[256] Ibid.

consequently, Dasein is left with a sensation of strangeness; it invokes and is invoked by its fundamental *anxiety*. "In the altogether unsettling experience of this hovering [of anxiety] where there is nothing to hold on to, pure Dasein is all that is still there."[257] Of course, for Heidegger this provides Dasein the possibility of "owning" a conscientiously constructed life. The additional question that Dasein must ask itself is: *how can I make meaning for my life while also knowing that my mortality, and that which is otherwise unknown about Being, render such efforts absurd?* Embracing the uncanny indicates to Dasein the viability of claiming authenticity as a mode of being.[258]

I preliminarily suggest that Heidegger's explication of Dasein's experiencing the uncanny meets many of the requirements that Adorno finds necessary to account for the non-identity of/in identity (alongside what Heidegger finds necessary to possibilize authenticity). Uncanniness marks a limit to Dasein's understanding. There is little extent to which Dasein is able to articulate the experience (whether to itself or another) of being fully inundated by the mood. When Dasein finds itself basking in the mood long enough (rather than distracting itself with activities familiar to living as the They, or perhaps turning uncritically to theology), it is arrested by its primordial anxiety, which "robs [Dasein] of speech."[259] Dasein simply cannot conceptually grasp anxiety's "object," which is no particular object at all, and rather the vaguely strange, unknown, or as Heidegger puts it in "What is Metaphysics?", the "nothing." "The nothing," he writes, "unveils itself in anxiety—but not as a being. Just as little is it given as an object. Anxiety

---

[257] Heidegger 1998: 89 - my brackets.

[258] Although this is not the main line of argument here, it is important to note that one cannot ever completely live in the light of uncanniness, and thus authenticity must be an impermanent way of being. We should view Dasein's interspersed anxious moods as part of an evolving, hermeneutical project in which Dasein is able to cultivate authenticity over time.

[259] Ibid.

is no kind of grasping of the nothing."[260] I claim that Dasein's struggling in vain to grasp the nothing (the "object") is akin to the Adornian subject's recognizing and valuing the "limit-concept." Dasein confronts the nothing, for which signification breaks down, non-conceptually. It must rely on a "non-conceptual moment" in order to find even an incomplete conceptual representation of its experience in the face of what *is not*. This shows how the latter *mediates* understanding, according to Adorno's connotation of the term, while Dasein is attuned by its uncanniness and anxiety.

As hinted in the previous section, I suggest that we interpret Dasein's onto-existential conditions (including thrownness and abandonment), which originate in the non-being of Being, to also be material conditions. To be sure, Adorno conceives of the mediating, material object in two ways: as either a distinct entity or a dynamic/event that goes into the configuration of sociality. Heidegger does not, at least unequivocally, account for the second (in Chapters Three and Four, I will extrapolate on *Being and Time* to show how the Ontology is able to account for it), but I find that, in this case, the first kind of mediation is already exemplified. Uncanniness emanates from Dasein's thrownness and abandonment in a materially tangible world. It is the "totality" of beings that "slip away" from Dasein's familiar conceptual understanding - beings that are suddenly stripped of their conventional meanings and become related to as naked in their physicality - that prompt uncanny experience. When Dasein encounters this "nihilation" of the mundane meaning of the "totality" of "what is," the radical otherness of beings, and of Being per se, is unconcealed.[261]

In light of this, what must be underscored is that it is the nothing itself, and *not* a willing by Dasein, which induces Dasein's uncanny state and its subsequently altered understanding of

---

[260] Ibid.
[261] Ibid: 90.

beings/Being. After all, the nothing "is essentially repelling; it "does not attract" Dasein's

everyday, "calculative" understanding (instead, it opens Dasein up to find meaning for its

existence in the unforeseen future, a point I will develop further, in juxtaposition with Adorno's

critique of authenticity, in Chapter Three).[262] If we take a moment to reflect on our own

experiences of feeling uncanny or existentially anxious, perhaps we agree that the most

overwhelming of them have emerged, so to speak, from out of nowhere. Deliberate reflection on

the existential can certainly arouse this feeling, but it seems to strike most robustly when least

expected. "We cannot even bring ourselves originally before the nothing," Heidegger affirms,

"through our own decision and will."[263] In this example, I find it clear that the nothing (here, the

object) takes priority in experience and understanding. Dasein cannot, then, be accurately

construed as a constitutive subject. It is delivered over to an affectivity, one quite similar, I

propose, to Scheler's "Psychic Contagion (*Gefühlansteckung)*," at least if we are to momentarily

put into abeyance the role of others in this feeling of one's "I" dissolving.[264] The situation of

"being there" finds an equiprimordiality of affectivity with third-order cognition, and this renders

unworkable Dasein's possible efforts to drive its experiences by absolute concepts.

To corroborate this point, I suggest that we decipher Dasein's relation to the nothing as a

relation that is mimetic in form. As explained in section two, for Adorno (and Horkheimer), a

subject relates to an object mimetically when she "imitates" that object, or when she is open to

being affected by the object in a way that compels her to adapt her understanding according to

what the object brings to the relation non-conceptually.[265] A mimetic relation is driven by the

---

[262] Ibid.
[263] Heidegger 2008a: 93.
[264] Scheler 1994.
[265] Walter Benjamin also writes heavily on the notion of mimesis. See, for example, "On the Mimetic Faculty," in which he considers the typical "mode" of being a child to explore how the commodity structure has increasingly

object's resistance to autonomous reason, and it nurtures the subject's way of relating to it non-identically. The relation is sparked by a "shuddering" of the subject in which she intuits the object's refusal of total assimilation into her conceptual framework. Replacing this assimilation is the subject's being washed over by indeterminate sensations of wonder and overwhelm, sensations that also compose Dasein's uncanny and anxious moods for which customary conceptions of objects have become epistemologically fractured.[266] Heidegger's description of the uncanny, I contend, is an exemplar of how conceptuality is conditional on what Adorno perceives to be a negative moment within which the object's non-conceptual properties resist capture.

I end these penultimate set of passages by remarking briefly on some of the implications of Adorno's objections to Fundamental Ontology, as well as the challenges I pose against them, for his critique of phenomenology more generally. In *Against Epistemology*, Adorno takes issue with the earlier Husserl for his method's alleged "violence to unfamiliar things."[267] Both it and Heidegger's Ontology "prate about infinity without respecting it."[268] This is not only because Adorno construes "bracketing" as just a stealthy way of justifying the preservation of the subject's presuppositions and, by extension, her reification of the world. Adorno faults Husserl more broadly for not espousing an anti-systematic style, which would nurture "a playful element" in philosophy. After all, "[p]hilosophy is the most serious of things, but then again it is

---

oppressed and repressed human being's playful instincts (Benjamin 1999). Moreover, in his 1993 book *Mimesis and Alterity*, Michael Taussig examines the idea of mimesis in its specific historical relations to colonialism and racism.
[266] Given this fracturing, Dasein, as I mention above, is at a loss for representing its mood, and the nothing to which it points, through analytic language. Later in his writings, Heidegger asserts the necessity of expressing Being poetically, on the basis that such expressions are the best candidates for capturing the non-conceptual moments that shape Dasein's understanding. Quite similarly for Adorno, giving expression to a non-identical relation must involve relaying the "uncommunicative material" within that relation (Adorno 2005: 219). He writes: "Dialectic—literally: language as the organon of thought—would mean to attempt a critical rescue of ... a mutual approximation of thing and expression" (Adorno 1990: 56). For both thinkers, language that mirrors the "truth" of a non-identical subject-object relation must be guided by the subject's responding to what the object brings to the relation non-conceptually.
[267] Adorno 1983: 5-6, 12.
[268] Ibid: 14.

not all that serious," Adorno contends. "To represent the mimesis it supplanted, the concept has no other way than to adopt something mimetic in its own conduct, without abandoning itself."[269] It is imperative to philosophy's retaining the non-identical that it, like great music that slips through the net of commodification, be unable to anticipate what comes next, and to value this inability, in its meditations. Any philosophy that begins from a definitive "standpoint," as Adorno claims Husserl's does, precludes the recovery of mimesis from its repression.[270] What is positive in Husserl for Adorno is his retaining the concept, in contrast to Kierkegaard and 20th century existentialists (including Heidegger) that he thinks commit themselves to irrationalism.[271] I agree with Adorno that Husserl's phenomenology is too systematic and does not leave room for the possibility of nurturing mimetic relations in any clear or substantial way. However, I disagree with his claim that Heidegger, by way of extension from Husserl, is guilty of this preemption and thus committed to irrationalism. One of my chief aims in this section has been to show how Dasein's relation to the uncanny coerces Dasein to rely on the non-conceptual in order to make sense of how that relation informs self-understanding. The state of feeling/being uncanny guides Dasein to recognize that its "projective character" underlies understanding, and that the latter is thereby not fixed across time and circumstance. Accordingly, Dasein is motivated to experiment with approaching the world in ways that are opposed to those it takes up while living as the They (Sartre of course also makes this possibility a central theme of his work). This is one reason why we should reject the idea that the Ontology functions as a rigid system in which the subject's spontaneity is compromised. What is more, my proposal that Heidegger accounts for Dasein's "playful" relations with the world does not entail that he reduces the Ontology to irrationalism. Underlying this expected criticism is Adorno's insistence that non-identity thinking requires both

---

[269] Adorno 1990: 14.
[270] On the notion of "standpoint," see ibid 2-5.
[271] See, for example, ibid: 70.

mimetic experience *and* critical reason. I have suggested why we should read the Ontology as capable of nurturing the former. To end this chapter, I now move on to suggest how the Ontology appears also to be capable of encouraging critical reason, and how this capability indicates one major way in which it is not incommensurate with identifying the significance of the non-conceptuality of identity and meaning. (To be sure, we should treat these last passages of the chapter as offering but broad support for what is a still very prefatory claim, just as I have mentioned that this first chapter overall should be treated as a template that broadly introduces and advances initial responses to the majority of this dissertation's primary concerns.)

. . .

In these final remarks, I begin to confront what up until now has been the elephant in the room: namely, the problem that, even if we grant the experiences listed above to be moments of non-identity thinking in Dasein, Fundamental Ontology still perhaps cannot account for the possibility of generating critical reason. For, as I have mentioned, the final upshot of Adorno's negative dialectic is to mobilize the subject's potential to recognize the object's mediation and priority *in the socio-institutional sphere*, and, on that basis, to work conscientiously against her "being as" her institutionally-given second nature, wherein she helps to perpetuate the values and practices of structural exchange.

At the heart of Adorno's critique, I take it, is his contention that Heidegger leaves the Ontology functional merely to describe the subject's passive, "common sense" experience and understanding, while what philosophy should actually aim to do is align "common sense" views with active, negative dialectical thought.[272] If my initial interpretations have been accurate and Heidegger sufficiently considers the mediating object in concept formation and in the existential

---

[272] See, for example, Adorno 2005: 72.

formation of Dasein's identity, we are still left with the worry that he fails to consider *the subject's mediation of the object*, i.e., how the meanings that the subject finds in her being-in-the-world, though informed by the object, still dialectically condition how the object will be conceived. On Adorno's count, while in one sense there is "too much" subjectivity in the Ontology (because it allegedly does not account for the mediating object), in another sense there is too little. Being is a "nonsubjective, nonobjective third" that Heidegger envisions as rising above the subject-object relation.[273] As in Kant, in Heidegger "what is left of the spontaneous subject ... ceases to be a subject; in the hypostatized logicity of a Kantian *cogito*, detached from any living I, it is covered by the all-controlling rigidity."[274] Purportedly following both Kant and Husserl, Heidegger advances a notion of Being prior to subjective critique, thereby diminishing the subject's particularity and capacities for actively pursuing social critique.[275] Fundamental Ontology for Adorno immobilizes subjectivity; it delimits what the subject thinks and how she behaves. This is why Adorno argues that the "apologetical, ontological need" has been founded out of necessity to conform to systems of exchange, which have increasingly forced the products of academic disciplines, as well as artistic and cultural artifacts, to imitate the administered conventions that erode the individual subject's "cognitive powers."[276]

Specifically, Adorno's concern is that Heidegger's descriptions of Dasein's everyday engagements with objects as ready-to-hand serve only to copy and reinforce commodification, as Heidegger does not move beyond these descriptions (1) to examine the overlapping socio-material dynamics that have normalized this mode of engagement, and (2) to offer a normative account of how other modes of engaging with objects may be achievable. In this way, Heidegger

---

[273] Adorno 1990: 104.
[274] Ibid: 91.
[275] See, for example, Adorno 1983: 5-6.
[276] Adorno 1990: 61

preserves what Adorno views is traditional phenomenology's "cult of irrational immediacy,"[277] which locks the subject into a too-passive role in experience that disempowers her interest in and ability for determinate negation. The Ontology is propelled by a desire to push beyond the limitations of traditional phenomenology that has arguably prized attention to immanency alone. But it pushed too far, as it instead, Adorno claims, came to implicitly identify the immanent with the transcendent:

> Heidegger wants to break out of the immanence of consciousness. But his outbreak is an outbreak into the mirror. Blinded to the moment of synthesis in the substrate, he ignores the fact that the mind ... is already implied in the meaning of what it presents as the pure selfhood it would be confronting.... This critique tacitly ignores the subjective mind and thus necessarily the material, the factuality which any synthesis acts upon.[278]

This quote outlines one major reason why Adorno thinks that Heidegger vacillates between idealism and naïve realism. The naïve realist Heidegger fails to recognize that the meanings of objects appearing immanently to consciousness, such as the ready-to-hand, are not also transcendent, "natural" parts of being-in-the-world, and rather products of a mind-world synthesis. Dasein is not described as playing a part in the social establishment of objects as ready-to-hand (i.e., as commodified, I will argue more thoroughly in Chapters Three and Four), and this is because neither it nor its lived world are conceived to be socio-historical and thus "truly" ontologically and epistemologically contingent; "the two poles are equally reified."[279] I take Adorno to claim that there is a hidden premise in the Ontology that rejects the plausibility of socio-material institutions as both preceding and engaging in a continuous, mutual discourse with an individual's present experiences and concepts. Of course, at the root of this problem for Adorno is Heidegger's desertion of Marxist-Hegelian thought, which preempts the possibility of

---

[277] Ibid: 8.
[278] Ibid: 84.
[279] Ibid: 91.

acknowledging the role of capitalism's base and superstructure in the development of

conceptuality, and the subject's (the concept's) dialectical connection within that development.

Alongside this, Adorno attests that the Ontology is for the subject only self-serving:

Heidegger "summons salvation from the world of ideas into Dasein," [280] and "applies the most

inwardly tautological relation of self to self-preservation."[281] Heidegger distinguishes an

exclusivity between discoveries of the meaning of Being in light of one's historicality and

potentiality-for-Being, and the possibility of a form of critical reason that can direct the subject,

both in theory and in praxis, to oppose autonomous reason and its "real" manifestations in

oppression and violence. I read Adorno to insinuate that Dasein's being as essentially

potentiality-for-Being does not necessitate that Dasein's relations to its immediate and distant

futures involve moments of non-identity, for the relations appear to be merely self-referencing of

Dasein's own existing presence. François Raffoul hints at (before aiming to expose the weakness

of) this justification for the objection that standing out in Heidegger is an absence of ontological

plurality: Dasein would be "closed upon itself in a solipsistic way, in a kind of soliloquy that

would reproduce within some sphere of ownness of the self the Platonic 'dialogue of the soul

with itself.'"[282] If valid, what would be most at stake in this justification is a depiction of Dasein

as systematically obliterating otherness for the sake of suiting its privilege and command over

things and others, in terms not only of theory, but of committing concrete injustices. In Adorno's

words, at stake is a "proclamation of the subject's decree as a plan of supreme authority and [the

subject's] disguise of his own voice of that of Being."[283] While Heidegger takes great pains in the

Ontology to underscore the priority of absence and potentiality - as MacDonald puts it, he offers

---

[280] Adorno 2003: 93.
[281] Ibid: 111.
[282] Raffoul 2010: 250.
[283] Adorno 1990: 88 - my brackets.

"a notion of being that is shot through with withdrawal (Entzug), reserve (Vorenthalt), and refusal (Verweigerung), rather than presence"[284]- I take Adorno to object that, since Dasein, as essentialized by its potentiality-for-Being, is (allegedly) self-reflexive, what Heidegger actually prioritizes are presence and actuality. Heidegger apparently exchanges critical visions of possible, alternative social realities for encouraging egocentric obsession with one's own temporal existence. This obsession fosters in Dasein (and Heidegger) an aloofness to the indivisibility of the phenomenon of readiness-to-hand from historical, socio-material conditions, and thus to the prospect of that phenomenon's impermanence.

As I have noted several times so far, for Adorno, Heidegger's apparent refusal to tackle the question of Being through an epistemic lens helps to induce his negligence (within that question) of the socio-historical and material. However, just in the way that Adorno wants philosophy *as* epistemology to do, Heidegger (1) assumes from the start that the modern subject-object gulf as it is founded in Descartes and seized by Husserl should be dismissed as a coherent premise for investigation, and (2) blurs the lines between traditional metaphysics and epistemology to the extent of instantiating a radically new approach. "Epistemology arouses us out of this slumber and points to problems," Heidegger proclaims in *Towards the Definition of Philosophy*. "These cannot be seen by clinging to immediate life-experience. One must rise to the critical standpoint. One must be free and able, in a progressive age of reason and culture, to place oneself over oneself. In this way one enters a new dimension, the philosophical."[285] Heidegger not only refuses to eschew epistemology, but clearly lends his Ontology to the potential of finally overcoming traditional metaphysics, including traditional phenomenology.[286] As this passage

---

[284] MacDonald 2011: 4.
[285] Heidegger 2008b: 63.
[286] Heidegger describes his investigations into the ready-to-hand to be both "pre-ontological" and "pre-phenomenological" (Heidegger 2008a: 102). I suggest that they are also "pre-epistemological."

illustrates, he also encourages Dasein to transcend what is merely empirical toward critical speculation on experience (points I will develop more throughly in Chapter Three and especially Chapter Four).

Based on all this, I now present a cursory form of what will be my ongoing challenge to Adorno's criticism that Fundamental Ontology neglects and diminishes the capacity of Dasein to become self-aware of its commodified and reified manner of being-in-the-world. I do this through two, related sets of claims, each of which I suggest begins to illustrate how Dasein's existence as hermeneutical and hence as possibility-oriented already bears within itself an elicitation of this capacity. The first set pertains to Dasein's relation to entities as ready-to-hand.

I accede that it is easy to infer from Heidegger's descriptions that the mode of being ready-to-hand is invested with an indissoluble meaning. I suggest, however, that we interpret him as describing commodified and reified reality, even if he does so covertly or unintentionally. To be sure, the descriptions as they are given are incomplete, as they do not meet Adorno's stipulations for accounting for the function of a dialectic between consciousness and socio-material institutions. But incompleteness does not necessitate mutual exclusivity, and I propose that, even if by way of our extrapolation, Division I of *Being and Time* offers a rough sketch of a few main components that characterize one's typical existence within late capitalist society. The ready-to-hand *is* a priori insofar as it is inherent to contemporary Dasein to tend to relate to objects as such in its average everydayness. Heidegger does not unequivocally condone engaging with objects as ready-to-hand, although in fairness to Adorno, I agree that his resistance to social critique makes him guilty of helping to normalize this mode of engagement. However, if it is mostly or only Heidegger's silence that is responsible for the Ontology's failure to be possibly read as potentiating Dasein's capacity to de-commodify the meaning of objects and to de-reify

97

consciousness, then we can extrapolate from his descriptions to help locate this possibility. This requires above all that we pinpoint instances in the Ontology in which Dasein's active role in the mediating process is evident.

Let us first look again at Dasein's shift in understanding once it comes to perceive a ready-to-hand object as present-at-hand. When this shift occurs, as it does within breakdown experiences, readiness-to-hand "does not vanish simply, but takes its farewell, as it were, in the conspicuousness of the unusable. Readiness-to-hand still shows itself, and it is precisely here that the worldly character of the ready-to-hand shows itself too."[287] To be clear, what Heidegger is saying here is that, in an experience of a present-at-hand object, Dasein does not mindlessly surrender to the experience; it does not somehow forget that the object typically is ready-to-hand. Rather, Dasein encounters an interruption in its mundane interpretation (from within which it does not explicitly recognize *how* meaning shows up for it) and at least for a moment surveys the object on a thematically onto-epistemic level. The shift in Dasein's understanding that stems from this surveying is often inconsequential for the possibility of generating substantial critical thought on the mode of readiness-to-hand, as Dasein inevitably will return to this mode of dealing with an object once the object has been repaired, replaced, or removed as an obstruction. Even given this inevitability, I argue that sometimes there are or can be experiences of presence-at-hand that, however fleeting, prompt Dasein to "awaken" to the reality of commodified and reified life. Dasein's sudden recognition of how it has taken objects for granted as ready-to-hand, is a kernel of its ability for critical reason in the Adornian sense of the term. That Dasein carries that kernel along with itself as it moves back into its everyday being-in-the-world is neither a promise nor the norm, given how strongly subjects are conditioned not to disrupt the exchange

---

[287] Heidegger 2008a: 104.

structure. At least in principle, however, Dasein may return to its everydayness while also still nurturing the growth of that kernel into a more expansive understanding of the socio-material conditions that implement readiness-to-hand as the status quo. This may actualize Dasein's potential to begin conscientiously cultivating a non-instrumental way of being - a guiding claim of this dissertation that will take firmer shape by Chapter Three.

What is foremost required to challenge Adorno's objection here at hand is a provision of evidence in favor of interpreting Heidegger to understand authentically resolute Dasein as concerned with not merely the conditions of its facticity and the mere fact of its inherently being as potentiality, but also with its specific, "always and already" possibility to critically reflect on the ways in which it participates in processes of meaning formation, especially where this entails how it has participated in reinforcing the values and norms of the exchange structure. As I have mentioned, I take much of Division I of *Being and Time* to describe how the subject in late capitalist culture is coerced into passivity; i.e., how her critical imagination is dampened. Heidegger tacitly portrays this situation as he describes Dasein's relating to objects as ready-to-hand. Because of her passivity within these relations, the subject is also thereby actively reinforcing the exchange structure. The exchange structure (an object) mediates the significance of entities for Dasein, and Dasein in turn mediates that structure by ignoring and thus perpetuating the conditions under which it has been sustained. Dasein's activity as such can be sighted in cases where experiencing a thing as present-at-hand guides Dasein progressively toward critical reason (which I will intimate below and to which, in the last chapters, I will return in more detail).

When a ready-to-hand object becomes conspicuous, obtrusive, or obstinate, Dasein is incited to configure the object in its normal readiness-to-hand as situated within a pattern of relations that point to how its readiness-to-hand is made possible:

> When an assignment to some particular "towards-this" has been thus circumspectively aroused, we catch sight of the "towards-this" itself, and along with it everything connected with the work—the whole 'workshop'—as that wherein concern always dwells. The context of equipment is lit up, not as something never seen before, but as a totality constantly sighted beforehand in circumspection. With this totality, however, the world announces itself."[288]

This explanation echoes Adorno's idea of constellations. The Adornian subject engaged in critical reason gradually draws lines across her existing perceptions, beliefs, and behaviors, and various instantiations of socio-institutional control, toward grasping more comprehensively how social "totality" operates systematically. In Heidegger's framework, Dasein may come to understand how its typical meaning for a ready-to-hand tool is informed by that meaning's reference to larger socio-material circumstances. Dasein's awakening to these connections may precipitate awakenings to scores of others that bring about similar realizations of its indirect support for capitalist profit and social injustice.

There are at least five critical, negative moments happening here: (1) Dasein's detecting how it mediates meaning formation in mundane life;[289] (2) its recognizing the contradiction between its typical concept of a ready-to-hand object and the meaning of the object as it in part eludes the concept; (3) its critical judgment of the control of capitalist relations of production over human lives; (4) its active refusal to identify an object with an ideological concept such as readiness-to-hand; and (5) its refusal to no longer support exploitative and violent capitalist

---

[288] Ibid: 105

[289] This instance can be broken down further into still two other negative moments: (1) mediation is a moment of negativity, and (2) even realizing that experience/meaning is mediated is a negation of the They (many aspects of which I read to be outlining Adorno's "administered world").

systems. Each moment demonstrates how the subject is thinking non-identically and how such thinking encourages Dasein's capacity for social critique.

Dasein, then, is not necessarily too epistemically passive. Breakdown experiences can deeply touch Dasein in ways that it comes to detect its complicity in the commodification of one or many objects, and in the reification of its own consciousness. Heidegger lays the groundwork for understanding Dasein's potential, by virtue of the meaning of Being itself, to recover its critical, individual voice, and to use it actively in working against the inculcation of its second nature by a society built upon universals that veil the particularities of and webs of references surrounding a given object or concept. Fundamental Ontology alludes not only to how the subject is habituated to think pragmatically (which also here means identically), but to her capacity to transcend this kind of thinking, whether in fleeting moments, or by way of a tenacious resolve to make negative critical reason an existential norm and regular practice.

To be clear, I have suggested that Dasein's experience of the present-at-hand can engender a non-reified mode of knowledge, at least in regard to a specific object. One objection that may arise to this is that such experience is actually a way of reifying the object, for the object would then be made into a mere "thing" abstracted away from its environment of socio-material relations and made an object for scientific/theoretical study.[290] I offer two brief counter-objections. First, challenging reification does not entail that one must abstain from theorization. Indeed, at least half of Adorno's project rests on a call for *more* theory, albeit theory that is executed in the proper, negative dialectical way. In the Ontology, Dasein steadily engages with an object on a theoretical level, where this is ultimately *for the sake of* tapping into her ability to perceive it as a particular object that is enveloped by constellations of meaning. Second, let us

---

[290] This objection was expressed during the Q&A session of a presentation of a draft of this chapter at Michigan State University in April 2016.

take into consideration Heidegger's note that "[t]he peculiarity of what is proximally ready-to-hand is that, in its readiness-to-hand, it must, as it were, withdraw in order to be ready-to-hand quite authentically."[291] There he indicates that a ready-to-hand object can only be perceived as such once its taken-for-granted meaning has been displaced within Dasein's view of it as present-at-hand. In its experience of the object as ready-to-hand, Dasein succumbs to its perception of the object as commodified and reified and its having been involved in the reification of its own consciousness. What is more, Dasein may recognize how it has reified readiness-to-hand as a very mode of being. (This is especially the case when Dasein's experiences of presence-at-hand coincide with moments of its being authentically resolute, as I will emphasize in Chapter Three.) For these (at this early stage still tentative and) general reasons, I maintain that experiences of objects as present-at-hand can often be, or can lead to, forms of non-reified understanding.

I now turn to the second set of claims that I find are suggestive of the Ontology's accounting for Dasein's potential as a critical social agent. Lacking in my previous justifications is an explanation of how we can find in the Ontology instances of dialectical movement between critical reason on the one hand, and mimetic experience on the other. As I have mentioned, Adorno argues that non-identity thinking is precipitated not simply by engagement in critical reason; the latter both is born out of and stimulates mimetic subject-object relations; mimesis and critical reason must continuously bounce off of one another. Without dwelling passively in mimetic experience, the subject would be unable to actively uncover contradictions in the socio-material sphere, for it is such experience that goads her to intuit the object's evasiveness from the

---

[291] Heidegger 2008a: 99.

reified concept. I preliminary suggest that, while being *authentically* uncanny, Dasein bears the potential to help nurture this interchange.

We should recall three important points about this mood of being/feeling uncanny. First, while in it, Dasein's typically pragmatic character is interrupted as Dasein faces its bare "being there" and hence its open-ended potentiality *to be*. Second, Dasein's relation to its object (Dasein's death, but also more generally the absurd and unknown) is non-conceptual; Dasein cannot command the relation through a substantive will, and it cannot identify the object with a static or familiar concept: "Anxiety [from which the feeling of being uncanny both arises and reinforces] 'does not know' what that in the face of which it is anxious is."[292] Third, if Dasein dwells in its uncanny mood long enough, it may assume an "authentic" way of facing the unknown. Authentically resolute Dasein finds itself supplied with a potential to live conscientiously *not* as the They: "uncanniness pursues Dasein constantly, and is a threat to its everyday lostness in the 'they.'"[293] With these points in mind, I argue that, for the Dasein who is in-the-world authentically, a dialectic between mimesis and critical reason must be at play. The implications of this pertain not only existentially to Dasein's personal struggle to become who it wants to be, but to a potential transformation of Dasein through which it becomes more readily prepared for and inclined toward negative social critique.

To unfold this argument, I remind readers of my suggestion above that we interpret Dasein's relation to its object (the unknown), while Dasein is uncanny, as a mimetic one. This is not simply because the relation necessarily depends on the contribution of the non-conceptual to understanding. It also is because uncanniness provides recourse to a summoning of Dasein's individuality and spontaneity, aspects that are "levelled down" by Dasein's coerced identification

---

[292] Ibid: 231—my brackets.
[293] Ibid: 234.

with the They, just as for Adorno these are repressed by the cultural values and practices of the administered world. When Dasein embraces its uncanniness, it permits itself to revel in a "playful," hermeneutic exchange between its intuition of its being-towards-death/potentiality-to-be, and its present thoughts and actions. This constitutes a large part of how Dasein "shifts" toward authentic being. No longer living predominantly as the They, Dasein's self-understanding as potentiality is solidified, and Dasein begins to take control over the development of its own choices and identity. It recognizes that its relation to social norms (one of the subject-object relations at work here) are fluid, and thus that it need not remain repressed by identifying with rigid conceptual schemas.[294] Such recognition, along with Dasein's resolving to choose to become an active creator of its own life, are critical, negative moments in hermeneutic understanding.

Although Heidegger certainly does not speak to this, part of what is potentially involved in resolving to detach from the They is Dasein's acknowledgement that its everyday, pragmatic way of being-in-the-world latently supports the sustaining of commodified and reified reality.[295] Dasein may also find itself prompted to take interest in deciphering and connecting the various stratums of late capitalist power that undergird this reality. Borrowing the words of Horkheimer and Adorno, it may "gain greater understanding of the intertwinement of rationality and social reality, as well as of the intertwinement, inseparable from the former, of nature and the mastery of nature."[296] The longer and more intensely Dasein is able to maintain a level of detachment of

---

[294] As I have mentioned previously in regard to a similar topic, this is an incredibly privileged position to adopt. Heidegger implicitly equates Dasein with an individual whom endures little or no social exploitation and injustice, and bears more freedom to construct its life because it need not out of, e.g., economic necessity, or the necessity simply to survive in a white supremacist and sexist society, comply with the dictations of the status quo. I bring this problem to the forefront of chapter two.

[295] The later Heidegger does attend to the social, especially to commodification, but he also by this time had abandoned expressing being/Being/beyng in relation to "Dasein." I will discuss both of these points in Chapter Three.

[296] Horkheimer and Adorno 2002: xviii.

its concepts and identity from the They, the more often will realizations pertaining to reality's envelopment by institutional control occur.

In part and in brief, this is how I justify my position that dwelling in uncanniness can naturally precipitate a back-and-forth dialogue between Dasein's mimetic experiences and determinate negation of its adherence to the public status quo, a dialogue that is, for Adorno, required for the possibility of generating critical reason. As I note above, while feeling uncanny, for Dasein the meaning of beings in their pragmatic functions "slips away" from everyday understanding; how they subsequently "show up" is described as similar to how beings as present-at-hand do.[297] For the authentically uncanny Dasein, so to speak, (which does not resist this loss of sense) is opened up the opportunity to discern the meaning of beings as socially constructed and therefore not inevitable and immutable. Its mimetic experiences with the absurd/unknown can function as springboards from which to jump off toward realizations of the interconnection between meaning formation and the arrangement of societies. This is because mimetic experience engenders in Dasein a power to experiment with meaning (and thus its being), toward distinguishing different ways in which an object can be denoted. Its passive role in the face of the uncanny (wherein, again, objects are suddenly stripped of their conventional meanings) can be channeled into an active role in which Dasein critically identifies and evaluates its everyday relation to objects as ready-to-hand, or commodified. Dasein would come to understand that readiness-to-hand is not natural and perennial, and that other kinds of relations to objects - relations that do not abstract an object away from its particularity - are realizable. The dialectical process between Dasein's mimetic experience of the uncanny on the one hand, and Dasein's deliberate negation of the power of Das Man over its concepts and identity (a negation

---

[297] See, for example, Heidegger 1998: 90.

that is triggered by the mimetic experience) on the other, can potentially culminate in Adorno's sense of critical reason. With this, I conclude by recommending that Fundamental Ontology is not destined to conflict with Adorno's contention that "[t]he a priori and society are intertwined."[298]

---

[298] Adorno 2000b: 145.

CHAPTER TWO:

Disclosing Non-Identity as a Condition of Being
Across Existential Modalities

I.   *Circling from and back to non-being: the hermeneutics of existential analysis*

As indicated in Chapter One, identifiable in *Being and Time* are two perspectives or "horizons" within which Being is to be interpreted: one entered into premeditatively to thematize Being, and one in which Dasein lives artlessly, unconcerned with "explicit ontological insights."[299] The primary intention of this chapter is to focus on examining the dialogical nature of these horizons; that is, by not only recounting how each horizon "thinks Being" but by illustrating how "thinking Being" is nurtured by ongoing, critical interchanges between Dasein's thematic and pre-thematic purviews. This will amplify, first, Being's hermeneutical character, and, second, how this character is ordinarily obscured. On that basis, this approach will also help to test one of the main assumptions that this dissertation has set out to defend; namely, that Heidegger's particular idea of hermeneutics depends on recognizing non-identity as a fundamental condition of Being. Examining the hermeneutic relation between the two horizons that constitutes the existential analytic serves more precisely as an entryway into examining the possibility that Heidegger's understanding of non-conceptuality or non-being, which defines Being, is akin to Adorno's understanding of the non-identity that defines conceptuality. Importantly, this would mean that non-identity is just as essential to modally inauthentic Dasein as it is to Dasein that *is* for the most part authentically resolute. The guiding question of this

---

[299] Heidegger 2008a: 102.

chapter is thus *how, in Heidegger's Ontology, does non-being, as non-identity, essentialize Being regardless of Dasein's modal status?*[300]

To further advance an answer to this question, this chapter also considers the role of language in Heidegger. It specifically considers how the very meaning of Being as a hermeneutic - and, I maintain, as rooted in non-identity - is revealed in part through recursive attempts to express it. Struggling to put the meaning of Being into words is a crucial component of refining one's understanding of that meaning, as it signals the hermeneutic character of and, so too, the ontological limits of language and its concepts. Accordingly, for Heidegger the question of Being and the problem of language must coincide, and the analytic is mutually developed by recognition of the non-being or non-identity of Being and how this is "always and already" illustrated by the hermeneutical reciprocation of thinking and saying.

Focusing this chapter on these two related sets of interchanges is also and ultimately in aim to encourage reflection on how the analytic functions as a heuristic for remodeling the habits and values that typify one's being-in-the-world. It is through the analytic that authentic self-realization becomes possible, and, as I will frequently indicate in anticipation of the dissertation's culminating thesis, the upshot of such analysis extends far beyond that of refining one's understanding of Being for the sake of redressing false metaphysical assumptions as an end in itself. For, as phenomenology, the motive of the analytic is to progressively recount what ontic experience and knowledge precisely are like, toward revealing how they are constituted ontologically. As I had begun to intimate in Chapter One, what is thereby revealed to be most

---

[300] Or, if Dasein is neither authentic nor inauthentic, then how is it essentialized by non-identity while it is modally *undistinguished*? Dasein lives as undistinguished - it is "indifferent" to Being - when it lives as neither fallen nor anticipatorily resolute. It lives from within a "pallid lack of mood," not totally habituated by the They, but neither is it interested in existential self-understanding; it "has no urge for anything" (ibid: 396). As such, one "[fails] to stand by oneself" (ibid: 166). For example, in its solicitude, Dasein may not be either for or against another human being. Rather, another does not "matter" to Dasein, who "passes by" them with indifference (ibid: 158). I do not focus on this, nor does Heidegger. I make the distinction here simply to indicate how Dasein need not completely "fall" into the They as an everyday modality in order to *not* be modally authentic.

fundamental to Dasein is its temporal structure as potentiality-for-Being. And, as I will suggest until this dissertation's end, because the analytic engenders this revelation, it is well-equipped to recover non-identity thinking as a benchmark for everyday experience, and therefore also to engender very practical consequences for Dasein's inherent capacities for instigating social critique and change.[301]

To put these intentions into the broader context of this dissertation, I remind that the latter's interest in "searching" for non-identity in Fundamental Ontology is motivated by what I have for Adorno's polemic partitioned into three groups of objections: (1) Dasein is a substantive subject, (2) modal authenticity is an abstraction or reification of human being as well as (3) a covert justification for social domination. While the primary aim of Chapter One was to challenge the first objection, because these objections are mutually entailing I had also begun to challenge the second and third. Similarly, as this chapter primarily aims to argue that non-identity is at the center of Heidegger's notion of Being, it will respond to the first and second objections, and, in doing so, will occasionally point to the third.

. . .

With an eye toward its potentiality for catalyzing meaningful revisions of our everyday beliefs and actions, let us begin by considering the programmatic approach of Heidegger's analytic. What is most important to grasp about this approach is how it sets in motion an evolving dialogue between our thematic and unthematic horizons of consciousness, toward ontological disclosure. While here the thematic horizon corresponds to our purview while interpreting Being *existentially*, it is the unthematic horizon from within which we normally interpret our being-in-the-world (it corresponds to *existentiell* interpretation). While the horizons

---

[301] However, as we see in Heidegger's own case, undertaking the existential analytic and thinking within the framework of Fundamental Ontology is not *promised* to engender practical consequences for working toward a more just world. I will focus on this issue in Chapter Four.

carry perspectival disparity, they are parallel in the pace at which they contribute to maturations

of understanding Being. As I will trace out, understanding Being from the perspectives of our

occupation with the existential analytic on the one hand, and of our typical being-in-the-world on

the other, must develop in tandem. This approach is advantageous for the success of *Being and

Time*'s end agenda to dissolve the "problem" of Being altogether by ushering the truth of the

meaning of Being to the forefront of everyday consciousness, whether we are acting as

philosophical practitioners or immersed in our daily routines. As is the case for all true

phenomenology, this requires the existential analytic to be an intensely personal undertaking.

Our ongoing role as readers is not merely to comprehend theoretically how the text portrays

Dasein's shift toward authentic understanding, but in doing so to sustain deeply internal shifts of

our own. Though to a separate point, Herman Philipse makes the case that engaging with *Being

and Time* (and this applies to all genuine phenomenological reflection) obliges "what might be

called the *reflectively* internalist requirement: that we apply Heidegger's conception and method

of interpretation when we interpret Heidegger's text."[302] For indeed, "the question of existence,"

Heidegger insists, amplifying the most basic tenet of phenomenological and existential thinking,

"never gets straightened out except through existing itself."[303] If overriding the historical

"forgottenness" of Being is to be made a real possibility, it is not enough that readers simply

recognize, by chronicling the interpretative processes of Dasein as the human condition broadly

construed, how Heidegger performs this idea (of understanding *through* existing). Instead, the

existential analytic must be taken as a means to the end of reconfiguring how our understanding

of Being will be accommodated or manifested practically once we ourselves "return" from the

realm of ontology that we inhabit while engrossed with the question of Being (and the text), to

---

[302] Philipse, 1998: 47.
[303] Heidegger 2008a: 33.

realm of the ontic, where day-to-day projects overrun our attention. The ideal aim is for our

mundane being-in-the-world to become habituated to our ontological understanding, which,

while undertaking the existential analytic, gradually gains in depth. To be sure, thematic insight

into the meaning of Being cannot, and in fact should not stand in place of our *being* mundanely.

Heidegger's programmatic approach encourages us, rather, to be "along a way" in which

existential and existentiell interpretation is, we might say, "blended"; where, within everyday

experience, our judgments of the ontological are as immediately and routinely passed into

awareness as is the content of our most familiar dealings.[304] Heidegger frequently alludes to this,

for example when he tells us that "if one posits 'practical' concern as the primary and

predominant kind of Being which factical Dasein possesses," then

> the ontological possibility of 'theory' will be due to the *absence of praxis* – that is, to a *privation*.
> But the discontinuance of a specific manipulation in our concernful dealings *does not simply*
> *leave the guiding circumspection behind as a remainder*…. The tarrying [of the theoretical
> attitude] which is discontinued when one manipulates, can take on the character of a more precise
> kind of circumspection, such as 'inspecting,' checking up on what has been attained, or looking
> over the 'operations' ["Betrieb"] which are now 'at a standstill'…. 'Practical' dealings have their
> *own* ways of tarrying. And just as *praxis* has its own specific kind of sight ('theory'), theoretical
> research is not without a *praxis* of its own.[305]

By "practical concern," Heidegger means concern for exactly those of our thoughts and actions

that have been habitualized by our being-in-the-world as the They, and which are conducted

without real agency - agency that might be intentionally cultivated in the wake of arriving at

ontological insight. With that, though for Heidegger it is not concern for the "practical" that

should originally drive existential analysis (which he roughly, and, I would argue, mistakenly

correlates here with "theoretical research"), such analysis cannot occur in earnest without

gaining "sight" for how the character of our praxis can readily inform our concern for the

---

[304] In this way, Heidegger, to a certain degree, "blends" Kant's analytic and synthetic judgments.
[305] Ibid: 409 - my brackets for clarity.

conditions of Being as a whole.[306] "Blending" existential and existentiell interpretation does not

solely or even literally entail the *application* of theory (ontological understanding) to praxis

(lived experience), not just because applied theory is often performed in the abstract and,

consequently, is often limited in its ability to contribute to a holistic understanding of truth, but

because the praxis of Dasein is always "reflected back ontologically upon the way in which

Dasein itself gets interpreted."[307]

Efforting to "blend" the two horizons of consciousness in this way is and must (until

death) be an endless process, just as it must be interminably interrupted or inhibited by Dasein's

personifying the doctrinal character of the They. Though the They *is* an *a priori* condition of

Being and thus should be read in broad reference to Dasein's necessarily understanding itself

publicly or through the lens of others, as I will examine in more detail in Chapter Three, the

specific character that the They embodies will always vary across historical and socio-cultural

"situations."[308] The They of our and Heidegger's "today" is designated by the western late-

capitalist ethos that dissuades us from putting ourselves into question and encourages us instead

to interpret the world from out of exclusive concern with our routine relations to ("little b")

---

[306] To bring Adorno into this issue for a moment, note his remark in *The Jargon of Authenticity* that "there is nothing between heaven and earth that is in itself ontic or ontological; rather, everything becomes what it is only by means of the constellation into which it is brought by philosophy" (Adorno 2003: 97). There he is criticizing the Ontology, arguing that it provides no basis for the possibility of discerning relational patterns among objects in their historical contexts (the "true" pursuit of philosophy as modeled by negative dialectics), and that this failure originates in a hidden attempt to distinguish, and therefore to unify under the absolute concept, lived existence on the one hand and a hypostatized idea of Being on the other. While reserving remarks on the conclusion of Adorno's criticism for later on, here I initially suggest another way to illustrate why its premise is mistaken; namely, by highlighting how imperative it is for the existential analytic to precisely *not* distinguish the ontic from the ontological. The idea of Being via the existential analytic cannot be hypostatized, for, as I examine in the passage above, it is affected and granted susceptibility to change by insights developed from within "practical" experience, which, importantly for Heidegger, we must not take as being in conjunction to, and rather as essentially integrated with, insights received within dedicated ontological meditation.

[307] Ibid: 36-37.

[308] This point has important implications for evaluating the soundness of Adorno's critique. I will introduce some of these implications in section two of this chapter, and I will focus on them more heavily in Chapter Three and in parts of Chapter Four.

beings.[309] The ultimate vision of the existential analytic is to transform existentiell interpretation so that the guiding concern of ontic life *just is* concern for the meaning of Being, including how the latter is always disclosed progressively. Such concern is not merely notional, but increasingly become accustomed to as an intuitive way of being-in-the-world. The transformation thereby experienced is that between modal inauthenticity or indistinguishability, and modal authenticity, a transformation which, far from instantaneous, must rely on prior ontological insight and its recursive revisions over time. While existentiell interpretation "does not require that the ontological structure of existence should be theoretically transparent," Dasein, so long as it embodies the They "primarily and for the most part," is well-positioned neither to theorize about the They as an onto-existential structure nor to resist it in praxis.[310] The existential analytic serves as at least one effective avenue through which Dasein can empower itself to do both. Undertaking it accordingly requires that we straddle the ontological and ontic horizons at once. Putting these horizons into dialogue, we maneuver back-and-forth between transcendental meditation on the meaning of Being and our mundane projects in which our thematic ontological understanding is lived, tested, and refined.

To advance further understanding of the nature of the analytic (and of the hermeneutic of Being), let us consider the role of language in the earlier Heidegger alongside the necessity of these perspectival interchanges. As pointed out in this chapter's opening pages, grappling with this issue will help to illustrate how attempts to express Being are a vital part of the analytic in their own right. We witness Heidegger to steadily "circle" around the question of Being *as* he steadily confronts the need to revise his means of expressing both the question and meaning Being. In doing so, he indicates the hermeneutic character of both language and the relation

---

[309] See Chapter Three for a more detailed interpretation of "the They."
[310] Heidegger 2008a: 33.

between language and Being, as he also gestures toward the impossibility of being-in-the-world without always *being* structured by non-being. The remainder of this section integrates these two considerations.

The notion of non-being for Heidegger takes root in his introductory posing of the question of the meaning of Being and his rejoinder that, for Dasein, the answer is always and already self-evident. In Chapter One, I recounted how this is illustrated by our bearing ability and inclination to pose the question at all. That Dasein "is *fascinated by* the world with which it is concerned," that one is prepared and eager to study the natural sciences, for example, is pre-conditioned by Dasein's living as wonder about or *care* for its being.[311] "Dasein is in itself ontological" because it always understands Being "pre-ontologically."[312] Extrapolating on Chapter One, what must now be underscored is how Dasein's pre-ontological understanding of, or for the sake of brevity what I will call its "pre-understanding" of Being, necessarily involves pre-understanding non-being as an essential condition of Dasein's capacity to grasp what it means for something to *be* a thing at all. Understanding that a thing *is* invariably presupposes recognition of what or how that thing in innumerable ways *is not*.[313] This preliminarily clues us in to Heidegger's proposition that, prior to ontological investigation, while casually attending to things (beings), we inherently pre-understand non-being's immanence in Being, that non-being grounds what is, or, to tentatively use Adorno's own phrase, that existence is established in "the mind's non-being moment."[314] In spite of the fact that it is ordinarily concealed, the meaning of

---

[311] Ibid: 88.
[312] Ibid: 34-36.
[313] By the term "intending," I do not mean to conjure the idea of intentionality in the traditional phenomenological sense. Instead, once again I am alluding to how Heidegger refashions, rather than outright rebuffing, the term "intentionality" to signify being-in-the-world, where the latter in turn indicates the impossibility of considering or dealing with a thing without this involving tacit awareness of the wider holistic context that conditions the thing's specific sense for Dasein at a given time.
[314] Adorno 1990: 201-2.

Being, as characterized by non-being, is given *a priori*. Pre-understanding non-being is a transcendental co-condition of Dasein.

Another preliminary clue is the ease and degree to which we use the infinitive "to be," Heidegger points out. Deriving from the Latin *infinitivus*, the term "infinitive" connotes that which lies or extends beyond concepts by which the meanings of subjects and tenses are pre-determinately bound. When we say "to be," we are working from our pre-understanding that the states of affairs to which the infinitive may refer are potentialities heterogeneous to a thing as it is perceived at a given time.[315] In the context of the question of Being, what we correctly pre-understand is Being *not* as subjectivity in the customary sense of the term wherein meaning (of identity, knowledge, experience) is suggested to remain static across time and circumstance, and instead as an action (*sein*, "to be"), connoting its fluid, hermeneutic character. Heidegger's electing to use the substantive "Being" is misleading given that he designates the being of entities too by the (lowercase) substantive.[316] Requiring ample stress, then, is how Being "demands that it be conceived in a way of its own, essentially contrasting with the concepts in which entities acquire their *determinate* signification."[317] Nevertheless, using the substantive apparently is necessary,[318] for, inasmuch as having the state of Being means actively "to be," omitting it risks redundancy, if not altogether unreadability (e.g., we would read Heidegger to

---

[315] On Heidegger's use of the copula, Adorno writes: "Because 'is' is neither a merely subjective function nor a thing, an entity - because to our traditional way of thinking it is no objectivity - Heidegger calls it 'Being.' [...] The insight that 'is' can be called neither a mere thought nor a mere entity does not permit its transfiguration into something transcendent in relation to those two definitions" (Adorno 1990: 104). Throughout this chapter and this dissertation as a whole, I will continue in various contexts to justify how Being is *not* "transcendent" in this sense of the term.

[316] When he contends that the question of Being requires understanding the being of entities, Heidegger often refers to entities by way of ("big B") Being, as in: "The Being of entities 'is' not itself an entity" (Heidegger 2008a: 26). This is inevitable, as our understanding of the being of entities reflects - it is occasioned by - our understanding of the meaning of Being itself.

[317] Ibid - my italics for emphasis.

[318] See Translator's fn. 1, ibid: 1.

explain "how to be is to be looked at").[319] Thus must Heidegger reconcile the idea of Being with

the inevitable linguistic constraint on its expression. Specifying Being as in relation to Dasein

("to be *there*") helps to mollify the problem of conveying its distinctiveness, for it situates Being

in the human condition, which, as opposed to entities that (very arguably) cannot identify

themselves in the particular way that humans do in time, is a matter of finding oneself *thrown*.[320]

However, Heidegger articulates the Being-Dasein connection itself still quite nebulously, where

this is exemplified in passages such as "Dasein, in its Being, has a relationship towards that

Being - a relationship which itself is one of Being."[321] Heidegger does not sufficiently clarify

that, though what the terms signify is ultimately the same, they are distinguished for two,

connected reasons. First, whereas Being *as it is treated within existential analysis* is "a *concept*

at one's disposal," Dasein is lived existence.[322] When Heidegger claims that "Understanding of

Being is itself a definite characteristic of Dasein's Being," what he means is that Dasein *is* the

way that it particularly is because primordially structuring it is its temporal self-awareness, and

the latter is just what Being fundamentally means; it signifies that *to be* Dasein is to be in relation

to (that is, to understand) itself as temporal projection.[323] "Only because Dasein is as constituted

by [understanding], can anything like Being be understood; only so is it possible to understand

Being."[324] To intelligibly articulate Dasein's contingency on this ontological structure, the

---

[319] Ibid: 26. The referring remark is "any treatment of it in line with the elucidations we have given requires us to explain how Being is to be looked at."
[320] While much contemporary philosophical and psychological literature has left in question the nature of the relationship of non-human animals to human animals' conception of time, this does not vitally bear on our interests here. To confirm, it is helpful to remember that Dasein only is ontologically "prioritized" insofar as our concern is with the phenomenality of being human. For Heidegger, this priority, as I will briefly suggest in areas throughout this dissertation, does not necessarily entail that humans are or should be granted moral or ethical privilege.
[321] Ibid: 32.
[322] Ibid: 27.
[323] Ibid: 32.
[324] Ibid: 272 - my brackets.

analytic must extract Dasein from its embeddedness in mundane life and designate it by the concept.[325]

As the very essence of Being prohibits its absolute representation - "it resists every attempt at definition" - the problem of faithfully capturing the meaning of Being in language is a critical component of the problem of disclosing such meaning.[326] How can we talk about Being when Being is, for the concept, just *not* itself, or, as Heidegger puts it more strikingly a few years later, when it "remains undiscoverable, almost like Nothing, or in the end *entirely* so"?[327] "Only by doing battle," Reiner Schürmann writes in *Broken Hegemonies*, "does ordinary language remain familiar with phenomena. By means of a brutal syntax, it forces them under concepts. A battle ensues owing to the referential amplitude of words, for their scope always exceeds a particular given."[328] Heidegger is clearly to be read in this. While conceding the inevitable limitation of words to convey the meaning of Being in full, he acknowledges how critical it is to continue "battling" with words, to work with them creatively in ways that push them nearer to Being (as non-being), as expressions of the mortal infinitude by which Being is essentialized. Such work involves taking caution to avoid relying on what Schürmann there calls "ordinary language," which eliminates "singularized" moments of existence in favor of pronouncing and reinforcing the "hegemonic fantasm" of universal referents.[329]

---

[325] After *Being and Time*, Heidegger continues to adjust his ways of expressing the Being-Dasein relation. Especially with intent of differentiating the concept of Being from its depiction by traditional metaphysics (which he earlier often puts as "ancient ontology"), from at least 1929 onward Heidegger substitutes "Being" with either the un-capitalized substantive "being" or the archaically spelled "Seyn (Beyng)." In 1949, he clarifies in retrospect that "in the language of metaphysics the word 'existence' is a synonym of 'Dasein'.... In *Being and Time*, the term 'existence' is used exclusively for the Being of the human Being. Once 'existence' is understood correctly, the 'essence' of Dasein can be thought" (Heidegger 1998: 283). Soon after, he abandons the term "Dasein" entirely, reasons for which include a desire to ensure that his expressions of Being more adequately reflect his commitment to eliminate the substantive "I" (an issue of marked interest to many of his contemporary critics).

[326] Heidegger 2008a: 21.

[327] Heidegger 2014: 39.

[328] Schürmann 2003: 19.

[329] Schürmann distinguishes the "particular" from the "singular," where the former are still subsumable under, and the latter resist, subsumption under universal concepts. Not only would grappling with this distinction in detail derail

Whereas for Schürmann "ordinary language" can refer to the domination of modern western ideologies more generally, for Heidegger it (though he does not use the exact term) refers to traditional metaphysical dogma in particular. At the basis of Heidegger's appeal for "overcoming" metaphysics ("the task of destroying the history of ontology") is his problematizing Being's identification with a hypostatized representation of subjectivity.[330] "In Heidegger's sense of the word, metaphysics cannot escape thinking being within the perspective of beings, which means that being remains effectively no different from beingness and beings," Krzysztof Ziarek writes.[331] Across metaphysical accounts, Heidegger discerns a shared neglect to position subjectivity from within facticity, leading to "the dispersal of the 'I.'"[332] There, the subject's being, distinguished but meagerly from the being of entities, is reduced to a non-relative concept: "the subjectivity of the *subjectum* ultimately develops into the absolute."[333] Because Being *is* the subject's being (its experience of embodied, factical consciousness), the true question of Being is, following suit, forgotten.

The historical failure of metaphysics, then, finds one reason not in its efforts to represent Being per se, but in its continued negligence to concede the limits of representation. This concession is a precondition not only for understanding the meaning of Being, but for being aware of the need to question Being *correctly* - that is, (1) with interest for Being's difference

---

the topic at hand, it would confuse the meaning of what in this dissertation I am referring to as the "particular," which, in Adorno's sense of the term, I find aligns more closely with what Schürmann means by the "singular" (Schürmann 2003).

[330] Heidegger 2008a: 41-48.

[331] Ziarek 2013: 82.

[332] This is in *Contributions to Philosophy (of the Event)* (Heidegger 2012: 253-4). In *Being and Time*, written approximately ten years earlier, Heidegger speaks of this "dispersal" in terms of Dasein's identification with the They; Dasein's subjectivity is dispersed in its conformity (Heidegger 2008a: 167). I note this here to foreshadow remarks on how Heidegger does not find metaphysics solely to blame for the problem of Being, but more generally the "groupthink" character of societies at large. That the earlier Heidegger focuses on the conductivity of metaphysics to the problem of Being (and not the concretely social), finds one simple reason in his overarching aim to interrupt academic philosophy's posturing that the question of Being is not part of a "holism" with all other philosophical questions. At a few points in this section and the next, I will suggest why we should interpret Heidegger to correlate this misbelief in the academy with the misbeliefs of the They; the two are co-conditional.

[333] Heidegger 2008a: 354.

from the fabricated, substantive subject, (2) by understanding that metaphysical questions relate holistically to one another *a priori*, and, what is of most emphasis here, (3) by heeding one's originary intuition that Being enigmatically "slips away" from its concept. Given that it does not concede the limits of representation, metaphysics is already positioned to question not Being itself but, like modern science, an attenuated representation of it as a "totality" of entities that are universally "for" the concept. A second and following reason is that the "categorical content of the traditional ontology [metaphysics] has been carried over to ... entities with corresponding formalizations."[334] Contra the implication in metaphysics that "the things themselves" are atemporal, Heidegger stresses how the meanings of entities are not truly independent from the temporality of Dasein, and how interpretation is rather always impermanent and inconclusive; it is simply hermeneutical. In the next section and chapters, I return to discuss Heidegger's understanding of onto-hermeneutic temporality as well as his leading claim that *how* Dasein interprets itself in time is what essentially determines how it interprets entities and the world as a whole. For now, I simply prefigure how entities, when they are interpreted as they "really" are in relation to Dasein (i.e., as determined by Being), are revealed to be simultaneously *for* and *against* the concept, a crucial fact that Heidegger maintains is lost on traditional metaphysics. So long as to grasp the being of entities is initially to grasp - it is conditioned by Dasein's grasping of - Being, entities too always escape the concepts and expressions on which Dasein relies to identify them. "In giving an existential signification to 'sight,'" Heidegger writes, "we have merely drawn upon the peculiar feature of seeing, that it lets entities which are accessible to it be encountered unconcealedly *in themselves*."[335] *When* entities are encountered as such (for this is

---

[334] Ibid: 44 – my brackets.
[335] Ibid: 187.

not *inauthentic* Dasein's natural way of seeing), they are revealed to be heterogeneous to their ascribed concepts.[336]

To explain this in different light, Heidegger regards metaphysics to be the harbinger of its own failure because it formulates the question of Being in terms of asking after "what is" - where "what is" is then totalized within an isolated present - without in the same stroke asking after the equally important "what is not" - a question that points to the negativity of meaning production (that nevertheless constitutes such production positively). In a footnote to his 1946 "Letter on 'Humanism,'" he contends that "'Being' and 'being itself' at once enter the *isolation of the Absolute* through [traditional metaphysics'] way of saying things."[337] Underlying this problem more generally, of course, is the presumption that genuinely thinking about Being can occur independently of examining lived experience. What is first and foremost amiss about metaphysics is its insufficient care for reflecting and reporting on experience in a phenomenologically faithful way, which importantly means by recognizing and valuing the hermeneutic of Being. As I will explain further in the next chapter, for Heidegger, metaphysics corroborates modern science, which he designates in his later works as mutually informed by the They's "worldview," wherein the meaning of Being is forgotten or of disinterest. Pursued correctly, ontology is based on one's *"appropriation"* of lived possibilities. That traditional metaphysics foregoes this path demonstrates its attachment to the doctrinal thinking of the They. In *Being and Time*, metaphysics "spring[s] precisely from inauthentic existence," Schürmann

---

[336] As Michael Zimmerman explains, "For Heidegger, 'to represent' meant not to accept the thing as it presents itself, but rather to *re*-present the thing in the sense of portraying it in terms amenable to the standards and purposes of the re-presenting subject" (Zimmermann 1990: 172).
[337] Heidegger 1998: 245 – my brackets.

notes, and this "indicates first and foremost that the retrieval proper of the being question is bound to fail unless it is preceded by what [Heidegger] then calls an existentiell modification."[338]

For all that, Heidegger concludes that the assumptions of traditional metaphysics inhibit it from truly doing metaphysics at all, and thus that its "end" has been historically inevitable. On these points Adorno does not totally contradict: "*According to its own concept*, metaphysics cannot be a deductive context of judgments about things in being";[339] "metaphysics cannot rise again" (though it "must know how to wish").[340] While Adorno *is* concerned with doing metaphysics, he demands that it be done as part of a holistic endeavor in which epistemological and socio-political concerns also coalesce. His position closely parallels Heidegger's, for which this "[t]alk of the end of metaphysics must not mislead us into thinking that philosophy would be done without 'metaphysics.' Quite to the contrary, 'metaphysics' in its essential impossibility must now for the first time play over to philosophy, and the latter itself in the same way must play over to its other beginning."[341] In this regard, Heidegger echoes Hume, whose skepticism of metaphysics and epistemology leads him not to reject their concerns, but to provide an account of knowledge dissociated from their imperious principles. The "other beginning" of metaphysics *as* Fundamental Ontology originates in Heidegger's, like Adorno's, refusal to reduce philosophy to specialized subdisciplines.[342] This refusal provides Heidegger recourse from traditional metaphysics' flawed approach to disclosing Being: As a "destruction of the history of

---

[338] Schürmann 1987: 237-38 - my brackets.

[339] Adorno 1990: 407 - my italics. Note: Adorno's philosophical procedure is itself largely deductive, whereas Heidegger's is inductive. Adorno's rationale for holding that metaphysics is doomed "according to its own concept" is, on that basis, still different from Heidegger's. My point here is that, at this particular juncture, their conclusions coincide.

[340] Adorno 1990: 404.

[341] Heidegger 2012: 136.

[342] Unlike Adorno, however, the specific philosophical concerns that Heidegger integrates into his earlier framework do not explicitly bear on concrete socio-political concerns, not to mention that Adorno's efforts to make philosophy a whole with other parts of intellectual "discipline" (sociology, musical theory, and cultural and literary criticism most of all) are more robust.

ontology," Fundamental Ontology "is essentially bound up with the way the question of Being is formulated," and as such Heidegger deems it metaphysics made anew.[343] In the same pattern, throughout the span of his career he keeps "going back to the beginning," upsetting his own works preceding, finding greater precision in thinking and saying Being. Still sustaining across those works is his resolution that "metaphysical inquiry must be posed as a whole and from the essential position of the existence that questions."[344] In a 2003 essay, Karl Aho explains that

> as an area of philosophical inquiry, Heidegger sees nothing inherently wrong with metaphysics. The problem is that the metaphysical worldview has become so dominant that it 'drives out every other possibility of revealing' (QCT, 27). Consequently, the metaphysical worldview becomes absolute; it fails to recognize that it is merely one of many possible interpretations of the world. Although metaphysics is the prevailing historical interpretation, it has become tyrannical in the modern age, preventing any other possible horizon of disclosure.[345]

When taken phenomenologically and therefore hermeneutically, the concept of Being is retrieved from its arrogation by the history of post-Aristotelian western philosophy, where it has been pressurized into a subject-object divide, imagined autonomous against lived, temporal existence. Heidegger resituates Being *as* temporal existence, which is to say according to Dasein's evolving self-interpretation and hence its inherent possibility to always disclose the meaning of Being in different terms.[346]

Adorno insists comparably with Heidegger that, having "broken its pledge to be as one with reality or at the point of realization, philosophy is obliged ruthlessly to criticize itself."[347] His position, of course, is that Heidegger does not succeed to this end. The Ontology rehashes metaphysical dualism as a "peephole metaphysics," wherein the subject "is locked up in its own

---

[343] Ibid: 44.
[344] Heidegger 1998: 82.
[345] Aho 2003: 9.
[346] One objection here is that the Ontology too is "tyrannical," for it often appears to assume (though as I have argued, Heidegger does not assume) that the existential analytic is the *only* horizon from within which Being can be effectively disclosed. Toward the end of the next section and throughout the subsequent chapters, I offer counter-objections to this especially by way of addressing Adorno's accompanying claim that Being in Heidegger is ahistorical and asocial.
[347] Adorno 1990: 3.

self," peering at reality "as through the crenels of a parapet."[348] Adorno equates being-in-the-world with interpreting reality through the lens of one, absolute concept (his interpretation of Being), which implicates that Dasein identifies itself and phenomena with static representations (i.e., it does not surpass identity thinking). And yet, to repeat, for both the earlier and later Heidegger, though Being is designated by the concept, it is not to the concept thereby reduced, for what the concept ultimately designates is the non-being of Being. What is in the end conceptualized via the existential analytic is that Being escapes conceptualization, which at the same time reveals how the latter is exactly contingent on that which it cannot, in the ordinary sense of the term as representation or identity thinking, quite conceive.[349] By transition, although Dasein *is* a reflexive relation (a relation that just is the meaning of Being), and although it is "locked" into a particular essence ("its own self"), that essence conditions Dasein's self-identity to always be conceptually fractured. By virtue of its being in and as *time*, Dasein is ontologically incapable of truly hypostatizing itself and the world, whether it is, as either authentic or inauthentic, aware of this or not.

Inadvertent support for this reading of Being/Dasein is often found in Adorno's own writings, for instance in his criticism of Hegel. Turning briefly to this criticism is helpful for understanding why Heidegger preserves and prioritizes the negativity of Being. Adorno rejects philosophy that does not retain the dialectic, while also remonstrating Hegel for converging reality and (absolute, linear progressing) rationality. This conjunction of claims is what first gives way to Adorno's negative dialectic. As he interprets Fundamental Ontology to account for neither the dialectic nor the non-conceptual element of rationality and experience, Adorno argues that it reinforces the fallacious aspects of Hegel's paradigm while it also dismisses the latter's

---

[348] Ibid: 139.
[349] Heidegger 2008a: 27.

virtue for setting philosophy on its historical path of perceiving the dialectical nature of existence. I suggest instead that Heidegger, though opting to conceive of subject-object mediation under the rubric of hermeneutics and not dialectics, still preserves the crux of the meaning of (Hegelian) dialectics in his onto-phenomenology,[350] as he also censures Hegel for reifying (dialectical) Being. Criticizing Hegel, Adorno writes: "The abstract concept necessarily lacks the ability to be nonconceptual, and Hegel credits this lack to it as a merit."[351] By the same token, Heidegger criticizes Hegel's "recasting" Being to be without "essential change" and thus withdrawing it "into consciousness and absolute certainty."[352] Adorno, to be sure, moves on to identify Heidegger as recasting, with no "essential change," Hegel's "purification" of Being "as it rejects its contents," where "contents" are phenomena in their particularity and hence non-identical to the concept of Being.[353] In Chapter One, I preliminarily discussed how the Ontology preserves the particularity of phenomena, and I will return to this idea in several passages of this chapter and more heavily in the chapters to come. Here, I challenge Adorno's more general claim that there is no discrimination to be reasonably found between Being as it is represented in the Ontology versus how it is represented in traditional metaphysics. Heidegger broadly concurs with Hegel's proposition that Being *is* thinking (*logos*), or, as it is named in *Being and Time*, interpretation. He also preserves Hegel's insistence on the inseparability of Being/interpretation on the one hand, and immediate existence ("dwelling") on the other. In view of combining these points, Walter Brogan explains that "Dasein is always already dwelling, that which governs and first of all makes possible the unity of thinking and being, the *logos* of synthesis, and the

---

[350] For more explicit remarks on the relation between hermeneutics and dialectics, see Chapter Four, section four of this dissertation.
[351] Adorno 1990: 121.
[352] Heidegger 2012: 183 - my brackets.
[353] Adorno 1990: 121.

relationship of the two."[354] Heidegger does reject, however, Hegel's establishing this situation to be "an *immediate* unity of *being-in-itself* and *being-for-itself*"[355]- an identification of immediate existence with metaphysical essence, from which Heidegger diverges on the basis that it reduces Being to a subjective, omnipresent "*substance*" that single-handedly conditions meaning formation. Shaun Gallagher succinctly articulates the point in his book, *Hegel, History, and Interpretation*, as follows:

> Insofar as the thinking of Being is connected with experience, this implies an entirely different meaning of Being for Heidegger, even if he is concerned with the same realm of Being and essence as Hegel. For Heidegger in contradistinction to Hegel, essence means not grounding but the loss of any firm ground, an abyss.[356]

Though Being and interpretation are, so to speak, "unified" in Heidegger, it does not thereby follow that the concept of hermeneutic Being unifies phenomena (including the subject/Dasein) with absolute concepts. Quite the contrary, what grounds interpreted experience is its structure of Being as non-being, or as that which, by virtue of time, is not yet or fully actualized. To use Adorno's term, Being always includes or points toward some "remainder."

Given that Adorno reproaches Heidegger for studying Being *qua* Being, i.e., through what is for Adorno the use of an absolute concept, let us unpack by distinguishing more carefully, in comparison with Adorno's notion of non-identity, what for Heidegger *the concept* of Being precisely suggests. My position is that, if to think non-identically is at root to preserve the concept's intrinsic referral to phenomena that are heterogeneous to the concept - to that which is experientially "infinite"[357] - then in the Ontology the concept of Being relates to Being "itself" non-identically.[358] Approaching this from the other direction, coming to terms with the

---

[354] Brogan 2012: 185.
[355] Hegel 1976: 120.
[356] Gallagher 1997: 51.
[357] Adorno 1990: 13-15.
[358] Although Adorno is often concerned explicitly with the concept, and Heidegger with a broader notion of experience, there should be no qualms about juxtaposing the two in regard to non-identity and Adorno's stipulations

irreducibility of Being to representation is just how Being *as* non-being is revealed. With that in

mind, there are two ways to apprehend in the Ontology the concept as a non-identical relation: 1)

the concept of Being is non-identical to Being per se, and 2) Being per se is just a relation or an

act of non-identity with itself (as Dasein) and other phenomena. When we conceive of Being

"properly," it by changeover becomes clear that the fundamental structure of lived existence

(Being) is non-being as (a certain, originary form of) temporality.[359]

In the first case, when from within the horizon of existential analysis we examine Being

as "a concept at our disposal," we do not presuppose it to be absolute; it does not reside in an

isolated sphere of either subjectivity or objectivity as it is in the traditional metaphysical

dichotomy. Paul Tillich, whose theological existentialism is heavily indebted to Heidegger,

contends that

> it is the function of an ontological concept to use some realm of experience to point to
> characteristics of being-itself which lie about the split between subjectivity and objectivity and
> which therefore cannot be expressed literally in terms taken from the subjective or the objective
> side. Ontology speaks analogously. Being and being transcends objectivity as well as
> subjectivity.[360]

While Tillich's reading is right, what must be clarified is that Being's "transcendence" (a term

Heidegger utilizes himself)[361] does not imply that Being somehow metaphysically exceeds

conceptuality in its relation to the phenomenal world. Rather, it is deemed transcendent to the

two realms simply because it is an amalgam of them. Refusing equation with the statically

---

for it. Indeed, "modes of Being" include all of "looking at something, understanding and *conceiving* it, choosing, [and accessing] it" (Heidegger 2008a: 26 - my italics). Experiential Dasein, as a lived hermeneutic, *is* a rationally thinking Dasein. What is more, Adorno's prescribed antidote to "damaged life" is to explore what he calls "spiritual experience," which we can interpret as a holistic mode of living in which one resolves to recover those aspects of subjectivity that, via intellectual canons and the late capitalist ethos, have been lost. (Cf. Roger Foster, *Adorno: The Recovery of Experience*, 2007.)

[359] Throughout this dissertation I will progressively unfold the meaning of what Heidegger calls "primordial" or "ecstatic" time. For the most detailed explanations, see Chapter Four, sections one, two, and three.

[360] Tillich 2014: 125.

[361] For a more thorough analysis of the meaning of "transcendence" in Heidegger, particularly in comparison to Adorno's critique of it, see Chapter Four, especially section two of this dissertation. There I argue that, for Heidegger, "transcendence" aligns as much, if not more, with Adorno's meaning of the term as it does with its meaning for traditional transcendental philosophy (Kant, Husserl, Brentano).

subjective and/or an objective constancy imagined to surpass experience, Being is not identical with either.

In the second case, we see that it is *through* attempts to fully conceptualize Being, and our subsequent experience of Being's resistance to this attempt, that Being is disclosed as temporally fractured – that to exist as Dasein is, in essence, to self-relate in the way of always "running ahead" of itself within (historically) present experience. The existential analytic, guiding readers to discover the character of conceptuality as always and already a temporal relation, complements Adorno's vision of a "cognitive utopia," which "would be to use concepts to unseal the nonconceptual with concepts, without making it their equal."[362] In the analytic we approach "the non-being of Being" (i.e., Being *as* Dasein's thinking non-identically) by means of the concept of Being. We discover that the concept is hermeneutic (in Adorno's case, a negative dialectic) through revealing Being as such. Although what holds our attention in the analytic is not Being per se, it, perhaps counter-intuitively, approaches the truth of Being more closely than previously possible from within everyday existence, where our ontic understanding (presumably) has not yet been imbued by ontological understanding.

What the analytic shows us, moreover, is that, insofar as Being *is* Dasein's lived interpretation, and interpretation requires the concept, Being constitutes conceptuality. While the concept of Being is a means to the end of, first, existenti*a*lly, and second, existenti*e*lly interpreting Being as non-being, this interpretation as it subliminally persists even in modal inauthenticity is in turn responsible for our ability to bear concepts, in the particular way that we do, at all. Non-conceptuality conveys the concept "by way of its meaning," Adorno corroborates, "which in turn establishes its conceptuality."[363] Looking to the concept therefore serves as an

---

[362] Adorno 1990: 10.
[363] Adorno 1990:12. - my brackets.

"ontological clue" for understanding Being's onto-existential structures by finding that those structures cannot be conceptualized completely if we are to avoid reifying Being. This clue helps us to grasp that Being - as lived interpretation, and so "apart" from its (absolute) concept, to a significant degree – just *is* defined by the discrete temporal character of being human.

Dasein's registering how its interpretation always leaves a conceptual "remainder" occurs in the *event of appropriation* [*Ereignis*]. The event for both the earlier and later Heidegger is that whereby the relation between Being (Beyng/being) and Dasein ("Da-sein" or, in his latest writings, the altogether absence of a term denoting subjectivity in favor of the present participles "thinking" and "saying") is no longer shrouded. That is to say, it is where ontological understanding tacitly comes to shape existentiell interpretation.[364] Dasein "consigns" Being to itself, or itself to Being, enabling its lived experience to be piloted by self-understanding as a fundamentally temporal relation.[365]

The event is impossible so long as Being has yet to truly "stand out" against its concealment by Dasein's living as the They. Commensurately, without the event, expressing Being will be delimited by the language of the They, with which traditional metaphysics' representations of Being coincide. In each case, the true notion of "subjectivity" - the notion of the subject as already bearing pre-ontological understanding simply through its ontic existence - is buried underneath dogmatic practice.[366] When Dasein resists this, it engages in an *act* of

---

[364] Once in a while, the later Heidegger *does* use a substantive. For example, he writes in a 1957 Freiburg lecture: "The event of appropriation brings the human and being into the ownership of their essential togetherness" (Heidegger 2012: 118). However, the term "human" here does not connote a substantive sense of subjectivity. Rather, utilizing it is a way (1) to *particularize* what previously was called Dasein (and Da-sein), and (2) to relate the particular individual to the essence of Being, which is the *activity* of thinking.

[365] See, for example, *Contributions to Philosophy (of the Event)*, especially pp. 323, 359-360 (Heidegger 2012).

[366] The philosophical subject-object dichotomy manifests *socially* as instrumentality and a loss of a sense of both individual and collective agency (and vice versa). They are dialectically engaged. Adorno's position is that, "[b]efore all social control, before all adjustment to conditions of dominion, the mere form of thoughts, the form of logical stringency, can be convicted of unfreedom…. [P]hilosophy and society are interrelated in philosophy's inmost core" (Adorno 1990: 233). I suggest that, to a great extent, Heidegger had this dialectical relationship in

unconcealing the structures of facticity. The event is possible first and foremost because

"[Dasein] *is* a definite mode of letting something be seen."[367] Whereas correspondence theories

broadly distinguish truth as a relation between a specific phenomenon and "real facts" (where

this relation is form of realism), for Heidegger, understanding faciticity (truth) cannot

conclusively be defined "factually" (even though the "fact" of faciticity *is* conclusively

irrefutable). Intimating this, he writes:

> To be closed off and covered up belongs to Dasein's *facticity*. In its full existential-ontological meaning, the proposition that 'Dasein is in the truth' states equiprimordially that 'Dasein is in untruth'. But only in so far as Dasein has been disclosed has it also been closed off; and only in so far as entities within-the-world have been uncovered along with Dasein, have such entities, as possibly encounterable within-the-world, been covered up (hidden) or disguised.[368]

The truth of Being, as it is constituted by hermeneutic thinking, is just not absolute. This does not

then mean, however, that truth is subjectively relative. Historically, philosophy (and this problem

remains today) has too often left us with an "either/or" scenario where absolutism and relativism

are mutually exclusive. Heidegger points to, as Adorno names it for him, a "third way," though I

distinguish my reason for favoring the term from Adorno's pejorative use of it. Adorno coins it

to substantiate a main objection undergirding all aspects of his critique; namely, that Heidegger,

by not beginning with the material (in Adorno's specific sense of the term), straightaway

precludes the chance of correctly accounting for the interlocking meanings of subjectivity and

objectivity. Adorno describes Being in Heidegger as a "third" because "every attempt to

conceive the 'is' at all, even in the palest generality, leads to entities on the one side and the

---

mind, and not only because he candidly strove to dismantle the dichotomy. Toward the end of this subsection, I present some ways in which to interpret parts of Division I as recounting experiences of suffering within exchange society - an experience which is to Dasein thus non-essential. The Introduction and Division I of *Being and Time* are in dialogue, and I question whether the Introduction, which states that the text's aim is to break away from metaphysics, finds a socially relevant response in Division I's description of the They, where emphasizes that metaphysics is not restricted to the "world" of academia, but that its assumptions parallel the ethos of public life. (Moreover, as previously mentioned, analyzing Heidegger's notion of the They in comparison with Adorno's understanding of exchange society will be a recurring task throughout this dissertation. See especially Chapters Three and Four.)

[367] Ibid: 57 - my italics for emphasis.
[368] Ibid: 265.

concepts on the other"; taking the copula thematically leads Heidegger to reify both consciousness and things (a nuanced point on which I will focus in parts of the next section as well as in Chapters Three and Four).[369] In doing so, Adorno dismisses that, for Heidegger, truth *is* objective largely in the sense that Adorno calls for. Truth is not only appropriated by disclosing *a priori* structures of lived existence that are yet still mutable in their specific manifestations (e.g., the case of the They, on which I will soon focus), but it entails acknowledging that the pursuit of truth itself is a constant *act* of reworking one's interpretations of those structures while entities and conditions come to be unconcealed in new ways. Thus truth does have a "relative" character for Heidegger, though this must be understood not in terms of conventional relativist theory. When Dasein appropriates truth, it is actively aware of the need to effort *toward* disclosing Being, for it accepts that disclosure is a continuous process of modifying ontological understanding (and accordingly, how one *is* modally - a topic for Chapters Three and Four). More specifically, Dasein will always to some extent stand in "untruth" because it must make and find meaning in the realm of the They, only wheeling into onto-existential reflection when practical dealings are at rest. Increasingly, however, Dasein self-identifies less with the They. Its mundane relations are remodeled as it comes to align its existentiell interpretations with its "proper" existential self-interpretations. Such alignment is never complete. Ontological truth in any given present moment is perceived *as* truth because Dasein retrospectively compares it in *relation* to how the meaning of Being has been antecedently disclosed with thicker "disguise." Given that, in the future, Dasein will retrospectively compare Being's disclosure in the same way (and so on and so on), comprehending this apparent paradox of the simultaneity of truth, or the non-being of Being, and "untruth," or Being as it is identified with the They, is necessary for the

---

[369] Adorno 1990: 104.

130

sake of appropriating truth itself. Truth is perceived as it "truly" is (i.e., apart from the reifying character of traditional metaphysics) just when Dasein concedes this paradox and chooses to stand in the discomfort of knowing that it never knows anything "truly" (in the metaphysical sense) except that its essence is not to know anything incontrovertibly.[370] Therefore, the one unassailable fact that Dasein's concession *does* bring to the fore is that essential to the meaning of Being is (perhaps tragically, but, as we also know, potentially reassuringly) is Dasein's being without the possibility of having categorical understanding of its facticity.

Primary truth, then, is "*phenomenological truth*" ("transcendental knowledge") that reveals Dasein's ontological structures. It reveals that the only static "fact" about facticity is that its meaning always outstrips judgments that attempt to hypostatize it as a static concept.[371] Being and truth are in this way interchangeable. And, as the truth of Being, the "Being of truth is connected primordially with Dasein."[372] Strictly speaking, Being only is "itself" when it is no longer veiled by Dasein as it lives as the They; for example, by the traditional metaphysician for whom judgments originate in idealist/realist principles that "have - with equal thoroughness - missed the meaning of the Greek conception of truth,"[373] and hence who neglects the truth "that the correctness of assertions arises from and presupposes the manifestness and openness of entities themselves."[374] Being is appropriately understood just when Dasein "lets it be seen" apart from its tendency, we can say preliminarily, to think identically.[375] Dasein is then able to project

---

[370] Importantly, this holds true for the existential analytic itself. On at least two occasions in *Being and Time*, Heidegger concedes that the approach is not the *only* way to interrogate Being, and that it may turn out that the approach is not the *right* one after all: "our way of exhibiting the constitution of Dasein's Being remains only *one way* which we may take." "Whether this is the *only* way or even the right one at all, can be decided only *after one has gone along it*" (Heidegger 2008a: 487). To adjudicate the efficacy of one's existential analyses is possible only as the latter advances.
[371] Heidegger 2008a: 62.
[372] Ibid: 252.
[373] Ibid: 57-58.
[374] Ibid: 125.
[375] See, for example, ibid: 56.

itself toward Being with "fore-sight [*Vorsicht*]," its clear grasp of and ability to attempt to express its pre-understanding or "fore-having" [*Vorgriff*]. It is able to embrace the unsettling feeling of confronting its conceptual limits and thereby to "open" itself to acknowledging that, if they are to be interpreted truthfully, neither the being of itself, nor entities, nor others must be imagined reducible to its conceptual or linguistic significations. Entailed by faciticity's always outlying judgments is that the meaning of entities encountered in one's environment(s) always to a significant extent outlay what they are exactly judged to be. "What we mean in the judgment," to use Adorno's words, "is always the entity due to be judged beyond the particular that is included in the judgment."[376] The truth of Being *is* objectively universal inasmuch as this points towards its perpetually resisting reification, and it is through appropriating this universal truth that the truth of things in their particularities is disclosed. *Re-envisioning truth as a becoming, where this leads to valuing particularity over generalizability, is what opens Dasein up to the possibility of modal transference, toward an authentic way of being-in-the-world*.

As a becoming, truth demands poetic language for itself, for the poetic helps to narrow the divide between Being and its concept/expression while simultaneously communicating for Being its universal character as non-being, and, for the phenomenal contents of existence (in which Being concretely manifests), their particularity. Though this demand is already apparent in *Being and Time*, it is not until Heidegger's later works that we see it thematically centralized. In *On the Way to Language*, published over three decades later, Heidegger writes:

> Singing and thinking are the stems neighbor to poetry.
> They grow out of Being and reach into its truth.
> Their relationship makes us think of what Hölderlin sings of the trees of the woods:
> "And to each other they remain unknown,
> So long as they stand, the neighboring trunks."[377]

---

[376] Adorno 1990: 152.
[377] Heidegger 1971: 13.

Poetry says ("sings") thinking that has appropriated Being. Thinking that has appropriated Being *is* Being, as Being is an event (thinking).[378] By transition, poetry says Being itself. Thinking (Being) and poetry *cannot become identical*, however, as they too are but "neighbors." Just as with a particular human neighbor, Being, despite its unavoidable proximity, will always resist total conceptualization, whether for ordinary or poetic language. Nevertheless, what cannot be escaped is how Being and poetry relate to each other hermeneutically, just as (caring) human neighbors do. Over time the latter will increasingly come *nearer* to knowing what the other's primary character is like, just as Being and poetry mutually come nearer by virtue of the poet's (Dasein's) progressive familiarity with the meaning of Being, which in turn equips her to poeticize that meaning more precisely. The poetic is significant to the question of Being for its capacity to illuminate the connection between Being and thinghood. Its greatest potentiality is to signify a thing in a form that most closely resembles lived interpretations of it, with diminished risk of reifying it by conclusively ascribing a simplistic, orthodox name. "To say that "'being' is not a name," Schürmann writes in reference to Heidegger, "is to strip it of the very power that has instituted all hegemonies: the subsumptive power."[379] Such power over the thing, as it is wielded by the hegemonies of institutions alongside the metaphysical canon, is "stripped" by the later Heidegger's refusal to name or reify it.

As Heidegger's own constant process of revision demonstrates, the possibility of expressing Being with yet greater precision both conditions and is conditioned by possibility of disclosing the meaning of Being with yet greater transparency. He progressively clarifies Being

---

[378] And yet, as Heidegger writes (now infamously) in *The Black Notebooks*: "Only someone who is German can in an originarily new way poetize and say being" (Heidegger 2016: 21). Occasionally throughout the next chapters I will juxtapose certain claims favoring the Ontology (against Adorno's critique) with examples from the *Notebooks* that suggest Heidegger's anti-Semitism and partisanship for National Socialism are woven into the fabric of Fundamental Ontology. I also devote the majority of Chapter Four, section four to confronting this issue.
[379] Schürmann 2003: 550.

and the ever new possible means by which it may be expressed, all the while intermittently

discrediting his earlier works (*Being and Time* much more so than the others). Though the

Heidegger of *Being and Time* does not yet at least publicly recognize Being's need for poetic

expression to this degree, he does prefigure it, professesing the co-primordiality of Being and

language, and how engaging them in dialogue is necessary for developing understanding of the

onto-existential conditions of Dasein. "As [ontological clues] progressively get worked out -

namely, in the 'hermeneutic' of the *Rede* - it becomes increasingly possible to grasp the problem

of Being in a more radical fashion."[380] *Rede*, or *discourse*, is Heidegger's term for distinguishing

rational language, in which Being comes to be disclosed in its "primary content," from the "idle

talk" [Gerede] of the They that is disengaged from the question of Being.[381] "The existential-

ontological foundation of language is discourse," which must, taking over from Aristotle, aim

toward the persuasion of *logos*, an act of synthesizing Dasein (thinking/interpretation) and the

concept of Being, which Aristotle (arguably) had not in this way made a proper motif.[382]

     With his later focus on poetry especially, we witness how, across the full span of his

works, Heidegger models the phenomenology of circling around the question of Being by

revising concepts and language for it hermeneutically. He discovers, throughout several

"renditions" of the event, new ways of thinking and saying Being, nevertheless retaining for

Being, and thus Dasein's identity, its core of negativity. He exemplifies Dasein's essence as

potentiality, which is synchronously "for" Being *and* language, through chronicling his own

performance of a lived hermeneutic and the response it demands by onto-phenomenological

---

[380] Heidegger 2008a: 47. On Heidegger's translation of "Rede" and "Gerede" from the Greek, see ibid, Translator's note 3.
[381] Ibid: 55.
[382] Ibid: 203.

reflection and recursive shifts between these two interpretative horizons.[383] This models for

readers how to keep advancing our self-understanding as Dasein, particularly our understanding

of non-being as a necessary condition of both being *as* Dasein, and, accordingly, understanding

ourselves to be grounded in non-conceptuality. What must be accentuated, then, is how far from

problematic Heidegger finds this rift between Being and its concept or expression.

> The reason for the impossibility of experiencing Dasein ontically as a whole which is, and
> therefore of determining its character ontologically in its Being-a-whole, does not lie in any
> imperfection of our *cognitive powers*. The hindrance lies rather in the *Being* of this entity. That
> which cannot ever *be such as* any experience which pretends to get Dasein in its grasp would
> claim, eludes in principle any possibility of getting experienced at all.[384]

While this impossibility is said to "hinder" Dasein from grasping Being completely, it does not

in fact place Dasein at a disadvantage. Inherent to Being itself, it is just what essentializes

humanly conscious experience. Coming to terms with this essence of the human "situation" at

large is indeed what advances ontological understanding; it brings Dasein *nearer* to the meaning

of Being, which in its truth is perceived in its *farness* from the concept. The struggle of putting

the meaning of Being into language is one crucial component of understanding this truth. It is

simply another "ontological clue" for the meaning of Being as non-being.

---

[383] "In both ordinary and philosophical usage, Dasein, man's Being, is 'defined'... as that living thing whose Being is
essentially determined by the potentiality for discourse" (ibid: 47).
[384] Ibid: 37.

II.   *Non-identity across existential modalities*

The foregoing outline of the existential analytic has indicated how inevitable it is to Being that it be conceptualized and expressed but only in periphery, even when Dasein is self-aware of and actively concerned with self-understanding; that is, when it is on the way to modal authenticity. This entails that (1) the limitedness of language is itself essential to the meaning of Being; (2) discovering this limitedness while engaged in existential analysis helps to facilitate moments of discovering Being as non-being; (3) Dasein is essentially grounded by its inability to conceptualize Being categorically; and following suit, (4) it is literally impossible for Dasein to self-identify according to absolute concepts (or "pure" presence).[385] What the outline has thereby uncovered is that the meaning of Being is ultimately to be fissured by non-being. This section further fleshes out that outline for the sake of beginning to elucidate just how ontological understanding is constituted by a web of non-identical relations that meet Adorno's basic criteria for counting relations as non-identical. To motivate this, I preliminarily examine how Dasein interprets Being differently depending on its modality. In doing so, I more pointedly frame the combined arguments of the next two chapters; viz., that modal authenticity "recovers" non-identity in/for "a particular Dasein" as well as a potential social norm.[386] Attending to Heidegger's "circle" and the two interpretive horizons that mutually work around it will all the while not be lost, and rather drawn on to emphasize for that recovery the integral role of discerning the hermeneutic.

As I have amply noted, the bipartite idea precipitating *Being and Time* is that, prior to ontological interrogation, we already understand Being pre-ontologically, and that the task of the

---

[385] See, for example, Heidegger 2008a: 375.
[386] On the "particularity" of Dasein (i.e., Dasein as factical relationality and not "transcendent" Being) see, for example, ibid: 33, 165.

existential analytic is to render that understanding explicit by approaching Being in terms of its fundamental structures.[387] In order to set a foundation for the analyses that follow, here I begin to emphasize (1) that yet more deeply determining those structures is the essence of Being as *time*, and (2) *how* Dasein experiences itself temporally is what fundamentally conditions how it *is* modally. For, "whenever Dasein tacitly understands and interprets something like Being, it does so with time as its standpoint."

> Time must be brought to light - and genuinely conceived - as the horizon for all understanding of Being and for any way of interpreting it. In order for us to discern this, *time* needs to be *explicated primordially as the horizon for the understanding of Being, and in terms of temporality as the Being of Dasein, which understands Being*.[388]

Towards this end, what must specifically be disclosed is how Dasein pre-ontologically understands itself as being-toward-potentiality, or *potentiality-for-Being*. In contrast to the They (the central conditions of and possibilities for "today's" public character) as well as post-Aristotelian philosophy, the analytic aims to uncover this essential grounding of Dasein. Through it, we rationalize (as opposed to deny or show apathy for) how our being-in-the-world, even as modally inauthentic or indifferent, is always animated by an implicit recognition that we could not grasp ourselves as "*being there*" at all were we unable to grasp the possibility of our *not being* or to "be there" in potentially different ways. The analytic further guides us to recognize that, while non-identity thinking is a permanent structure across existential modalities, Dasein, while living authentically, is conscientious of the denormalization of *non*-identity thinking (its

---

[387] In *Being and Time*, Heidegger reserves the Introduction and final subsection of Division II to focus on Being as a most general concept. While the final subsection initially appears to round out an idea of Being conclusively, it returns to the hazy hypotheses that characterize the Introduction: "*How is this disclosive understanding of Being at all possible for Dasein?* Can this question be answered by going back to the *primordial constitution-of-Being* of that Dasein by which Being is understood?" (ibid: 488). As it seems, the intention of Division III was to investigate still more specifically how Dasein is able to shift from inauthenticity to authenticity. Did it intend to ask after *what* existentiell "happenings" would prompt Dasein toward this shift? Does such prompting more heavily invoke the socio-material? Whatever the case may be, a primary intention of this dissertation is to extrapolate on what Heidegger gives us in *Being and Time* to propose that his form of existential analysis is well-equipped to facilitate critique of the socio-material conditions of historically specific "situation(s)."

[388] Ibid: 39 - first instance of italics ("*time*") omitted.

"hiddenness" by the They) and the need for its efforts to resist this. To be in-the-world as modally authentic is to recover non-identity thinking from its subjugation by institutional dogma and to cite it as a benchmark for everyday interpretation. Developing these connected claims in preparation for the next two chapters, where this will require exploring how Dasein's relationality is defined by relations of non-identity, is this section's guiding task.

We recall that, for Adorno, the term "non-identity" broadly designates how we relate, by means of the concept, to the world non-conceptually. Thinking is a negative dialectical process between concepts and phenomena that elude conceptualization: "all concepts ... refer to nonconceptualities, because concepts on their part are moments of the reality that requires their formation."[389] Thus we must problematize the equation of non-being and non-conceptuality, to which I have so far I only been suggestively tending. Indeed, we should expect Adorno to object to this definitional transition from non-being, to non-conceptuality, to non-identity, as he rejects non-being and non-conceptuality's interchangeability. If this is right, my more general position - that Dasein's self-identity essentially comprises relations of non-identity - would be unsound. The connection between non-being and non-conceptuality, then, must be explored.

One way to facilitate this is by examining Adorno's concern for philosophy's delimiting the idea of negation - which, if otherwise taken correctly, would be a non-conceptual *moment* - to a transcendent realm where what is negated still belongs to the *inactive* concept. Speaking to this concern albeit indirectly, Adorno writes the following in regard to Kant:

> The concept of the intelligible realm would be the concept of something which is not, and yet it is not a pure nonbeing. Under the rules of the [practical] sphere whose negation is the intelligible sphere, the intelligible one would have to be rejected without resistance, as imaginary. Nowhere else is truth so fragile. It may deteriorate into the hypostasis of something thought up for no reason, something in which thought means to possess what it has lost; and then again the effort to comprehend it is easy to confuse with things that are.[390]

---

[389] Adorno 1990: 11.
[390] Ibid: 393 – my brackets for clarification.

There Adorno presents a summative view of the fundamental problem in Kant's idealism. Although the schematism of consciousness correctly accounts for rationality as a synthesis of what is *a priori* and empirically given, Kant fails to adequately account for how rationality is, as this synthesis, conditioned by the "practical realm."[391] Kant treats the empirical for the most part by determining the (undeterminable) "thing-in-itself," which does not at least explicitly encompass the socio-historical material world. This leads Kant to "disfigure" the finitude of the mind, Adorno claims.[392] He describes this problem in his 1959 lecture *Society ● Block* as Kant's "blocking" reason against dialogical engagement with the societal conditions that shape it,[393] consequently nurturing a "growth of subjectivity" that corresponds to the "growth of reification."[394] Kant does "*the very thing that he forbids reason to do*. He constructs something from pure thought."[395] This "very thing" refers to Kant's positioning the faculty of imagination as an opaque medium between concepts and intuition. While I will not directly address this adjacent issue, I mention it here to help show how Adorno connects Kant's neglect of the "practical" to Kant's positing an idea of subjectivity that does after all belong to a realm of "pure" reason,[396] "the hypostasis of something thought up *for* no reason," stripping experience of its relational character.[397]

---

[391] Adorno does, however, find the Kantian "in-itself" to prefigure an idea of such conditioning, and thus to prefigure some idea of non-identity. As Deborah Cook explains, "Noting that Kant retains the idea of otherness in his concept of the noumenal *Ding-an-sich*, Adorno also speculates that Kant advanced the idea of things-in-themselves because he refused 'to be talked out of the moment of the object's preponderance'" (Cook 2011: 36).

[392] Adorno 1990: 392.

[393] Adorno 2001b. See Lecture Sixteen, *Society ● Block*, pp. 170-79.

[394] Ibid: 115.

[395] Adorno 2002: 217.

[396] Adorno's relationship to Kant is of course extremely nuanced. For instance, I have not highlighted that Adorno's criticisms fundamentally have to do with matter and sensuality; Kant does not envision the empirical deeply enough because, against his own intentions, he renders the empirical to be a realm of "mere entities" lacking effect on reason. According to Adorno, this guides his failure to illustrate how the categories *relate* to one another in ways that can be understood in terms of dialectical materialism (See, for example, Adorno 1990: 390-393; Adorno 2002: 217; Bernstein 2001: 433-4). Intermittently throughout this dissertation, however, I will broach the problem of materiality, where this problem propels Adorno's critique of Heidegger. Here I draw attention to Adorno's critique

For Adorno, it is not only that Heidegger maintains Kant's failure to account for how experience is objectively or societally structured. Boding worse is his allegation that Heidegger outright rejects experience as a synthesis of concepts and phenomenal content, for this keeps Heidegger at bay from even Hegel's dialectic (an objection addressed in different light, and to different ends, in the previous section). Heidegger's recasting the schematism lifts Being into an "intelligible realm," evincing the futility of the Ontology's aim to radically overturn traditional metaphysics. This is in contrast to Kant, who shares this aim but, as Adorno sees it, not futilely so, for whereas he attempts to integrate the empirical into the constitution of consciousness, Heidegger construes Being to be totally independent of it; Being is the "pure and simple over all ontical and real things."[398] What remains in the concept of "Being," then, is just that: a concept, one that, in its refusal to reference the very "practical realm" that conditions it, is absolute. It is "fictitious," since without its non-conceptual "moment" a concept can only be conjured up.[399]

What results from these combined problems, Adorno holds, is that non-being is but "pure non-being."[400]A tautology, it refers Being back to itself. What is negative in Being, then, is not non-conceptuality. In Being, "every memory of an objective meaning beyond the mechanisms of conceptual construction [is] excluded."[401] In reference to the passage above, he claims that, for Heidegger, thinking "means to possess," to account for as part of its very constitution, "what it has lost" (the non-conceptual "moment" of thought), but in its "effort to comprehend" this, thinking "confuses [things that are not] with things that are" (fully *for* the concept). The

---

of Kant to help motivate a defense against Adorno's objection that non-being Heidegger is not truly the concept's non-conceptual "moment."

[397] Adorno 1990: 393 - my italics for emphasis.
[398] Ibid: 65.
[399] Ibid: 223.
[400] Interestingly, Adorno sometimes uses the term "non-being" as an alternative to "non-identity." For an example, see ibid: 201-202.
[401] Ibid: 126 – my brackets.

Ontology sets up its own inability to distinguish negativity as non-conceptuality, Adorno concludes.[402]

This conclusion is untenable, I contend, and it is faulted by a more general misunderstanding of the meaning of Being - a misunderstanding that underlies most facets of Adorno's polemic against Heidegger. I justify this initially by recapitulating how the meaning of Being, correctly understood, self-evidences non-being as that which is ontologically non-conceptual. To be clear, here the objection from Adorno first requiring response is that the non-being of Being in Heidegger is entirely conceptual. Like reason in Kant, Being is transcended to an "imaginary" realm of pure intellectual activity, devoid of socio-material relationality.

As noted in the previous section, Being is not identical to its concept or linguistic expression foremost because, as time, it is always exceeding itself. For Adorno, the concept is defined by its inherent inability to identify itself with a phenomenon completely, and Being in Heidegger is defined in this same general way; i.e., above all by its resistance to our attempts to issue it a decisive definition. Being's meaning rests in Dasein's pre-ontological understanding that its concepts do not at any given moment represent a totalized "actuality."[403] As potentiality-for-Being, in Dasein "there is *constantly something still to be settled*"; "essential to [its] basic constitution" is that its interpretations always will point to something more than can be discerned in the palpable present.[404] In juxtaposition with Adorno's claim that a "mind that is to be a totality is nonsense,"[405] for Heidegger lived interpretation, which must include the concept,

---

[402] The role of negativity in the Ontology, I take Adorno to mean, is restricted to that of logical negation, where what is negated does not actually refer to something that is phenomenally "other" than its corresponding concept. This is to say that, for Heidegger, the "preconditions" of negation do not truly belong to phenomenal experience.

[403] To foreshadow one of this dissertation's primary arguments, which concerns the potentiality of Heidegger's Ontology and analytic for facilitating social critique, consider, in conjunction with Heidegger's claim to Dasein's potentiality-for-Being, Horkheimer and Adorno's claim that, if or when the power of the subject is reclaimed, it will be at the expense of maintaining late liberalism's "exclusion of the new" (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002: 106).

[404] Heidegger 2008a: 279.

[405] Adorno 1990: 199.

signifies in Being a "lack of totality."[406] Dasein's "always and already" understanding its

existence as hermeneutical and hence as constituted by non-being is manifest in its presupposing

that its interpretations of being-in-the-world are both restrained by and reliant upon Adorno's

"concept of the limit," which Heidegger introduces with similar intent as the "*limit-Situation*" of

potentiality-for-Being.[407] The meaning of Being captures Adorno's general meaning of the

concept as a mutually referential relation with phenomena that oppose unqualified

circumscription. When I distinguished Being from its "concept," this was not only to speak about

Being in a coherently ordered way, but to emphasize the limitedness of conceptuality itself *per*

Being. What must be qualified is that Being exceeds its concept *because* the meaning of Being

itself entails that all concepts are limited. As determined by Being, they always *both* are pointing

toward *and* are unable to reify what is alterior to the "actual" present.[408] Thus I find it necessary

to challenge Adorno's insistence that

> Heidegger's stress on [thinking's] phenomenal aspect against its total reduction to thought [the
> concept] would be a salutary corrective of idealism. But his procedure is to isolate the factual
> moment, to conceive it, in Hegel's terminology, as abstractly as idealism conceives the synthetic
> moment. Hypostatized, it ceases to be a moment and comes to be what the ontology in its protest
> against the split between concept and entity would least like it to be: it becomes a thing.[409]

Insofar as the concept (thinking) in Heidegger is conditioned by Being, it is hermeneutically

temporal, and for that fundamental, albeit preliminary reason, it cannot hypostasize phenomena.

---

[406] Heidegger 2008a: 279. Note: In *Being and Time,* Heidegger does sometimes refer to authenticity in terms of Dasein's possibility to identify itself as a "totality" (e.g., ibid: 276). His sense of the term in this context, however, strictly differs from the senses for both his and Adorno's quotations here. As a "totality," Dasein discloses the truth of Being, and on that count it exists according to its apprehending that *concepts are unfinished*, that to understand Being is to understand that it cannot by conceptuality be totalized. (Dasein does not reach "its wholeness" until it dies, but it can work "wholly" around the hermeneutic circle; it authentically can "be-a-whole" in this way of understanding Being's non-being.) I suggest that Adorno confuses these two senses.

[407] Heidegger 2008a: 400.

[408] See ibid: 487. There, Heidegger recognizes "ancient ontology" as "[working] with 'Thing-concepts' and that, in it, "there is a danger of 'reifying consciousness.'" To quell this danger, "one can never carry on researches into the source and possibility of the 'idea' of Being in general simply by means of the 'abstractions' of formal logic." This is likewise Adorno's aim. Of course, Heidegger insists that "one must seek a *way* of casting light on the fundamental question of ontology, and this is the way one must *go*" - the imperative of undertaking existential analysis that Adorno precisely rejects.

[409] Adorno 1990: 80-81 – my brackets for clarity.

Examining how the concept of Being is specifically not a hypostatization, and is most definitely not "something thought up for no reason," functions as an example for concepts in general, which operate in just this way. Rather than a mere idea, Being itself, as the reality reflected by its concept, is lived, projective existence. Dasein's pre-understanding Being is "really" *a priori* (that is, not conjured up), a term that Heidegger, equating it with the ontological, argues is always in synthesis with what is experienced "*a posteriori*," or what he effectively recasts as the ontic. Such pre-understanding is *a priori* because it distinguishes what is fundamental to being-in-the-world, including Dasein's own intuitive understanding that its ontic existence is shaped by certain, *a priori* structures. Because such self-understanding is possible only through existing, the "*a posteriori*" is equally responsible for shaping it.[410] The *concept* of Being is determined in exactly this way; the meaning of Being itself entails the concept's defeasibility. How Dasein (thematically) conceptualizes Being at a given time will not remain precisely the same, as it revises the concept inconclusively in light of its being-in temporally, relationally, and phenomenally.[411]

This serves as evidence that the concept of Being is, when all is said and done, just Being itself. While I have claimed for Heidegger that Being can only be conceptualized/expressed from its "periphery," I had yet to arrive at a position where posing the following qualification would be reasonable; namely, that the limits of conceptualization/expression do not imply ontological

---

[410] The division between the *a priori*/ontological and *a posteriori*/ontic, then, only appears to Dasein while phenomenologizing in the thematic horizon. For, like Kant's synthesis, the division does not actually "exist" to an immediately existing consciousness.

[411] This is immediately apparent, for example, in writing this dissertation, an inconclusive and (very) imperfect endeavor made all the more so due to the nature of the topic. I think and write about Heidegger's thinking and writing about Being, where both the former and latter have evolved or are evolving over time. I have progressively come and am coming to understand the meaning of Being for Heidegger and myself with greater precision, which is simultaneously responsible for (1) my lived experience of engaging Heidegger over a lengthy duration of time, and (2) my ongoing "return" from the thematic horizon to adjudicate Being's concept while moving along within day-to-day life. Exploring the concept of Being through the existential analytic is what guides one hermeneutically to faithfully understand experienced reality as a hermeneutic.

separation of Being from its concept. To put this into perspective, I remind that I have also claimed, for Heidegger and anticipatorily with Adorno, that Being's concept relates to Being non-identically. Against appearances, the two claims do not contradict one another. Although this dissertation naturally requires caution in proposing "identity" between things, for two, intertwined reasons the requirement does not in this instance truly apply. I allude to the first reason directly above: engaging the concept of Being is the way to disclose Being itself, for it is through this engagement that one confronts the limits of one's concept of Being – that the concept, as hermeneutical, cannot ever grasp Being "in full." Reversing direction, the second reason is that Being's foundation as a hermeneutic is just the foundation of the concept, which to be understood *correctly* requires that it not be understood *entirely* – that we allow it to resist absolute identity with itself. The "concept" of Being (for these reasons I momentarily put the term in scare quotes) and "concepts" in general, insofar as they belong to Dasein, are never quite "themselves," for they are holisms largely constituted by that which is absent in or to them.[412] Things being otherwise, the "concept" of Being would indeed just belong to that "intelligible realm," that transcendent host of ideas that are unmediated by concrete existence. That Adorno, without reservation, equates Being, cognition, and experience in Heidegger with the categories of Kant's transcendental logic, is the basis on which we must question the legitimacy of how he interprets the Ontology and its analytic. It is clear, I suggest, that he ties the concept/thinking in Heidegger to (what are for both philosophers) traditional metaphysical renderings of the terms as corresponding to "pure" actuality or presence.

---

[412] Of course, Adorno would still counter-object that a concept can only be accurately said to be mediated when it is mediated by the socio-material world. The phrase "concrete existence' would be too subjective, in contrast to the "objectivity" in his sense of mediation. We do, however, already have ample clues pointing us to discern how Being/Dasein is, albeit implicitly, mediated in this way. For example, (and most generally), as Dasein both is in the phenomenal world and defined by its hermeneutic character, we can cursorily contend that its interpretative existence is mutually conditioned by facts about and dynamics within the socio-material sphere in which it lives. I will address this issue more thoroughly in Chapters Three and Four.

This informs how we should interpret the status of non-being in relation to non-conceptuality. Just as the aforementioned "requirement of caution" does not apply to the identification of Being with its concept, it does not apply to the identification of Being with non-being, and for similar reasons. Recognizing the identity of Being and non-being – the non-being in/of Being, and the Being in/of non-being – is precisely how Being as a non-identical relation is disclosed. "[T]he nothing is *more originary* than the 'not' and negation,'" Heidegger clarifies in brief wake of *Being and Time*.[413] It is "more originary" because "the nothing" (non-being) *is* Being, in a distinct sense. Most generally, they must be identified insofar as Being's essence as time constitutes the existence of Dasein as hermeneutic. The term "non-being" signifies a primordial and perpetual lack in conceptual understanding, whether that understanding is of Being itself (from within the thematically ontological horizon of interpretation), or any worldly phenomena (from within the horizon of immediate existence). When logical negation occurs in the case of either horizon, it is preconditioned by Dasein's "always and already" knowing its essence. Being as non-being, in other words, is the condition of the possibility of negation, for what it means "to be" is also invariably what it means "to be not." The assertion that something *is* only can be made from within intuitive reference to a holistic understanding that apprises Dasein what that thing is *not* or of the thing's potential to be *nothing* at all. This holism is the constantly evolving procession of interpreted experience, which is viscerally recalled in any present act of negation. To be sure, this procession, as the heart of the meaning of Being, conditions any present act of interpretation and not only acts of interpreting Being per se. The "negative moment" in Being is in this way additionally accounted for, just as it is accounted for in Adorno's notion of the concept. Unwittingly *with* Adorno, Heidegger attempts to repair the

---

[413] Heidegger 1998: 86 – my italics.

chasm between concept and intuition that metaphysics has opened up, and he affirms the idea, as Horkheimer and Adorno put it in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, that "philosophy is defined by that attempt."[414] The responsibility of philosophy is to reinstate the "classical demand to 'think thinking'" – to critically reflect on the constitution of the concept as fundamentally interlaced with viscerally understood experience.[415]

Assuredly for Adorno, in non-identity thinking the concept is equally the non-concept, whereas conceptuality/thinking in Heidegger is tied to a metaphysical "purity" of actuality/presence. In his own writings, Adorno presupposes this connection as well; he never disappoints to qualify the concept's non-conceptual character especially when the standard to which he compares it is traditional metaphysics. But Adorno fails to distinguish just how radically Heidegger also diverges from traditional portrayals of the concept, as well as how much this divergence is owed to Heidegger's way of thinking about temporality, a way that, as I will argue in Chapter Three and especially Chapter Four, finds affinity with Adorno's own framework. Corroborating this reading of his locating non-conceptuality to be one of two necessary (and interwined) conditions of Being, on the final page of *Being and Time* Heidegger writes: "Being has been disclosed in a *preliminary* way, though nonconceptually; and this makes it possible for Dasein as existent being-in-the-world to comport itself *towards entities*—towards those which it encounters within-the-world *as well as towards itself* as existent."[416]

Let us now revisit the issue by which this section was introduced and yet to which I could not attend adequately so long as the suspicion that Being is an absolute concept lingered in the air: namely, that Dasein's self-identity is a relation of non-identity. (Though hopefully readers will now agree that that suspicion has been relieved, intermittently throughout what follows I

---

[414] Horkheimer and Adorno 2002: 13.
[415] See ibid: 19.
[416] Heidegger 2008a: 488 – third italic is mine.

will speak to it again.) To remind, my proposal that Dasein's self-identity is a relation of non-identity rests on Heidegger's deeming Dasein as potentiality-for-Being. The final upshot of this proposal is to frame the next chapters' more focused thesis that non-identity is recovered in modally authentic Dasein.

I begin by way of example. In the case of my projecting toward "being a professor," I relate to the possibility of professorhood in part non-conceptually, as the possibility is anticipated in relation to its *not* being actual. It is a matter not only of how uncertain it is whether the possibility will come to fruition, but also of how it necessarily must be unknown to me what my professorhood specifically would be like. That I *a priori* apprehend this indetermination as an instance of non-being echoes how, as foundational to my Being, I always experience a connate limitation on self-identifying completely with the very concepts I rely on to understand my facticity. If my self-understanding were totalized, I would cease to be Dasein, as I *am* only insomuch as I project, and this means that "what I am" au fond is being incessantly in relation to what I am *not*. My concept of "being a professor" drives my self-understanding as potentiality-for-being-a-professor, whereby that self-understanding is just a relation to that which cannot be hypostatized.

On the other hand, this indefinite possibility as a non-conceptual self-relation conditions my very concept. I could not conceptualize my possibility of professorhood were it not for my being temporal (in the way of Dasein), and therefore were it not for my conceptuality "being" intrinsically limited. Mutual to pre-understanding Being is pre-understanding that potentiality-for-Being both shapes *and* is shaped by "actual" experience, similar to which, for Adorno, thinking is a lived process of the concept and non-concept's relating dialectically. What is pre-

147

understood is that, as Adorno puts it, "the nonconceptual moment conquers in the concept."[417] The concepts of Dasein's interpretation are these kind of negative "moments" of, and they are formed by, Being's reality as non-being.

As mentioned in the first section, our intuitive reliance on the infinitive "to be" is one clue for how we always pre-understand Being. I now briefly consider our use of other verb forms of "to be," which will permit an opportunity to grasp further how Being is distinctly structured by non-being, and how non-being is simply "the non-conceptual moment" of existence. Discerning our pre-understanding of Being requires modest effort when our clue is a claim like "I want to be a professor," for it is conspicuous that the claim indicates a relationship between the present and future (what has so far been defined as potentiality-for-Being). In contrast, claims like "I *am* a student" or "Today it *is* chilly" do not so obviously demonstrate our pre-understanding, for the verb tenses appear futureless, referring purely to presence. Nevertheless, they do demonstrate this, so long as we recognize an additional determining characteristic for Dasein: its *historicality*. Until the next chapter's discussion of thrownness, historicality may be defined generally as Dasein's immanent understanding of Being *insofar as* that understanding is grounded in the factical "connectedness of its life."[418] In this case, knowing presently that I am a student and that it is chilly is dependent on my historical "fore-having" of what studenthood and chilly weather are not. "'As long as' Dasein factically exists, it is never past [vergangen], but it *is*, indeed, as always already having *been*."[419] Non-conceptuality (or non-identity) first appears to be lacking here in the connection between Dasein's historicizing and its present concept. Knowing what these states of affairs *are not* is due to previous familiarization with the concepts of working professionally, unemployment, and degrees of weather signified by adjectives other

---

[417] Adorno 1990: 126.
[418] Ibid: 42.
[419] Heidegger 2008a: 41

than "chilly." However, once we square away what historicality entails, we will see that, as an

ontological structure, it too implicates for Dasein essential relations of non-identity. The ability

to assert that "I am a student" is conditional on my understanding that studenthood is a present,

yet transient state of existence, and that many of my future possibilities are by that state

modulated;[420] for, Dasein "is its past, whether explicitly or not."[421] In the same vein, when I

project myself toward being a professor, that projection does not merely relate the present to the

future, but relates *that* relation to the conditioning of my past. I perceive the possibility of

professorhood as viable because I am currently a doctoral candidate, which was perceived as a

viable possibility when I was in the past an undergraduate, and on the basis of even still previous

student status (which points to its own historical conditions) was doctoral candidacy capable of

actualization.

> By this understanding [of Dasein's historicality], the possibilities of [Dasein's] Being are
> disclosed and regulated. Its own past - and this always means the past of its 'generation' - is not
> something which *follows along after* Dasein, but something which already goes ahead of it.[422]

Dasein's interpretations of its present and future are innately affected by its "fore-having," or the

historical context(s) it brings to its interpretations. (And to be sure, altogether driving this holism

is Dasein's projective character, from out of which Dasein is at all capable of interpreting its

past. A point requiring further space than is allotted here, I will return to it shortly in this section

and examine it more thoroughly in the chapters to come.) This temporal triad composes Dasein's

hermeneutical situation. Dasein, in its interpreting, always is taking for granted that its

"presence" is an interchange between its retaining of past events and, on that basis, its

anticipation of future ones; it pre-understands that what is "actual" cannot be thematized for

---

[420] Can this be qualified? "How time flies; another ten days and I have achieved nothing. It doesn't come off. A page now and then is successful, but I can't keep it up, the next day I am powerless." - Excerpt from a March 11th entry in Kafka's diaries, presumably to encourage graduate students. From Franz Kafka, *The diaries: 1910-1923* (Kafka 1988: 332).
[421] Heidegger 2008a: 41.
[422] Ibid.

hypostatization.[423]"The 'nows' *come along*, and those which are coming along define the 'future.'"[424]

To be Dasein is to be historical, even when it is inauthentic and its historicality has thus been "thoroughly uprooted by tradition," tending, in consequence, not to care immediately for onto-existential reflection.[425] Historicality is "a temporal kind of Being which Dasein itself possesses, regardless of ... how Dasein is an entity 'in time.'"[426] While Adorno insists that Heidegger is at odds with his position that "the concept is a concept even when dealing with things in being does not change the fact that on its part it is entwined with a nonconceptual whole," for Heidegger the root meaning of Being is just the concept's (thinking's) entwinement as such.[427] When Being as this basic situation of *being* hermeneutic is registered while Dasein moves through the existential analytic (that is, as it aims toward acts of authenticity), Dasein appropriates a progressively more holistic "fore-sight" of the truth of Being; what it appropriates is that Being (and hence the concept) is itself a temporal holism largely composed by what "is" non-conceptual.[428] Analyzing the "existential projection of Dasein's historicality merely reveals what already lies enveloped in the temporalizing of temporality."[429] It reveals Being as an oscillating tension between the past and future, as never conceptually absolute.

Again, programmatically, the analytic motivates its readers' "fore-sight" by narrating existence from the perspective of Dasein's identification with the They, for which, tantamount to metaphysics, not only the meaning but the need to question Being correctly is neglected; the

---

[423] Ibid: 448.
[424] Ibid: 475.
[425] Ibid: 43.
[426] Ibid: 41.
[427] Ibid: 12.
[428] What is more, Dasein must be historical not in a strictly "personal" sense, where this would imply that its understanding is independent from the world. In the next chapters, I respond to Adorno's pertaining objection, which is rooted in his claim that "when history is transposed into the *existentiale* of historicality, the salt of the historical will lose its savor" (Adorno 1990: 129).
[429] Heidegger 2008a: 428.

They "deprives the particular Dasein of its answerability."[430] What I argue we find is that, no matter its unconcern with Being, to the extent that Dasein cannot escape its essence as a "temporal stretching," when Dasein's "who" is the They it still thinks non-identically. What is structural to Being is determinative for "*every kind of Being that factical Dasein may possess.*"[431] Dasein's pre-understanding of Being is at the helm of its ontic interpretations, regardless of whether it is mindful of this.

What Heidegger describes mundane Dasein to be preoccupied with understanding is, to be sure, not Being but beings. For this reason, continuing the analytic by looking at how entities "show up" for Dasein in its familiar world(s) serves as another "ontological clue." Foremost "showing up" are things in their signification for Dasein's projects, as when I immediately perceive a desk in a furniture store as potentially "to be" for writing (in contrast, e.g., to how it may be perceived by a wood artisan). Although Dasein here is only interested in entities, and although it understands them, per equipmentality, strictly as for use to fulfill a particular intention, that its concepts of those entities are still appropriated hermeneutically manifests how non-identity thinking is fundamental to Being; it manifests how Dasein already assumes in its everyday dealings Being as such. Beholding a notebook as a medium for the visual communication of ideas, for instance, is indebted to Dasein's understanding that the intrinsic being of an entity (as it is shaped by Being) lies in its potentiality and not actuality. After Dasein's initial intention for the notebook has been fulfilled, it will come to be perceived or intended toward differently (as something that presents hosts one's ideas, and, perhaps later on, as a relic of one's past).

---

[430] Ibid: 165.
[431] Ibid: 38 - my italics. Also see ibid: 41, 149.

To be clear, whether an entity is beheld only in its potentiality for human manipulation or not, entities still must be *for* Dasein.[432] This is in plain view of time's singularity to (human) existence, which is not to propose that something *like* temporality is not also a condition for beings other than Dasein and instead to observe that our ontic understanding originates from nothing more elemental than our lived being-in-the-world as projection.[433] In the case of the notebook, even though its original potential for one is its manipulation, one still pre-thematically apprehends how its potential to *be* perceived as anything at all is indebted to one's own potentiality-for-Being. Dasein understands the being of entities *because* it understands its own Being, and vice versa. The incentive of the existential analytic throughout much of Division I is to render palpable Dasein's self-understanding as potentiality-for-Being by connecting it to a context that is most familiar to readers (for again, as a work of phenomenology, its overall aim is to inductively lead us to disclose Being by first reflecting on the appearance, meaning, and conditions of phenomena in our ordinary environments).

With that said, one objection to the suggestion that non-identity thinking yet underlies Dasein's existence while living as the They is that, eventually, an entity's *difference* from the concept will be forgotten. Fetishized, it will be regarded, to use Adorno's words, as "made of the positive in-itself."[434] This is not altogether unsound. For example, that Dasein's perception of an entity as ready-to-hand at some point becomes automatic evinces its identification of that entity

---

[432] By contrast, an entity may be beheld explicitly in its potentiality for helping to "event" Being. This is roughly how the later Heidegger's "thinking in truth" is described as beholding things, though I suggest that a kernel of this idea, to be addressed later on, is sowed by the Ontology's phenomenology of authenticity.

[433] This is not a (false) position on the subjectivity of truth: "*Because the kind of Being that is essential to truth is of the character of Dasein, all truth is relative to Dasein's Being.* Does this relativity signify that all truth is 'subjective'? If one Interprets 'subjective' as 'left to the subject's discretion,' then it certainly does not. For uncovering, in the sense which is most its own, takes asserting out of the province of 'subjective' discretion, and brings the uncovering Dasein face to face with the entities themselves" (ibid: 270). Neither is it a philosophical anthropology wherein a natural science of human being would be of interest to disclosure (see, for example, Tymieniecka 1991: 43-6).

[434] Adorno 1990: 159.

with a static concept (hence why "breakdown" experiences are so disillusioning). As the "way" of the They largely is instrumental, it, like traditional metaphysics, imagines conceptual representation to be perfect and unlimited.

When Dasein embodies the "way" of the They, it inevitably reifies itself, failing to distinguish itself in its truth as potentiality-for-Being. Sartre, speaking to this problem far more directly, explains that "we can be nothing without playing at being. 'If I am a café waiter ... this can be only in the mode of *not being one*.' And that is true. If I could be a café waiter, I should suddenly constitute myself as a contingent block of identity. And that I am not. This contingent being-in-itself always escapes me."[435] Two points are at stake in this passage. The first hinges on an individual's susceptibility to *be* in "bad faith," or to exist inauthentically by means of oblivious conformity to a totalized social role; the individual self-identifies completely with a concept. In Heidegger's terms, the inauthentic individual fails to distinguish her Being from the being of entities; she interprets her facticity as the kind of "*factual* objective presence" to which an entity is perceived as belonging.[436] She *is* always pre-thematically aware of her Being as temporality (potentiality) but she, still pre-thematically, denies it in the haste of her everyday projects, which are chosen and developed without critical reflection on the full extent of what she can and/or wants to be (even if this involves reflecting on what she wants "to be" within her occupying a particular social role).[437] On this level of consciousness, Sartre's café waiter figures his being in his role to have *just happened*, as if he were devoid of all agency. Although neither the earlier Heidegger nor the earlier Sartre frames it as such, this *tangible* repercussion of the

---

[435] Sartre 1984: 131.
[436] See, for example, Heidegger 2008a: 56, 73. Note: I say "*perceived* as belonging" because, insofar as the being of entities *is* Dasein's Being, they are not, when Being is disclosed in its truth, understood as static, objective presence. That entities are perceived as having this presence is part of the modality of inauthentic Dasein. Heidegger writes: "since the phenomenon of the world itself is passed over in this absorption in the world, it is replaced by objective presence in the world, by thing. The being of beings, which is there too, comes to be understood as objective presence" (ibid: 126).
[437] Heidegger 2010: 56 - my italics.

contemporary west's dichotomization of subject and object is echoed by one of Horkheimer and

Adorno's principle contentions: suffering from "the repression of the internal nature of human

drives," [438] the subject unknowingly defines herself as a mere thing. [439]

However, just as for Heidegger inauthentic Dasein still harbors dormant self-

understanding as potentiality-for-Being, Sartre's second point here is that the possibility of living

in bad faith depends on intuiting that one primordially is "for-itself." That is, one intuits that

facticity does not entail total resolution by those "in-itself" contingencies of existence lying

exterior to the realm of one's control, just as when Heidegger delineates interpretation as

conditioned by a "fore-having," he is not thereby proposing a philosophy of determinism. The

waiter is capable of identifying himself with the concept of that role because on a pre-thematic

level he understands what the concept is *not* – or more precisely, that what defines the concept *is*

its incessant pointing equally toward the past and future – and therefore what he otherwise *could*

be. He knows of Being's inextricability from Nothingness. Such knowledge converges with

Dasein's presentiment that "it constantly is *not* other possibilities." [440]

Indeed, living as the They corresponds to but only one existential modality:

"Understanding develops or decays along with whatever kind of Being Dasein may possess at

the time; accordingly there are many ways in which it has been interpreted, and these are all at

Dasein's disposal." [441] Referencing Dasein's possibility of not hypostatizing itself, Heidegger

moreover signals that, while it is true that "Dasein is in each case mine," [442] "it could be that the

"who" of everyday Dasein just is *not* the "I myself." [443] By qualifying Dasein to be "in each case

---

[438] Horkheimer and Adorno 2002: 218.
[439] "Individuals define themselves now only as things, statistical elements, successes or failures" (ibid: 21).
[440] Heidegger 2008a: 331.
[441] Ibid: 37.
[442] Ibid: 152.
[443] Ibid: 150.

mine," Heidegger means, first, that "the 'who' [of Dasein] is what maintains itself as something

identical throughout changes in its Experiences and ways of behavior, and which relates itself to

this changing multiplicity in so doing."[444] This persistent core of identity is Dasein *as* Being *as*

non-being (as non-identity). Immanent to Being is the possibility of reflecting explicitly on what

its experience of being-in-the-world may be not. As John Haugeland specifies, that Dasein is "in

each case mine" signifies how Dasein *is* itself in the distinct *kind* of way that it is:

> Ownedness [authenticity] and unownedness [inauthenticity] are modes of Dasein's being, and
> they are both grounded in that fact about Dasein as such, that it is in each case mine. Thus,
> ownedness and unownedness are alternative ways in which Dasein, in any given case, can be
> respectively 'its own' ('mine').[445]

To know that Dasein is "mine" is to know that I am temporal in a form that defines my existence

as potentiality.

The anticipated objection, while correctly observing that mundane Dasein *perceives* itself

and entities as identical to absolute concepts, fails to take into consideration that this perception

(1) is motivated by Dasein's social conditioning, and (2) is nevertheless structured by Dasein's

pre-understanding of Being. "Entities look as if … they have, in a certain way, been uncovered

already, and yet they are still disguised," Heidegger writes.[446] And yet, while their meanings

remain mere "semblances," the being of entities, and the Being of inauthentic Dasein while it

identifies itself as a "mere" entity, are still tacitly understood to be related to Dasein's

temporality and as non-identical to their present appearance for the concept.

With this, Sartre magnifies the position I provisionally suggest is also latent in the

Ontology, for which underestimating or denying one's agency is attributed to one's social

---

[444] Ibid.
[445] Haugeland 2013: 206 - my brackets.
[446] Heidegger 2008a: 265.

conditioning to think identically. For the "publics" described by Heidegger and Sartre,[447] which "obscure everything," fetishizing and reifying are normalized because questioning the meaning of Being is not.[448]

> Publicness proximally controls every way in which the world and Dasein get interpreted, and it is always right - not because there is some distinctive and primary relationship-of-Being in which it is related to 'Things', or because it avails itself of some transparency on the part of Dasein which it has explicitly appropriated, but because it is insensitive to every difference of level and of genuineness and thus never gets to the 'heart of the matter' ['auf die Sachen'].[449]

Note Heidegger's (for what is in *Being and Time* a rare) allusion that "publicness," or the They, represents a *secondary* relationship with Being. As I articulated in section one, "primary truth" is for Heidegger a "phenomenological truth" that integrates historical conceptions of truth as either absolute or relevant. As primary/phenomenological, truth is equivalent with Dasein's ongoing revelations of its ontological structures, the most fundamental of which is potentiality-for-Being. Here, Heidegger continues to clue that Dasein, while living as the They, is related to this structure inauthentically or, we can say with Adorno, as from within the position of one whose "second nature" dominates how one experiences the world.

Though it is not until the following chapters that I justify more thoroughly why the allusion typifies Heidegger's position on the ontological status of the They, its emphasis now is important, for it contributes to this preparatory defense against the preceding Adornian counter-objection that identity thinking is essential to Being. Lacking explicit apprehension of Being's structuring by time (and hence non-being), Dasein presumes that its facticity is restricted to actuality, and is thereby inclined to reduce itself, and as a matter of course the being of entities, to customary, directly intelligible concepts. (Surprisingly, in Division I, Part Four, others are not

---

[447] In parts of Chapter Three but especially in Chapter Four, I focus on unpacking Heidegger's notion of "publicness" in conjunction with Adorno's critique of the role of "transcendence" in Fundamental Ontology.
[448] Ibid: 124.
[449] Ibid: 165.

overtly described to be reified by inauthentic Dasein: "[E]ven 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, primordially in their Being-in-the-world."[450] At the same time, however, Heidegger casually notes how others "show themselves in the world in their special environmental Being, and do so in terms of what is ready-to-hand in that world."[451] I broach this dual and rather indistinct character of being-with in Chapter Four.) So long as Being is "veiled in darkness," Dasein's "way" is to presuppose identity thinking as a norm for existentiell interpretation.[452] Without fore-sight of Being's temporal character, Dasein's self-understanding as potentiality-for-Being, or its understanding that it *just is* a lived relation of non-identity, is suppressed. Such de-normalization of identity thinking is in the end what I am referring to in my developing claim (to be continued in Chapter Three) that Dasein "recovers" non-identity for its mundane way of thinking and acting. Above all, this de-normalization requires, for both Heidegger and Adorno, that in everyday experience potentiality be prioritized over actuality. Coming to the same thing, what it requires is that Being's "negative moment" of non-being is recognized and that Dasein relies on such recognition to discover or recoup its essential possibility for exploring the limits of its agency. Recovering non-being and recovering non-identity are quite simply analogous projects. Their fundamental commonality lies in an attempt to correct the concept's historical polarization from lived experience as it is rooted in human intuition and the concrete world.

Especially in anticipation of Chapter Four's central argument, we should remain mindful of how Dasein's prioritization of actuality (and, correspondingly, Being's concealment) is not merely an esoteric problem for disciplinary philosophers, for this loss of truth is tangibly

---

[450] Ibid: 156 - my italics.
[451] Ibid: 160.
[452] Ibid: 23.

repercussive to Dasein's capacity for agency. The project of recovering the meaning of Being and the project of recovering human freedom ultimately are selfsame, despite Adorno's objection that freedom in Heidegger is merely a claim to total self-possession.[453] Equally included in this loss is the capacity of habituating *ethical relations*, a topic on which this dissertation will end. These repercussions are what are most at stake when existentiell interpretation is left wanting for genuine existential analysis. The analytic provides a theoretical lens through which Dasein can enable itself to critically discern how its typical being-in-the-world is, as modally inauthentic, conditioned by the They, and on that basis to respond, by affirming its agency, to the need for de-normalizing identity thinking within non-theorized experience. Dasein's existential "reflection upon its own meaning is the way out of the concept's seeming being-in-itself as a unit of meaning."[454] Specifically, the concept is released from the concealment of its essence as temporally fluid and ontologically (and thus too, epistemologically) inconclusive, which is synchronous with the disclosure of Being as Dasein's relation to non-being, which, still more, is synchronous with the disclosure of Being's non-identity to conceptuality. Along with negative dialectics, the existential analytic demonstrates, *by* employing the concept, how the concept is equally formed by phenomena to which Dasein can only non-conceptually relate. This catalyzes Dasein to locate "a new *status of Being*" in which its essence is for it exposed even as it interprets its being-in-the-world immediately.[455] As a result, I suggest, the analytic is capable of catalyzing intentions to normalize non-identical relations with things, others, and oneself.

To remind, for Adorno there are three key "ingredients" to non-identity thinking: the *priority* and *particularity* of the object, and *mimetic* experience. Underlying all of these is the

---

[453] See, for example, Adorno 2003: 104. In the next two chapters I discuss Adorno's critique of modal authenticity in Heidegger.

[454] Heidegger 2008a: 12.

[455] Ibid: 90.

priority of potentiality over actuality. A specific sense of temporality is the shared foundation of Heidegger's and Adorno's frameworks. While I will explore both points more in-depth in the next chapter, here I note that, because authentic Dasein recovers the priority of potentiality, it is thereby inclined to recognize itself, things, and others in their *particularities*, resisting its inclination while inauthentic to translate its experiences into absolute representations. For, authentic Dasein understands that, while it necessarily is compelled "to operate with concepts…, this necessity must not be turned into the virtue of their priority.[456] When it is not the concept but the truth of Being that is prioritized, what follows is a modal demotion of actuality, and what is appropriated by the concept for authentic Dasein is that Being cannot be appropriated completely. Dasein must in a certain sense "let Being be," which also involves "letting entities be," or allowing them appear to the concept without the attempt of the concept to generalize them. To recognize them in their particularity, Dasein largely relates to entities mimetically, non-conceptually.[457]

To clarify the significance of these points for challenging Adorno's critique of authenticity, I remind that one of the main purposes of this chapter has been to make the hermeneutic circle that belongs to the organization of *Being and Time*, including the two horizons that move around it, relevant to that challenge. The routes taken until now were necessary for arriving at a position where we can preliminarily answer the question "*what* exactly does the circle precisely move back around *to*?" The answer is key to confronting the ultimate charge of Adorno's polemic against the Ontology's purported commitment to identity thinking; viz., that authenticity "grow[s] toward the same exchange-society anonymity against

---

[456] Adorno 1990: 11.
[457] See, for example, Heidegger 2008a: 56-57.

which *Sein und Zeit* rebelled."[458] I designate this charge as "ultimate" for two reasons. First, it points to real ethical implications that Adorno thinks stem naturally from the Ontology's "idealism." The end effort of Adorno's negative dialectic is to demonstrate how philosophies working within the Kantian paradigm are prone to reinforce the structural values and norms of late capitalism and, as as result, to controvert what Adorno argues must be philosophy's telos: to critique and resist instrumentality as a way of life and to critically imagine practical alternatives. While Chapters One and Two of this dissertation dispute Adorno's objection that Dasein is a substantive subject, Chapters Three and Four dispute his objections that authentic freedom is "fictitious" and that to assume it is morally dangerous.[459] The charge above is "ultimate" for the second reason that it relies on these objections here. Modal authenticity purportedly encourages individuals to embody or continue embodying the precepts of exchange-society because, as an idea, it presumes that individuals are capable of willfully excluding themselves from domination by socio-material institutions. To embrace the idea and try to live accordingly is to disable one's own agency and to permit oneself to be indifferent to social injustice.

Why we should take these objections with hesitancy can initially be rationalized by finishing the synopsis of *Being and Time's* programmatic approach. As I have noted, the "program" is to guide readers through a visceral "circling around" of the question of Being, the success of which depends on discovering and developing one's potential for modal authenticity. This dependence is mutual, for, in turn, Dasein's release from the They and affirmation of authenticity presupposes the discovery of "original" Being as an event oriented by and toward Dasein's self-interpreting to be essentialized by its relationality with phenomena that are metaphysically and epistemologically alterior to what would otherwise be an absolute ego. The

---

[458] Adorno 2003: 13.
[459] Adorno 1990: 223.

possibility of that release demands an approach that encourages a personally interpretative passage out of Being's unconcealment to understand "in a way which is 'original' and 'intuitive.'"[460] The approach, as thematically hermeneutical, traces how Dasein itself, from within its lived experience, hermeneutically comes to ontological disclosure. Heidegger, à la his philosopher's horizon, circles back to the origin of the Ontology's interrogation, confirming our pre-understanding that what it means to be is to "lie *beyond*" (false notions of) statically present experience. Analogously, the reader (Dasein) is led back around to her intuited sense of this while she had identified with the They, though, this time, she is equipped to explicate it, and by that means to problematize her typical "way" of interpretation. Just what is found in these "blended" horizons is what Heidegger regards as the supreme ontological truth: "Higher than actuality stands *possibility*."[461] "We can understand phenomenology only be seizing upon it as a possibility," he writes, intimating two aforementioned points. First, like hermeneutic existence itself, phenomenology is always unfinished, and second, to understand one's existence as hermeneutical, one should come to perceive the existential analytic as an opportunity for recognizing one's living with or as "forgottenness" of Being.[462] When ontological understanding develops, what one comes to understand is that, (1) while Being sustains its constitution by non-being across interpretive changes, that fact suffers "decay" at the hands of Dasein's living as the They, and that (2) understanding is not to be taken in the ordinary, "vulgar" sense of the term as conceptual determination.[463] Rather, to disclose Being is to understand how it always eludes the concept and how Dasein cannot by the existential analytic (or, for that matter, any other "method" that Heidegger deems subpar) be specified completely. The analytic prompts readers

---

[460] Heidegger 2008a: 61.
[461] Ibid: 63.
[462] Ibid.
[463] Ibid: 401.

to grasp this idea shared by Heidegger and Adorno that, while the concept facilitates

understanding, understanding supersedes the concept.

Given that this idea, which is grasped *through* the analytic, is also just what had been

originally intuited, we see, as Steven Crowell recounts, that "'the circularity is a theoretical and

theoretically created difficulty' (GA 56/57:95). Philosophy need not remove, but only move

within, the circle of its material beginnings.[464] (We must clarify, however, that the "circularity"

referenced here belongs to the thematic horizon and not to pre-thematic experience; the latter is

circular, and the former recreates that circularity for the purpose of performing hermeneutic

phenomenology). Heidegger affirms that "what is decisive is not to get out of the circle," which,

with metaphysics, would entail disinterest in the question of Being, "but to come into it in the

right way," that is, with regard to how the question asks for a critical, phenomenological

ontology.[465] The analytic purposes to overturn that distortion by motivating readers to "move

within" our own pre-understanding of Being. It ultimately aims to move us out of the

"*theoretically created* difficulty" so as to apply our findings, on our own, practically to everyday

life. The most valuable upshot of the analytic, to which I will add detail in the next chapters, is

registering the need to recursively test what we might otherwise expect to be inflexible

boundaries of thought, where this leads us to discern ontological understanding as the condition

of the possibility for motivating modal authenticity.

---

[464] Crowell 2001: 135.
[465] Heidegger 2008a: 195.

CHAPTER THREE:

Recovering Non-Identity as a Possibility for Being, Part One:
Authentically Resolute for Critical Interpretation

I.   Dasein's "progression" toward authenticity

The preceding chapters have proposed that the ultimate agenda of Fundamental

Ontology, because it is to dissolve the problem of Being within not only the "world" of

disciplinary philosophy but also public life at large, is at the same stroke to recover non-identity

thinking as a value and norm that shapes the subject's typical, immediate self-consciousness as a

social agent. The existential analytic initially facilitates this, I explained, by prompting us to

engage in self-dialogue as we shift hermeneutically between the thematic and unthematic

horizons, "circling around" to our original sense of Being as non-being, which I have suggested

we consider as non-identity in Adorno's approximate sense of the term. The purpose of

emphasizing the Ontology's agenda in conjunction with beginning to trace how the analytic

generally unfolds has been to frame the main conclusion of this chapter; namely, that Dasein's

 "turning" to affirm itself authentically, or realizing its intrinsic possibility for exploring the

extent of its agency, comprises a series of authentically resolute acts that prepare Dasein for

critically interpretating not just the ontological structures of its facticity, but how its facticity is

specifically embedded in concrete social conditions. On that basis, I will explore how

Heidegger's existential analytic is supportive of, if not also preparatory to, engaging in acts of

determinate negation. The guiding aim of this chapter is to lay the groundwork for Chapter

Four's more extensive examination of how the analytic is conducive to negative social critique in

Adorno's fashion, as well as its considerations of how the analytic reveals Dasein's intrinsic

responsibility to care authentically for others, where this form of care resembles Adorno's vision

of intersubjective relations rooted in non-identity thinking. As Dasein experiences events of

appropriating a critical understanding of Being, it experiences *releasement* from the They, and

what it particularly releases itself from are societal doctrines that impede Dasein's possibilities

for realizing its "always and already" being poised to project itself toward the world *as* these two

manifestations of recognizing and valuing the "negative moments" that mediate meaning

formation.[466]

Whereas in Chapter Four I will advance these arguments by examining in more detail the

significance of Heidegger's ideas of historicality, socio-materiality, publicness, and

transcendence for understanding why authentically resolute Dasein is resolute *for* critical, socio-

ontological interpretation, here I intend to contextualize the arguments by focusing on, first, the

"how" of Dasein's "progression" toward modal authenticity, and second, the main elements of

Adorno's critique of authenticity in Heidegger. To this first end, I will consider how, as Dasein

recursively discloses the meaning of Being, its "lostness in the 'they' is revealed" (*"who"* it

typically is becomes transparent) and, following suit, it apprehends that its identity and

possibilities are not defined absolutely by the "actuality" of its facticity.[467] Insofar as "[a]uthentic

Being-one's-Self takes the definite form of an existentiell modification of the 'they,'"

authentically resolute Dasein uncovers that its identity is essentialized by its primordial *being as*

potentiality-for-Being, and, consequently, that how it decides to relate to itself and the world is

contingent on how it understands its temporal character. When Dasein traces that character back

to its ontological origins, it interprets itself to be founded by its tripartite structure of thrownness

and its being-in as projective care. It finds that no other *ontological*-existential structure - a

structure that *necessarily* exists independently of "worldly" contingencies - defines its existence

---

[466] In Chapter One I observed how, insofar as disclosing Being is a gradual process, Being must "event" itself numerous if not innumerable times. Each time, Dasein more starkly understands itself as essentially potentiality-for-Being.

[467] Heidegger 2008a: 354.

absolutely.[468] To the second end, I will enlarge upon the fundamental objections of Adorno's

polemic against Fundamental Ontology to show how they sustain Adorno's particular objections

against this idea of authentic freedom. These objections are (1) that authentic freedom is asocial,

ahistorical, and voluntaristic, (2) that it presents as nothing other than false consciousness, and

therefore (3) that the individual believing herself authentic augments her tendency to reify

consciousness, leading her to participate in the diminishment of her own agency and especially

her abilities to engage meaningfully in social critique. These objections, I contend here and

throughout the next chapter, reflect Adorno's wider misapprehension that existential-

phenomenological approaches fail to presuppose a "contradiction between the experience which

consciousness has of itself and its relation to [social] totality."[469]

These tasks are largely divided into two sections. To establish a firmer context in which

to address Adorno's critique of authenticity, in this first, briefer section I outline how Heidegger

specifically regards Dasein's "progression" toward modal authenticity to transpire.

. . .

Toward challenging Adorno's grounding objection that Dasein is a substantive subject, in

Chapter One I spoke to Dasein's existential "attunement" of *anxiety* [*Angst*], which, as

ontologically innate, arrives from the uncanniness of experiencing the unrepresentable unknown.

While I had there also alluded to the relation between anxiety and Dasein's projective character,

I had not yet begun to unpack what that relation specifically involves or what it is that motivates

(incipiently) authentic Dasein to reflect on it steadily and conscientiously. To do so now, what

must finally be introduced is Heidegger's idea of the *voice* or *call of conscience*, to which

Dasein's response cultivates authenticity from out of its anxiety. This is precisely how

---

[468] Ibid: 313.
[469] Adorno 1990: 261 - my brackets for clarity.

ontological truth - the truth of Dasein as potentiality-for-Being and, for that reason, as constituted by non-being or non-identity (I have argued) - is disclosed. The call is "heard" when Dasein confronts its anxiety candidly rather than seeking palliation by reaffirming the socio-cultural standards and values of the They. Refusing to repress its anxious disposition and thus its "originary" identity as thrown non-being (for the former necessarily co-constitutes the latter), Dasein opens itself up to the opportunity this confrontation provides for reflecting on the existential origins (and, as we will see, the social conditions) of its "public" *situation as* Dasein.[470] Dasein responds, first, to the call's "*appeal* to the they-self in its Self"; its "self" that, in the haste of its everyday dealings, is inattentive to the ontological-existential structures of its facticity. Second, the call "summons the Self to its potentiality-for-Being-its-Self, and thus calls Dasein forth to its possibilities."[471] On the basis of what it uncovers in the call's *appeal*, Dasein responds to the call's "summoning" by way of anticipatorily discerning possibilities to affirm its individual autonomy; that is, of realizing the need and opportunity to explore the range of its possibilities, to conscientiously decide which possibilities it will aim to fulfill, and to risk projecting itself toward them. This *rational* urge is its "conscience."

Additional "steps," phenomenologically speaking, lie within this loosely depicted relation between Dasein's hearing the call and determining to be authentic. What must first be addressed is a "step" that conditions the possibility for not only hearing the call, but for experiencing anxiety authentically (although the latter temporally overlaps with the call, with Heidegger I distinguish them thematically). This condition is Dasein's *resoluteness*. "He who is resolute,"

---

[470] "A mode in which the today makes itself present, in which therefore one already sees something like Dasein, is the *open space of publicness* which belongs to the being-there of Dasein," Heidegger writes in *Ontology - The Hermeneutics of Facticity* (Heidegger 1999: 38). For more on the role of publicness and public discourse as these pertain to modal authenticity, see Chapter Four, especially sections two and three, of this dissertation.
[471] Heidegger 2008a: 319.

Heidegger posits, "understands the *possibility* of anxiety."[472] *Authentically* resolute Dasein is

"*ready* for anxiety."[473] Noting that the exact relationship between the terms "resoluteness" and

"authenticity" is sometimes ambiguous in Heidegger and a point of contention among scholars,

resoluteness is at least *a form of being* through which Dasein "individualizes" itself (against the

They) and anticipates modal authenticity.[474] "But at the same time," Heidegger contends, "this is

the Being to which Dasein as Being-in-the-world has been delivered over"; Dasein *is* always

resolute insofar as resoluteness is an essential structure of Being.[475] The "call" catalyzes Dasein's

recognition of this structure and its possibilities to think and act in a way that reflects ontological

understanding. My interpretation of the relation is supported by Tom Rockmore's explication

that "there are authentic and inauthentic forms of resoluteness," and "resoluteness is authentic …

when it picks out what is uniquely characteristic of [an individual Dasein]."[476] This helps to shed

light on why Heidegger often appears to use the two terms interchangeably. Rockmore adds with

slight difference in connotation, however, that "[r]esoluteness is the key transitional notion, the

way in which Heidegger means to mediate between authenticity as a theoretical concept, an ideal

for human being as it were, and its practical realization."[477] Whereas "authenticity" designates

explicit disclosures of ontological truth, "resoluteness" designates Dasein's taking that truth to

apply it to, or as I have put it, to "blend" it within everyday existence (existentiell

interpretation).[478] (This must also be the case because, as I will explain, authenticity cannot be a

---

[472] Ibid: 395 - my italics for emphasis.
[473] Ibid: 393 - my italics for emphasis.
[474] Ibid: 232.
[475] Ibid: 232-233.
[476] Rockmore 1997: 46 - my brackets.
[477] Ibid.
[478] I take issue with how Rockmore delineates "authenticity as a theoretical concept," as this can suggest that Dasein can only come to understand Being authentically when it engages in specialized discourse. As I have mentioned, on at least two occasions Heidegger concedes that the existential analytic is but "one way" to approach the meaning of Being (though, not clarifying further, he leaves us room for just dubious speculation). Alongside but still more than that, Rockmore follows Heidegger's own tacit assumption that Being only can be disclosed within "theoretical"

permanent mode of being; acts of striving *for* modal authenticity, or acts of authentic resoluteness, are what the term "authenticity" actually signifies.) To reiterate Schürmann's reading (cited in Chapter Two), for Heidegger "the retrieval proper of the being question is bound to fail unless it is preceded by what he then calls an existentiell modification."[479] Resoluteness both originates in the possibility of such a modification of, and it is consequential for modifications in "practical life." Heidegger puts this as such: "In Dasein itself, and therefore in its own understanding of Being, the way the world is understood is ... reflected back ontologically upon the way in which Dasein itself gets interpreted."[480] Settled in, or ready for its anxiety, authentically resolute Dasein is ready to understand what is nevertheless pre-ontologically understood in modal inauthenticity: that it is defined by its temporal character, and thus that the essence of Being is to be suffused with non-being. Experiencing these authentic (we might say with Adorno, "negative") moments from within its mood of anxiety, Dasein in turn experiences an alteration in how it understands its particular *situation* as being-in-the-world; it "reflects" its ontological understanding "back upon the way" it immediately interprets itself. What it is *resolved* for is immediately interpreting its existence as always "open" to possibilities, all of that which is "other" than actuality per se.

Resolute Dasein is prepared to hear the "call of conscience," or to participate in ontological discourse, where this call "has the character of an *appeal* to Dasein by calling it to its ownmost potentiality-for-Being-its-Self; this is done by way of *summoning* it to its ownmost Being-guilty.[481] It experiences or, we should say, it "recovers" its *guilt*, given that Heidegger, de-

---

study. I suggest instead that the term "authenticity" be described as corresponding to lucid understanding of the meaning of Being, as this aligns more closely with Heidegger's description of the "event," but also accommodates the possibility for Dasein to disclose Being independently from esoteric texts.

[479] Schürmann 2003: 237.
[480] Heidegger 2008a: 26-7
[481] Ibid: 314 - original italics.

theologizing Kierkegaard, deems "being guilty" to be ontologically essential. Guilt, not in its

ordinary usage, but as an "existential phenomenon," is primordial to Dasein.[482]

> Being-*guilty* belongs to the Being of Dasein itself, and we have determined that this is primarily potentiality-for-Being. To say that Dasein 'is' constantly guilty can only mean that in every case Dasein maintains itself in this Being and does so as either authentic or inauthentic existing.[483]

Just what is Dasein guilty *about*? As explained in the previous chapter, Dasein always pre-

ontologically understands that it *is* what it is because it also is *not* what it is exactly in the factual

present; its facticity is constituted by a temporal "stretching" between the past and future. This

means that, as potentiality-for-Being, for Dasein there is always something "*still outstanding*" or,

to put this more precisely, Dasein always "outstands" or "stands beyond" itself; it is "that *Being*

of the 'not yet."[484] Its sense of being outstanding or not yet is co-primordial with its sense of

being factically *thrown*. Thrownness, Dasein's "Being-towards-the-beginning," is its existing

without having chosen to do so; Dasein is simply stuck with its "being there."[485] What is thrown

to Dasein is Being simpliciter but, for that reason, also the concrete social sphere to which it is

tied: the They. Inauthentic Dasein's self-understanding as thrown is overlaid by its identification

with the They. It is unaware of itself as thrown into a collective existence that, as inhibiting its

"fascination" with the fact of its being-in-the-world, inhibits its inherent inclination to reflect on

its onto-existential conditioning.[486] While "falling prey" to its otherwise mundane habituation,

Dasein is oblivious to its sense of self as essentially guilty, for what it is first and foremost guilty

about is what is has done with its condition of having been and having to be thrown.

---

[482] Ontologically "essential" guilt is the foundation of "ordinary" moral guilt (ibid: 277-8). This distinction for Heidegger is important to hold on to, as a point I will make in Chapter Four, section four, where I will address the issue of being-with-others, pivots on it.
[483] Ibid: 353.
[484] Ibid: 287.
[485] Ibid: 425.
[486] Ibid: 88.

Recognizing its thrownness, Dasein makes it its "own." This co-occurs with "taking over" its guilt resolutely, which "is accomplished only when that resoluteness, in its disclosure of Dasein, has become *so* transparent that Being-guilty is understood *as something constant*."[487] Dasein is always guilty insofar as it understands itself as having not been or being resolute. Its resoluteness both demands and is demanded by its uncovering this thrown-guilt relation that is essential to its Being; Dasein resolutely "*hands* itself *down* to itself" to reflect on what its existence originally "is."[488] It therefore comes to resonate with the meaning of its guilt "as Being-the-basis for a Being which has been defined by a 'not' - that is to say, as "*Being-the-basis of a nullity*."[489] Guilty, resolute Dasein is "appealed" to contemplate its state of thrownness, which, in large part, is just this essential "nullity" of itself, or its factically Being as non-being. It understands that though its existence, as hermeneutical, is ontologically holistic (its structures of being must be understood in conjunction), it cannot ever be existentially "whole."[490] Concomitant with this non-viability is Dasein's always having to choose (as opposed to inauthentically "fall" into) the actualization of some possibilities at the expense of others. Dasein's pre-understanding Being *as* non-being points to the ontological necessity of its always losing out on its possibilities, as the majority of those that Dasein even detects must inevitably go unfulfilled. At root, Dasein is guilty because it is thrown into its having to make decisions while also knowing implicitly that their alternatives, which might position it on a drastically different life course, cannot, by virtue of time, be accommodated, and also because it determines its actions while also knowing that acting resoluteness is always a risk; that the projects it chooses may fail or turn out not to be worth the while, prompting Dasein to become conscience-stricken

---

[487] Ibid: 353.
[488] Ibid: 443.
[489] Ibid: 329.
[490] See, for example, ibid: 279-290.

by the finitude of time. Understanding and embracing its guilt as such occurs as anticipatory acts of affirming itself to be *free*. Freedom is "tolerating one's not having chosen the others and one's not being able to choose them."[491] Guilt, the anxiety attunements that both encompass and engender guilt, and thus freedom would not be in Dasein's realm of possibilities if it were not potentiality (non-being, non-identity), but actuality (reified being, identity) that originally determines Dasein's facticity.

Authentically resolute Dasein confesses its guilt to itself, and through this confession its unique possibilities come to initially be perceived. Its guilt points it mindfully *back* toward its state of thrownness, and in doing so points it *forward* - "ahead of itself" - to grasp itself as projective nothingness; its "being there" then emerges as potentiality-for-Being. In this way, Dasein "awakens the present."[492] This moment is mutually informed by Dasein's authentic "historicality," which prepares the way for more frequent moments of revealing the ecstatic nature of time.[493] Here Dasein finds itself not to be conjunctively thrown *and* projective, but *thrown projection*, or just as its "hermeneutical situation" that establishes its *care* for its situated being.[494] Whether Dasein cares authentically or inauthentically, it is defined by potentiality-for-Being, which correlates with its inherently *being* historical. The possibility of Dasein's caring authentically, then, is mutually conditioned by its being authentically historical - that is, by its candid self-understanding of Being as a "temporal connectedness." [495]

To set this differently, as conscientious of always and already being historical, resolute Dasein (having authentically fulfilled its "wanting to have a conscience") understands that it has

---

491 Ibid: 331.
492 Ibid: 378.
493 Ibid: 437-438.
494 Ibid: 265.
495 For a more thorough treatment of "historicality" in Heidegger, see Chapter Four, sections two and three.

been thrown *both* into essentially having to be "null" of actuality *and* "full" of potentiality,[496] *as well as* into the They, habituating it to cooperate unwittingly in concealing its self-understanding as thrown potentiality.[497] It determines that it may as well then choose, if not that it is *responsible* for choosing with considered foresight whichever of its possibilities it is autonomously impelled to realize. Accordingly, Dasein finds its originary situation to be a simultaneous "burden" and "gift." As "burden," thrown projection conditions Dasein's inability to ever escape its "lack-of-togetherness" with itself.[498] Though irresolute and resolute Dasein equally desire to be ontologically "total," it is only through being authentically resolute that the unattainability of such totality is lucidly understood. Resolute Dasein understands that its "[lack of totality] is a 'not yet' which any Dasein, as the entity which it is, has to be," and yet too that it cannot fulfill all of its "not-yets" while still being Dasein.[499] As "gift," thrown projection is embraced, for resolute Dasein accepts its "being-there" exactly as it is. The world always "gives itself [es gibt sich]" to Dasein, but only as resolute does Dasein perceive itself as onto-existentially projected "openly" into the world, inexorably receiving what is given; it understands its situation and what it is now able to do with it.[500] "This is the basic fact of human life we cannot deny nor ignore nor get beyond," as Mark Wrathall puts it. "We have to accept the world as it is given to us and take it from there."[501] (However, we must stress that, as hermeutical, Dasein cannot simply "accept" its situation all at once if it is to be genuinely resolute. Otherwise, it would risk falsely believing itself to have achieved authenticity as a *substance* of Being, which is exactly what Adorno argues modal authenticity is all about. As I will explain in Chapter Four, authentically resolute Dasein

---

[496] That Dasein is "null" of actuality does not mean that it is unconditioned by the concrete world. For again, part of what Dasein is "thrown" is its socialization by the They. Dasein's "nullity" references its temporal fracturing in which its being is unconfined to the "actual" present.
[497] Ibid: 334.
[498] Ibid: 287.
[499] Ibid: 288.
[500] For example, see ibid: 260.
[501] Wrathall 2013: 55.

also engages in historical acts of "repetition" through which it recursively refines how it understands its situation and possibilities.) Dasein concedes to its anxiety and on that basis it resolves to resist how it has internalized and continues to internalize the habits and values of the They.[502] Dogmatic constructs of identity, canons of metaphysics and theisms, any and all micro- or macro-level concepts resting on absolutes, may be recognized in moments of resoluteness as fragile, dispensable, if not also violent dictations of life. To a similar point, Rollo May asserts that "the objectless nature of anxiety arises from the fact that *the security base of the individual is threatened ... the distinction between subject and object breaks down*."[503] Resolute Dasein, for May and Heidegger, is disillusioned by its originally appropriating a reified construct of subjectivity. Reiner Schürmann articulates this as anticipation of "the singularization to come as an undertow that undermines every hegemonic fantasm."[504] This singularization, this "place of an instant,"[505] occurs in "Dasein's own place," in "the abyss of the ground lost," which is ultimately to say in Dasein's relieving itself of its typical assumption that its identity and possibilities are preordained.[506] Singularized Dasein attunes to the blank non-being at the center of its Being, in hope of refuge not from anxiety and the existential "nullity" that anxiety lays bare, but from the stale life for which its previous repressions of anxiety are precisely responsible. It acts resolutely in spite of its existential "groundlessness" and suppressed impulses or instincts and desires.

We must be cautious, however, not to misinterpret anxiety as necessarily motivating Dasein to come to "stand in" existential or moral nihilism. Some scholars have assumed Heidegger to mean that authentic Dasein's freely choosing one possibility over another

---

[502] See, for example, Heidegger 2008a: 443.
[503] May 1997: 208.
[504] Schürmann 2003: 25.
[505] Heidegger 2008a: 549.
[506] Ibid: 551.

ultimately bears no significance.[507] Denis McManus, devoting several chapters of his book

Heidegger, Authenticity, and the Self to address this assumption alone, contextualizes it within

Heidegger's claim that anxiety reveals "the nothing of the world."[508] Proponents of the position

rationalize that, given Heidegger's description of Dasein as a thrown "nullity," the actualizations

of all possibilities are to be interpreted as equally meaningless. McManus illustrates his response

with this telling note in *Being and Time*: "Anxiety liberates him ['He who is resolute'] *from*

possibilities which 'count for nothing,' and lets him become *free* for those which are

authentic."[509] The inference made by these proponents, he concludes, confuses Heidegger's

insistence on Dasein's factual non-being as suggesting that authentic Dasein is indifferent to its

decision-making. To annex McManus' response, these proponents efface that which crucially

differentiates authentic from inauthentic Dasein. Their reading implies that authentic Dasein is

unaware of its living as the They, which (on Heidegger's count) must depend on its unawareness

of itself as potentiality-for-Being. Authentic Dasein carefully chooses, or at least recognizes the

need to carefully choose, how it will project itself in the world, and it does this based on its

recognizing, in particular terms, how the They constricts its agency. Its choices come to be

shaped by a desire to explore the distinct possibilities for its existence. That being the case,

authentic Dasein's choices *must matter* to it. To claim differently is to render inauthentic and

authentic Dasein indistinguishable, for Heidegger supposes inauthentic Dasein to lack such

intersecting awareness of its ontological primordiality as temporally projective and its being

"destined" to make sense of itself in a world conditioned by the They. In other words, if "nothing

really matters" for authentic Dasein, then it has come to terms with its being thrown neither in

---

[507] This is William Blattner's interpretation, to take one example. "None of its possibilities matter to it differentially," he writes about anticipatorily resolute Dasein (Blattner 1994: 67).
[508] McManus 2014: 164.
[509] Ibid: 164 (SZ 344).

terms of its basic existentially nor its specific social environment(s), and this simply is not

Heidegger's standpoint. "*Conscience manifests itself as the call of care*";[510] "*Resoluteness*,"

Heidegger continues, "*is only that authenticity which, in care, is the object of care [in der Sorge*

gesorgte], and which is possible as care - the authenticity of care itself."[511] Dasein determines to

care for its being-in-the-world in a new way; it cares about nurturing its agency (and, as we will

see in the next chapter, the agency of others), something that it is said to not truly care about

while modally inauthentic, for the They provides merely the "illusion" of choice.[512]

There remains a final problem entailed by authentic Dasein's misrepresentation as

nihilistic. Portraying Dasein to reconcile itself with neither "level," we might say, of its

thrownness, one sorely misses how fundamental is Dasein's transparently experiencing itself

being-toward-death as a condition of authentic resoluteness. I have noted that Dasein always

"outstands" itself as something that exceeds actuality, and that this amounts to its potentiality-

for-being. Whether Dasein comes to grips with this authentically or not, its potentiality-for-Being

is indebted all the same to its primordial understanding that "*Death is something that stands*

before [it] - something impending."[513] Up until Section 48 of *Being and Time*, Heidegger speaks

of Dasein's potentiality for "ripening" itself - for fulfilling itself as a "whole," or "totality." But

this is attainable only in death. "Dasein's coming to an end ... gives to it its wholeness."[514] Of

---

[510] Heidegger 2008a: 322.
[511] Ibid: 348.
[512] (1) Though inauthentic Dasein might *believe* that it cares for its agency, the meaning of agency is for it distorted.
I will later return to this issue for purposes of juxtaposing the They with the "administered world."
(2) Nietzsche's writings on "conscience" in *The Gay Science* (§344) are particularly apt in this context. "Do you
know nothing of an intellectual conscience? A conscience behind your 'conscience'? Your judgment, 'that is right'
has a prehistory in your drives, inclinations, aversions, experiences, and what have you failed to experience; you
have to ask, '*how* did it emerge there?' and then also, '*what* is really impelling me to listen to it?' [...] In short, there
are a hundred ways to listen to your conscience. But *that* you hear this or that judgment as the words of conscience,
i.e., *that* you feel something to be yourself and in your blindly having accepted what has been labelled *right* since
your childhood; or in the fact that fulfilling your duties has so far brought you bread and honours - and you consider
it right because it appears to you as *your own* 'condition of existence'" (Nietzsche 2009: 187-188).
[513] Ibid: 294 - my brackets.
[514] Ibid: 284.

course, in death Dasein is no longer Dasein, meaning that a sense of wholeness is unattainable after all. Heidegger describes the "call of conscience" to be originally "appealing" *because* Dasein is being-toward-death; viz., being-toward-death is to which Dasein ultimately "owes" its being as time. It is the origin of Dasein's (hermeneutic experience of) temporality and thus for its capability to exist resolutely. Authentic Dasein's perceiving itself as thrown projection is possible just as it is both thrown and projecting toward death. Its grappling with guilt

> is made possible only in so far as Dasein discloses to itself its potentiality-for-Being, and discloses it 'right to its end'. Existentially, however, Dasein's "*Being-at-an-end*" implies Being-*towards*-the-end. As *Being-towards-the-end which understands* - that is to say, as anticipation of death - resoluteness becomes authentically what it can be. Resoluteness does not just 'have' a connection with anticipation, as with something other than itself. *It harbours in itself authentic Being-towards-death, as the possible existentiell modality of its own authenticity.*[515]

To qualify the earlier claims that (1) resoluteness must already be in place as it "prepares" Dasein for anxiety, and (2) the terms "resoluteness" and "authenticity" are in Heidegger often interchangeable, we are now in a position to more patently detect how resoluteness is not simply a forerunner to anxiety, but that it appropriates and is appropriated by anxiety in a way that nurtures Dasein's understanding and affirmation of itself as *anticipating* its own future and finitude. Here Schürmann's deciphering authentic Dasein as a "singularization" is given a more distinctive context. As "anticipatorily resolute" towards death, Being is "given" to Dasein as the possibility for recognizing the precarity of, and undermining, hegemonic norms of living. Authentic Dasein embodies "a freedom which has been released from the Illusions of the "they."[516]

> Anxiety makes manifest in Dasein its *Being towards* its ownmost potentiality-for-Being – that is, its *Being-free for* the freedom of choosing itself and taking hold of itself. Anxiety brings Dasein face to face with its *Being-free for* (*propensio in*...) the authenticity of its Being, and for this authenticity as a possibility which it always is.[517]

---

[515] Ibid: 353.
[516] Ibid: 311.
[517] Ibid: 232-233.

Living as the They, Dasein grapples with its mortality in abstraction from what it pre-understands. It "flees" to ideate that "everyone dies but else me"; that "the 'they' never dies because it cannot die; for death is in each case mine"; that "[t]o the very end ['Dasein'] always has more time.'"[518] Inauthentic Dasein is consumed by seeking after the comfort that a sense of existential "wholeness" would provide. Its anxiety is irresolute, and by this it remains in denial of its own death, and therefore also of its existential freedom, or agency. Anxiety is constituted by a future, "but not by the inauthentic future of awaiting" - not by a passivity toward death and the possibilities preceding death that themselves await actualization.[519] Viscerally understanding the human situation as being-toward-death is just how Dasein comes to self-understand as potentiality-for-Being. As the They, Dasein "cannot die," for death can only be conceptualized as a "not-yet," which brings forth Dasein's concept of itself as "not-yet" in terms of an incessant projecting toward the future. Authentically resolute Dasein realizes its potential for such self-awareness, which occurs in tandem with its realizing the need and possibility for working out the meaning of Being.

---

[518] Ibid: 477 - my brackets.
[519] Ibid: 393.

II. *Socio-historical Dasein and resoluteness for critical interpretation*

Although I have referred to it as a "progression," Dasein's turn from inauthenticity to authenticity does *not* entail that Dasein's self-identity is somehow transmuted in one fell swoop or that it is even guaranteed that, once Dasein begins to experience moments of self-interpreting authentically, authenticity is thereby secured as a perennial modality. Heidegger attests to Hegel's position that "'progress' never signifies a merely quantitative 'more.' [...] In its development spirit aims 'to reach its own concept.' The development itself is 'a hard, unending battle against itself.'"[520] For Heidegger specifically, that modal authenticity must always be an inconclusive project is justified by the simple reason of the ontological circularity of temporal Being, or of the meaning of Being as temporally hermeneutic interpretation.[521] This fact reflects how (as I intimated in the foregoing section), while the truth of Being is disclosed progressively, what constitutes that progress is Dasein's interpreting its essence (the truth of Being) *by* projecting into the future *while* reciprocally connecting its present projecting (its Augenblick - its transient "moment-of-vision") to its past (Dasein "repeats" its Gewesenheit). Both Alexander Garcia Dütmann and Gert-Jan van der Heiden elucidate this in terms of how thought is always a "memory." Dasein is "concerned with the past in the sense of *das Gewesene*, that which has been" (rather than as *Vergangene*, where the past would be regarded as a collection of facts able

---

[520] Heidegger 2008a: 485.

[521] Although in *Being and Time* Heidegger often appears to describe Dasein's maturation toward modal authenticity as a linear movement, what his story intends to tell is just how resolute Dasein increasingly realizes that interpreted experience must always unfold non-linearly. The story of hermeneutic being is inevitably structured as such only for purposes of pursuing existential analysis, which advances reflection on one's own self-identity by engaging a general pattern through which the meaning of Being as potentiality can come to be embraced. As Katherine Withy puts it in her 2015 book, *Heidegger on Being Uncanny*, "the story told in the ode is not about actual events in time but is a narrative projection of essence. The narrative cannot fall out perfectly as a linear process because it is attempting to express a kind of looping within Dasein's essence" (Withy 2015: 208). That is, the hermeneutic that is definitive of language and Being obliges Heidegger to describe Dasein's maturation, which of course is itself hermeneutic, in a circular way.

to be fully codified and that ontologically *are* no longer).[522] Daniel Dahlstrom adopts this theme

to illustrate how "the hyphenated '*is*-as-I-*am*-having-been' indicates neither something over and

done with nor something still lingering like a nasty hangover. Instead the expression signifies, as

Thomas Sheehan has aptly put it, 'that which at any given moment is always prior to and beyond

our determination.'"[523] Thought is always a memory even while, or better put *because* it also is

always projecting toward the future, for (leaving to one side that death fundamentally conditions

Being's hermeneutic character) Dasein cannot project itself if not *from* the past. A "leap into a

new realm," van der Heiden continues, "always needs an old domain to leap away from."[524] In

that sense, the past *is* the future, and vice versa. What is happening, then, is that Dasein is not

exactly "itself" as it comes to interpret Being authentically; its self-identity only can correspond

to projective memory, wherein the future and past each elude identification with a statically

present concept (such a concept is indeed impossible). What authentic Dasein precisely interprets

is how its essential character is to always be not "itself." "Looping" its occurring experience to

its experience while living as the They, Dasein recognizes how it has interpreted Being

untruthfully and, simultaneously, that its pre-understanding of Being from out of historicality and

projection has been and is what is grounding its facticity. Here, Kierkegaard's influence on

Heidegger becomes most evident. "It is quite true what philosophy says: that life must be

understood backwards," Kierkegaard affirms in an aphorism that indicates his understanding

temporality as hermeneutic. "But then one forgets the other principle: that it must be lived

forwards."[525] In general, how Heidegger's describes Dasein's "progression" toward authenticity

---

[522] van der Heiden 2014: 145. Also see Düttmann 2002.
[523] Dahlstrom 2009: 329. Note: Here Dahlstrom addresses the later Heidegger, in which this specific idea of "thought as memory" is more pronounced. I find his reading, however, to apply to the earlier Heidegger as well.
[524] van der Heiden 2014: 144.
[525] Kierkegaard 1996: 161 (43 *IV A* 164). Note: Although in Division II Heidegger deeply channels (his) Kierkegaard to several ends - for instance as G. Patios points out in relation to Heidegger, "Kierkegaard completely

reflects how Kierkegaard traces the development of the self as unfolding through "three leaps," albeit unidirectionally. Neither Kierkegaard nor Heidegger regards paths to self-realization as occuring through sequential stages that passed through on a categorically ascending line. Contributing to his rationale for this scenario's impossibility, Heidegger explains that Dasein's hermeneutic "looping" is informed by its inability to escape the inevitable "*flight of Dasein from itself*, a flight from itself into the world discovered by it" - that is to say, Dasein's fallenness into the They.[526] This remains the case even while Dasein *is* authentically resolute, for "Being-fallen into the 'world' does not now somehow come to rest."[527] As mentioned in the previous chapter, that Dasein is destined to fall indicates that traditional metaphysics is not fundamentally to blame for Being's forgottenness. Though metaphysics certainly amplifies the problem, the problem is also already structural to Being as the They, and "fleeing" to it, are essential to Dasein's situation.

Foreshadowing a challenge to one of Adorno's main objections, Dasein's primordial tendency to "flee" must involve one of two possibilities. In the first case, Dasein will not become abidingly resolute, for it will either determine or suffer psychical coercion to revert to the habits of the They. Repeating or continuing to dwell within moments of authentic resoluteness is not guaranteed because Dasein may forfeit its interest in its evolving understanding of Being. Dasein may perhaps attain a brief moment of ontological insight, recoil in overwhelm, and return to identify with the They as a steady mode of existence. In the second case, Dasein chooses to remain anxiously attuned, with discomfort of knowing itself as finite potentiality, to refine, repetitiously, how it self-interprets and how it avails itself of its "situation(s)." In the first case, Dasein may rejoin its existential analysis at a later time and thus realize this second possibility

interweaves human self and temporality... Temporality is the very blood of the (historical) self" - Heidegger amends Kierkegaard's notion of "being-in-time" to emphasize the primordial simultaneity of repetition and projection (Patio 2014: 167, note 19).

[526] Heidegger 1985: 282.
[527] Heidegger 2008a: 222.

(perhaps over and over again). In the second, it may be that Dasein commits to its discomfort still more tenaciously, often holding still in curiosity of how deep its onto-existential understanding can be. Regardless of which path Dasein takes, "having itself for its own in intimacy with itself" is an unfinished project, and still then one that must be constantly interrupted as time presses on.[528] For, even if Dasein is committed to exploring its anxiety - if it, à la Kierkegaard's Knight of Faith, resigns itself to how "patience makes itself free in the unavoidable suffering" - it will recursively throughout this process return to understand itself in relation to its everyday, socio-material environments from which its meditations initially led it astray.[529] We must take into account, however, how over time these interruptions may occur less frequently, as Being "events" itself in more sharply defined ways and Dasein accustoms its mundane interpretations accordingly. Indeed, inevitably at a certain point may Dasein "blend" its ontological and ontic horizons to the extent that these cannot be considered "interruptions" at all. This is precisely the point of modal authenticity: to unify one's thematic, ontological insight with one's immediate tendencies of ontic life, or to typify one's everydayness by a commitment to always value and care for the ways in which the temporally hermeneutic character of Being always reveals new possibilites for shaping how one engages in the world.

Pointing towards this, Heidegger writes:

> A specific kind of *forgetting* is essential for the temporality that is constitutive for letting something be involved. The Self must forget itself if, lost in the world of equipment, it is to be able 'actually' to go to work and manipulate something. But all the same, inasmuch as an *awaiting* always leads the way in the unity of the temporalizing of concern, concernful Dasein's own potentiality-for-Being has, as we shall show, been given a position in care.[530]

Whether authentic or inauthentic, Dasein must "forget" itself; it cannot dwell endlessly within the horizon of "explicit" ontological insight. Yet while *authentic* Dasein "forgets" itself, it at the

---

[528] Ibid.
[529] Kierkegaard 2009: 119.
[530] Heidegger 2008a: 405.

same time still cares for itself as potentiality-for-Being. It continues to hear the call of its conscience, even Dasein is receptive to the call without such insight. The life Dasein thereby leads, McManus explains, "is inflected by authenticity, though still lived within the everyday. One must return authentically to the everyday, for there is nowhere else to live."[531] As Heidegger phrases this, "Dasein's facticity is such that as long as it is what it is, Dasein remains in the throw, and is sucked into the turbulence of the "they's" inauthenticity."[532] Following from Dasein's inability to evade its thrownness, Dasein is also unable to evade "returning" to the mundane. This time, however, because it is authentically resolute, it is mindful of the "ownness" of its identity, the "mineness" of its Dasein.

Sustaining this self-temporalization - that is, continuing to engage with its fallen past and present by means of ruminating on its identity as potentiality-for-Being (and vice versa) - Dasein discerns its "already there" possibility, which belongs to it intrinsically, of *being itself* in a way that is at least not fully defined by the They. Although but only in oblique reference to Heidegger, Tillich summarizes this circumstance as: "In every encounter with reality man is already beyond this encounter. He knows about it, he compares it, he is tempted by other possibilities, he anticipates the future as he remembers the past. This is his freedom."[533] While Dasein, no matter its modality, cares for itself as the They - it cares about its existence while experiencing Being in its untruth - in difference to when it exists inauthentically, Dasein here registers, to borrow Kierkegaard's words from *The Concept of Dread*, that "untruth is precisely unfreedom," i.e., that there is a necessary correlation between Dasein's freedom on the one hand, and its particular sense of Being on the other.[534] Dasein becomes aware of its routine inclination

---

[531] McManus 2014: 131.
[532] Heidegger 2008a: 223.
[533] Tillich 2014: 82.
[534] Kierkegaard 1957: 138.

to "shrink," as Adorno puts it for his subject, "to the nodal points of conventional reactions and the modes of operation objectively expected of [it],"[535] and in doing so it accepts that "to decipher the human essence by the way it is *now* would sabotage its possibility."[536] Continuing, McManus plainly describes this as authentic Dasein's self-realizing its power to "modify the Anyone [the They]." "Authenticity inflects the everyday, which in turn continues to provide the 'content' of one's life: ... one's social roles, etc."[537] Running counter to its inauthentic identity as this is imagined as statically present being, authentic Dasein self-identifies with Being as a temporal holism (though Dasein itself cannot ever be "whole"). Uncovering this true basis of its self-identity, within its everyday affairs authentic Dasein finds itself free for *individualized* decision making. Like Tillich's subject who bears "courage to be," Dasein is free "in the sense of being able to determine [itself] through decisions in the center of [its] being."[538] Understanding that its mode of everyday existence is *not* stationary, or that its concepts and behaviors are not absolutely predetermined, Dasein "modifies" itself in relation to the They by recouping its essence as projection. Given this, I tentatively suggest that Heidegger's hermeneutic phenomenology of authenticity dovetails with Adorno's call for a "dialectical definition of the will," or "the force that enables consciousness to leave its own domain and *so to change what merely exists*; its recoil is resistance."[539] Authentically resolute Dasein fathoms how its facticity is not wholly determined by the character of its society (for instance, it may challenge how it ordinarily encounters entities as merely ready-to-hand).[540] As I initially uncovered in Chapter

---

[535] Adorno 1990: 21 - my brackets.
[536] Ibid: 220.
[537] McManus 2014: 131 - my brackets.
[538] Tillich 2014: 52 - my brackets.
[539] Adorno 1990: 241 - my italics.
[540] In section one, I presented the possibility that Heidegger tacitly corresponds the structure of equipmentality with that of the They, and that, while the They, as social character, is ontologically structural, the They described in Division I is only structural to the contemporary Western epoch. In that case, certain structures of Being, including equipmentality, would be socio-historically contingent. This is what I have in mind when I suggest that authentic

One's last section, because the object of its anxiety is ultimately its own *being* uncanny in the face of "the nothing," Dasein cannot interpret it from within total reliance on the concept. I argued that we should read this as a mimetic relation - a "negative" moment in conceptuality - just as for Adorno the negatively dialectical "will," which would "force" the subject to shrink away in horror from her experience of total social constraint, is also in part "external" to - it is *not* - the subject herself. Assembling her consciousness of that constraint does not correspond to absolute willing. Authentic Dasein is *not* detached from the world but, indeed, is all the closer to it.

With all this in place, I turn now to describe and address a few of Adorno's core objections to authentic freedom as it is interpreted in the Ontology, objections which both encompass and exceed his objections to the idea of existential freedom more generally. The objections are mutually entailing and cannot be addressed without sure expectation of overlap. They all follow, moreover, from Adorno's headlining premise that the idea of existential freedom is a form of reifying consciousness, that it "insulates" the subject from its "entwining" with a "nonconceptual whole."[541] I itemize them for the purpose of organizational coherence. My responses to these objections, in this chapter, should be treated as still quite preliminary and incomplete, with readers bearing in mind that I will return to them in Chapter Four.

. . .

Dasein may challenge its typical dealings with entities. While I discuss authentic being-with in the following section, I will return to consider this reading, especially by introducing the problem of determining the They's relation to modal inauthenticity and by offering new supporting evidence.
[541] Ibid: 12.

Taken holistically, Adorno's argument against existential freedom is that it corroborates the Enlightenment principle of individuation,[542] which implicates a "fictional" sense of agency as unconditional to the object, which is broadly construed as the socio-material world.[543] The subject's imagining herself to be existentially free is just self-reification, for she assumes that consciousness "tolerates no 'outside'" and is instead purely transcendent.[544] She is "for-itself," as a meaning-making agent, while not also "in-itself"; the relation of herself as a socio-historical being, with her socio-historical world, is not figured into her self-identity.[545] "The subject, the concept of which was once created [by existential phenomenology] in contrast to reification, thus becomes reified."[546] As such, for Adorno her sense of freedom is metaphysically and epistemically incoherent, for the choices she makes are products of consciousness as it is constituted by a dialogical relation between concepts and the institutional dynamics and norms ("materiality") of the particular society that is responsible for cultivating her "second nature." He discerns Kierkegaard to have set a precedent for theories of freedom rooted in neglect of the fact that "[w]hatever an I can introspectively experience as 'I' is also 'not-I.'"[547] Although the Sartre of *Critique of Dialectical Reason* corrects *Being and Nothingness* by centralizing the "negative moment" of consciousness, Adorno intermittently upbraids the earlier text for its deficient treatment of how the "in-itself," as objectivity in the Hegelian-Marxist sense, both shapes and is shaped by the "for-itself." In that way, the distinction Sartre posits between the two mimics the traditional subject-object dichotomy.

---

[542] See, for example, Horkheimer and Adorno 2007; Adorno 1990: 261-262.
[543] Adorno 1990: 223 - my brackets.
[544] Ibid: 274.
[545] See, for example, Adorno 2005: 16; Adorno 2003: 78-82.
[546] Adorno 2003: 94.
[547] Adorno 1990: 279.

While Adorno's critique of freedom problematizes both Kierkegaard and Sartre, its main

target is of course Heidegger. As Trent Schroyer puts it in his Forward to *The Jargon of*

Authenticity, the notion of authentic Dasein echoes "Kierkegaard's radical inwardness," which

"becomes an idealistic objectivism by failing to comprehend subjectivity as a historical

category."[548] But the problem is more pronounced in Heidegger than it is in Kierkegaard; Dasein

is yet more definitively ahistorical and asocial. David Sherman iterates that, while Adorno

absolutely finds Kierkegaard to abstract the individually free subject from its existence,

Kierkegaard's *intention* was at least to attack Hegel's "identity thinking,"[549] an intention missing

in Heidegger, who purportedly eschews, on the basis of Hegel's shortcomings, the idea of the

dialectic entirely. Moreover, although Adorno faults Kierkegaard for purportedly equating

freedom with independence from "social ills," Kierkegaard still appears to take for granted,

albeit to a minimal extent, an integration of concrete society into the formation of individual

identity.[550] This is also in contrast to Heidegger, who, according to Adorno, "seals [the societal

relation] off in the identity of the subject;" the subject "is de-societalized into an in-itself,"

unencumbered by affects of cultural mediation, rendered both indeterminate and immutable.[551]

Though this holds for both inauthentic and authentic Dasein,[552] it is in the latter that this

detachment is morally revered: "The findings of Heidegger's existential analysis, according to

which the subject is authentic insofar as it possesses itself, grant special praise to the person who

is sovereignly at his own disposal."[553] Authenticity is a "preordained factor," a "mythically

---

[548] Adorno 2003: xi.

[549] Sherman 2012: 18.

[550] I connect here the basic premises of *Kierkegaard: Construction of the Aesthetic* (Adorno 1989), the majority of which is nevertheless a scathing account of Kierkegaard.

[551] Adorno 2003: 94-95.

[552] "Until further notice, authenticity and inauthenticity have as their criterion the decision in which the individual subject chooses itself as its own possession" (ibid: 94).

[553] Ibid: 104.

imposed fate."[554] This is inevitable given that authenticity is an explicit affirmation of (Heideggerian) Being, and, as I have explained, Adorno interprets Being as a variation of idealism. The fact that in Heidegger it is Being that grounds consciousness, combined with Adorno's interpreting this Being to be categorically distinguished from the socio-material world, accounts for Adorno's inference that the idea of Dasein is comprised by only a "selfsame" relation between concepts that are nothing but "pure positivity."[555] "The supreme state which has to be thought, but which also refuses being thought, is mutilated by the jargon [of authenticity].… The dialectic is broken off: the dialectic being word and thing."[556] That "supreme state" is reality as a dialectical totality of conceptuality ("word") and concreteness ("thing"), which refuses identity with the concept. While in Chapters One and Two I defended the concept in Heidegger against Adorno's charge of identity, that defense now warrants additional substantiation. For, what is fundamentally at stake in Adorno's critique of authenticity is the possibility that, when Dasein figures itself to have "achieved" authenticity, it confirms for itself no recourse to conceptual negativity, and rather amplifies its extant disposition to think identically. It robs itself of the possibility to recover the "*negative moment*" in the concept (the moment "is mutilated by the jargon"), and hence of the possibility to resist adminstered principles that, internalized by Dasein, impede Dasein's agency.[557] In that vein, Adorno argues that imagining to have shaped one's own identity according to Heidegger's idea of freedom results in an outcome opposite to the one intended, as freedom "can be defined in negation only, corresponding to the concrete form of a specific unfreedom.... Posited positively, as given or as

---

[554] Ibid.
[555] See, for example, Adorno 1990: 89-92.
[556] Adorno 2008: 8.
[557] Adorno 2003: 8.

unavoidable amidst given things, freedom turns directly into unfreedom."[558] Any defense of why

freedom in Heidegger is at least largely invulnerable to Adorno's critique, then, necessitates

above all consideration for whether Heidegger normatively reinforces (per the idea of

authenticity) what Adorno presumes is Dasein's already described tendency to identify concepts

and phenomena "totally," and, alongside side this, to imagine its agency as independent from the

socio-historical world. This is primarily why I have taken Chapters One and Two to address the

first issue. Here, I will continue to address the second.

Adorno concludes that, in light of his purported failure to construe authentic Dasein as

realizing its freedom to conceptually negate the ways in which it "really" is unfree, Heidegger

ultimately represents freedom as *voluntarism*. All to which the term "freedom" refers is self-

identification and deliberation on self-serving choices that are posited in abstraction from "the

ontic."[559] The term is reified, as it "outlives" any of its references to concrete contexts.[560] Instead

it refers to the subject's confusing its agency (and thus we might say, for Adorno, Dasein's self-

understanding as potentiality-for-Being) with "self-possession, unlimited and narrowed by no

heteronomy."[561] Aligning with late capitalism's need to press a doctrine of individualism - "a

propagandistic appeal of freedom" - authentic Dasein subscribes, no matter how unwittingly, to

the principle of social atomization.[562] In only apparent contradiction, for Adorno this results in

Dasein's being "stripped" of its individuality. Dasein "recoils into [an ontological] objectivism"

wherein it denies the potential of its rationality to *be as* determinate negation, leaving itself

vulnerable to indoctrination by institutional ideology; it validates the normalization of "passive,

---

[558] Adorno 1990: 231-232.
[559] Adorno 2003: 92. In this passage, Adorno is performing immanent critique, as he does throughout the majority of his polemic against Heidegger, and part of which includes utilizing the language of Heidegger's own framework.
[560] Ibid: 33.
[561] Ibid: 105.
[562] Adorno 1990: 275.

atomistic, reflex-like conduct."[563] Dasein resigns itself to standardized conceptions of identity,

which leads it to cooperate, with institutionalized thinking, in its own *depersonalization*.[564]

Throughout this section and the following chapter, I argue for several cases that reveal the

untenability of these interconnected objections.

In *History and Freedom*, Adorno stresses that designating freedom as voluntarism,

whether implicitly or explicitly, is a historical problem for philosophy, one that is tied to another

problem yet more ubiquitous; viz., the west's attachment to the ideal of "progress." Regarding its

manifestation in institutional academia especially, the ideal of "philosophical progress dupes us,"

"presumptuously [forcing] itself on our attention at the expense of its object of inquiry."[565] To be

expected, he names Heidegger as a key contributor to the problem's persistence. The problem

bears double-meaning. On the one hand, Adorno is speaking to philosophy's proclivity to

envision subjectivity/humanity as always ascending toward a mystical state of existence. This

misguides philosophical analyses to extract themselves from candid considerations of how the

world ("the object of inquiry") is truly experienced. I have already argued that *Being and Time* is

not an account of what would otherwise be Dasein's linear progression toward authenticity, and I

will continue to argue that, predominantly *because* its progression is non-linear, modal

authenticity is interdependent with Dasein's critical reflection on "real" reality. What must be

specifically addressed here, however, is Adorno's drawing attention to how philosophers have

tended to imagine themselves and their works to be historically advancing nearer to truth, as

Heidegger does by deeming Fundamental Ontology the first true metaphysical account since

Aristotle that foregrounds the question of "what is." That Adorno finds this fallacious is certain

given that his notion of truth corresponds most generally to the uncovering of consciousness as

---

[563] Ibid: 277 - my brackets.
[564] For example, see ibid: 70-1, 279-285.
[565] Adorno 2006: 169 – my brackets.

defined by its dialectical relation with socio-material dynamics (hence why he diagnoses in the academy a "devaluation of so-called cultural philosophy").[566] My rejoinder is that, despite this disparity, in the end Heidegger and Adorno arrive at mutually supportive conclusions pertaining to what it *is* that is essential to human being or that drives the particular, basic way in which we interpret the world. This commonality rests on how both apprehend what is ineluctable to thinking: an essentially projective quality, as well as a susceptibility to underestimate or altogether shroud this quality within itself.[567] This is the origin of truth in what are in other respects ostensibly conflicting philosophical approaches.

The elemental aim of each Adorno and Heidegger is to guide readers to reflect explicitly on thinking as such; that is, to discern (1) how one typically takes no notice of thinking as projection and (2) that one's utter identification with the character of one's environing society is culpable for this, and subsequently (3) to explore how, *as* projection, one may think and act with greater autonomy. In doing so, one reveals the origins of not only truth, but freedom, as for both thinkers the two are metaphysically inseparable. Adorno and Heidegger do diverge in what they each distinctly conceive to be the final upshot of this aim. Heidegger is interested in liberating individuals from the denial of death, whereas Adorno hopes to liberate us from false consciousness. At the same time, I suggest, these forms of liberation are not, as Adorno insists, mutually exclusive. It is not only that the two may advance side by side, but that existential freedom can support - recognizing its possibility can serve as an entryway into - recognizing the possibility of the kind of social freedom that Adorno particularly envisions (and for which he holds meager hope). Heidegger casts a similar vision in which authentic living would be prevalent rather than life without reflection on one's relationship to society: "Hope," which

---

[566] Ibid: 125
[567] See Chapter Four, sections two and three of this dissertation for a more thorough analysis of Adorno's purview on the temporal and projective nature of identity.

"brings alleviation [erleichtert] from depressing misgivings, means merely that even hope, as a state-of-mind, is still related to our burdens, and related in the mode of Being-as-having been. Such a mood of elation - or better, one which elates - is ontologically possible only if Dasein has an ecstatico-temporal relation to the thrown ground of itself."[568] As I will gradually propose, under the rubric of Adorno's third objection, and throughout this chapter and the next, Heidegger appears to foretoken modal authenticity to be a condition of the possibility for social critique, for identifying and critiquing the "burden" of Dasein's having been thrown into its existence as the They. To be sure, Heidegger's "top-down" approach, which starts from a holistic understanding of reality to interpret its more specific structures, is at variance with Adorno's working from the material "up" to such holistic understanding (one understands the false "totality" of reality as one progressively constructs "constellations" among socio-material conditions and one's consciousness of identity). Nevertheless, equally grounding the approaches is the still more pivotal premise that negativity, and hence potentiality, is the foundation of all thinking. Thinking's capacity for "transcendence" as such is the principle theme of, and is commensurately prioritized in both *Negative Dialectics* and *Being and Time*.[569]

Considering this commonality serves as a catalyst for challenging Adorno's main objections against freedom in Heidegger. Especially bearing in mind his objection that authenticity reflects and promotes the principle of individuation, I first point out how Adorno's imagined subject of liberation - she who "recoils in resistance" from institutional dictates - experiences a kind of temporalizing in and of herself. "Similar to [the] becoming" of fetishism's dissolution, Adorno claims, "is [that of] temporal experience. It is when things are read as a text of their becoming.... The means employed in negative dialectics for the penetration of its

---

[568] Heidegger 2008a: 396.
[569] Chapter Four, section two of this dissertation is largely devoted to comparative analysis of the meaning of "transcendence" in each Adorno and Heidegger.

hardened objects *possibility* - the possibility of which their reality has cheated the objects and which is nonetheless visible in each one."[570] In that passage of *Negative Dialectics*, Adorno insinuates how resisting such dictates (here by destabilizing a thing's ascription to its concept) is epiphenomenal to the subject's revelation that potentiality is the substratum of thinking, which is to say that the "distinguishing element" of thinking "necessarily appears as nonidentity."[571] Things would only "become" themselves, apart from their identities with concepts, in a situation where the subject would be able to critique and free herself from "the totalitarian unison with which the eradication of *difference* is proclaimed"; that is, with which to the essence of thinking is falsely attributed absolute identity.[572] Later on in the text, Adorno affirms that "existence [is] the essentiality of transience, the temporality of temporal things." Interestingly, Adorno's intends for this claim to problematize Heidegger, who "keeps existence away by naming it" as such.[573]

Of course, Adorno also frequently notes how "[freedom] is sought precisely where it is denied by the organization of the existing society: *in each individual*."[574] When taking *Negative Dialectics* and his related works as a whole, we see how he, albeit tacitly, regards the subject's temporalizing and repossession of its individuality to be primordially connected. Emphasizing this connection is crucial for grasping one primary reason why Adorno's charge of voluntarism is unfounded. To seize thinking essentially as temporal projection is for Adorno the founding point of liberation from the exchange structure, which coerces subjects to dispossess themselves of individuality. This coercion is ipso facto a coercion to presume that inherent to *being* is but a negligible capacity for agency (and the idea of agency in that case is *still* distorted, as it is equated with "freedom" for efficient production). "Ripening in the internalization of social

---

[570] Adorno 1990: 52 - my brackets and italics.
[571] Ibid: 277.
[572] Adorno 2005: 18.
[573] Adorno 1990: 131.
[574] Ibid: 276 - my italics for emphasis.

coercion into *conscience*, with the resistance to social authority," however, "is a *potential* that would rid men of coercion."[575] (By comparison, note how Heidegger describes Dasein's "ripening" to happen by means of self-understanding as potentiality-for-Being/being-toward-death and the "*conscience*" concurrently assumed.) Affirming one's potential to think in a way that is conscientious of how thinking is itself "always and already" a relation of non-identity, if not also seeing this to its practical realization as social resistance, is the rudiment of Adorno's meaning of freedom:

> The power of the status quo puts up the facades into which our consciousness crashes. [Consciousness] must seek to crash through them…. Surviving in such resistance is the speculative moment: what will not have its law prescribed for it by given facts transcends them…. Where the thought transcends the bonds it tied in resistance - there is its freedom. Freedom follows the subject's urge to express itself.[576]

"The subject's urge to express itself" is the urge to explore its thinking as potentiality. It is, as Adorno later puts it, "whatever stirs in a man [that] contradicts his unity" with institutionalized identity thinking.[577] Following this urge, the subject's freedom culminates in claiming the power of consciousness to speculate on alternatives to present reality, or what is actual or presumed to be actualizable.[578] Matching this, the subject's individuality, which is "not yet," *comes to be* as she attunes herself to the dialectically temporal nature of the concept. "Where the thought transcends the bonds it tied in resistance," and where those bonds are to identity thinking, especially as it manifests in social institutions, "there is its freedom."[579]

While Adorno reproaches the Ontology for construing freedom as a variation on the principle of individuation and, on that basis, as voluntarism of the will, Dasein's self-

---

[575] Ibid: 275 - my italics for emphasis.
[576] Ibid: 17.
[577] Ibid: 277 - my brackets.
[578] See, for example, ibid: 27.
[579] Ibid: 277.

temporalizing is for Heidegger just what freedom, as an "individuation," fundamentally means.[580]

Apprehending that its thinking (its being, its interpretation) is temporally circular, authentic

Dasein revisits its self-identity as it comes to understand how its existence is primordially a

projective relation, and thus how its facticity, as I alluded to in the previous section and chapters,

cannot escape the metaphysical priority of potentiality over actuality. Heidegger later remarks in

The Essence of Human Freedom (which, despite its belonging on the other side of Heidegger's

"turn," is grounded, as all his works are, in this value): Essential freedom "bind[s] oneself to

oneself, but not egotistically; i.e., not in relation to the accidental [false] 'I.'" Rather, one is free

when one no longer "evades precisely that which alone actuates the actuality of man and forms

his essentiality" - when one no longer thinks "time" just as a theoretical concept but as that

which "gives" itself as lived, temporal experience.[581] The essence of freedom, in other words, is

the actualization of Dasein's possibility to recognize its essentially being as a temporal

hermeneutic. Importantly, though Heidegger speaks of freedom as an "actualization," he does

not thereby suggest that freedom is actualized as a quality that conclusively *determines* the

particularities of one's existence. What is actualized is one's self-understanding as being "open"

toward the world, unbounded by "actuality" in its meaning as static presence; Dasein

understands its essential "way" as being-toward-potentiality and, for that reason, as free from the

ideology that the absolute concept, not conceptual negativity, is what determines meaning

formation.

Working out this idea more extensively, Iain MacDonald narrates what Adorno but

especially Heidegger offer as a manifold of ways in which this priority presents itself. While

recounting all of them exceeds the space and is not demanded by the overall intention of this

---

[580] Ibid: 261.
[581] Heidegger 2005: 201.

chapter, I draw on MacDonald to help recapitulate Adorno and Heidegger's consistency on this foundational issue.[582] For the negative dialectic, he explains that

> in order to counter the ways in which the "world as it is" represents nonhomogeneous possibilities as impossible or unreal, i.e., in order to counter ideology, we must develop or rediscover the capacity to retrieve "the consciousness of [heterogeneous] possibility" from actuality through immanent critique, for it is only this capacity that can break the spell of actuality. For this one, simple reason, possibility must have priority over actuality. Adorno thereby urges us to see reality as 'more' than it appears to be, not in the manner of a hidden being-in-itself, but rather modally.[583]

MacDonald's hesistancy to describe the subject's perceiving the priority of possibility as a "development" rather than a "rediscovery" is rightfully due to Adorno's own paucity of remarks on the matter. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, however, supports the reading that what Adorno has in mind here is that the priority is indeed "rediscovered." As I broached in section one, there we find Adorno and Horkheimer to claim that the pathway of Enlightenment thinking has coerced the subject to repress her underlying urge to always think *toward* what else may be.

> Beneath the known history of Europe [is] the fate of the human instincts and passions repressed and distorted by civilization.[584]

> Humanity, whose skills and knowledge become differentiated with the division of labor, is thereby forced back to more primitive anthropological stages, since, with the technical facilitation of existence, the continuance of domination demands the fixation of instincts by greater repression.[585]

The priority of potentiality must be *re*discovered because it belongs to human instinct. Correspondingly, it is instinctual to foster non-identical relations, an instinct that has been repressed and substituted with the artificial inclination to think identically, or to think according to the principles of efficiency and domination over "nature." Clarifying this distinction is significantly relevant to our purposes, as it reveals how structurally similar are Adorno's and

---

[582] I also cite him to invoke an article that had greatly influenced me to decide on this dissertation's general theme: "What is, is more than it is: Adorno and Heidegger on the Priority of Possibility" (MacDonald 2011).
[583] MacDonald 2011: 22-3.
[584] Horkheimer and Adorno 2002: 192.
[585] Ibid: 27-28.

Heidegger's frameworks for problematizing subjectivity (i.e., how subjectivity is prevalently assumed to be constituted). To plug the above into Heidegger's language, the priority of potentiality must be rediscovered because it belongs essentially to Dasein's pre-ontological understanding of Being, which Dasein, living as the They, has been taught to distrust and subdue. We can work out this point for MacDonald as well, who continues by noting that, in contrast to Adorno, "for Heidegger, the priority of possibility is clearly stated from early on." "Possibility as the refusal of be-ing [as Being's refusal to be detained in actuality] signifies the inevitable *loss or return* to the immeasurable potentiality that is proper to being."[586] MacDonald furthermore hints that, in Heidegger, the They is that to which the rediscovery of potentiality owes its need. I read him to concur that, in turn, the paramount outcome of this rediscovery is Dasein's self-awareness as an agent for whom it is possible to resist the They. "To think being as possibility is not a purely formal gesture," he explains, "but rather the necessary precondition *for responding adequately to the public realm* and the general fixity of beings in language."[587]

I append to MacDonald's reading how such self-awareness is conjoined with Dasein's awareness of the non-identical, or the "negative" moment in thinking, which is to Dasein primordially instinctual. Authentically resolute Dasein rediscovers that Being *is* essentially *not* what is contained in the reified concept. Modal authenticity is through which Dasein recognizes the concept as but a part in a "nonconceptual whole," or that the concept itself is in part nonconceptual.[588] On that basis, Heidegger demonstrates Adorno's contention that "[t]he substance of concepts is immanent as far as the mind in concerned, and transcendent as far as

---

[586] MacDonald 2011: 23 - my brackets and italics.
[587] Ibid: 25-6.
[588] See, for example, Adorno 2005: 12-13.

being is concerned. To be aware of this is to be able to get rid of concept fetishism."[589] Heidegger "gets rid of concept fetishism" by illustrating thinking to both be grounded in immediate actuality and hold an inherent potential to "transcend" what is actual. This points preliminarily to the untenability of Adorno's interpretation that, as authentically free, Dasein imagines its Being to transcend the concrete world. Authentically resolute Dasein *does* "transcend," but only insofar as what it transcends is the They: its falsely inscribing fixed characters into the concept and self-identity. Following from its visceral confrontation with its own finitude, Dasein understands that the concept is immanent insofar as it owes its being to, or, we might say, it understands that experience is *mediated by* the circular temporality of Being; the concept is interwoven with the "holism" of finite existence. Concurrent with this understanding, then, is that of the concept's potential to transcend its having been fettered to its hypostatized form. "Society comes before the individual consciousness and before all its experience," Adorno writes in both alleged contradistinction to Heidegger and lack of confession that he himself holds that "before" society is the dialectical nature of the concept, for what is ahistorical in Adorno's subject is the potential to negate reified concepts and societal dictates.[590] Given this, he must not strictly mean that society "comes before" individual consciousness and instead that it runs alongside it, as mutually responsible with the nature of the concept for its constitution. He undervalues how, when taken as a whole, Fundamental Ontology arrives at kindred conclusions. The essential character of consciousness is to be temporally projective and to be thrown into and conditioned by "administered society" (the They). While authentic, Dasein perceives, if not also actively aims to

---

[589] Ibid: 12.
[590] Adorno 1990: 181. Of course, Adorno's utopia would be on in which the subject and object are "reconciled," and thus the need for intentional practice of negative dialectics would be obsolete. However, this does not take away from the truth of his suggestion that the subject always, even as repressed within late capitalist society, thinks non-identically; it is inherent to thinking to be projected toward the future, only this essential quality is "repressed" in the subject. What I mean by "the subject's potentiality for negating societal dictates" is ahistorical is not that those dictates are ahistorical - indeed, they are historically contingent - but simply that this quality of thinking is.

actualize the possibility for critically reflecting on the They in a series of onto-hermeneutic events toward finding its agency, including its agency for social resistance.

Of course, Adorno would object that the "mediator" of conceptuality here is not the socio-historical world at all. Coming to terms with one's finitude and the fact that, until death, one always is projecting toward the unknown, is not enough to capture the meaning of mediation, where the latter is broadly the "objectivity" of/in one's particular existence. The priority of potentiality is realized *through* reflections on that objectivity. This objection proceeds from Adorno's more general contention that "the materialist echo reverberates from a vast distance" to Dasein's transcendence, and that this originates "in the ontological doctrine of Being's priority over thought."[591] Being is portrayed in absolute distinction from "reality," and Heidegger must therefore conceive the real upshot of existential analysis to be disconnection from the realms of day-to-day praxis. The idea of authenticity "celebrates" such disconnect, as it moves individuals even further from the possibility of acknowledging and resisting how they have been "turned into a fetish," including their own inadvertant participation in this.[592]

The majority of the foregoing passages in this section have already both indirectly and directly preempted this objection. In anticipation of the next chapter, in which I will more throughly address Adorno's combined claims that authenticity entails a loss of agency for self-determination and social critique, here I offer three further proposals in counter-objection to Adorno's claims currently under review, which, to reiterate, are not only that Dasein is ahistorical and asocial, but that authenticity is also thereby voluntarism.

The first proposal pertains to the role of the They in Heidegger, and it is motivated specifically by Adorno's claim that Heidegger "transposes" Dasein's *care* for *equipmentality* -

---

[591] Ibid: 200.
[592] Adorno 2003: 100.

198

that which Adorno deems "a historical state of affairs" - "into the pure essence of man."[593]

Heidegger chalks up the They's veiling of reality "as a fault of existence in general," he argues.[594] I have so far suggested that Dasein is inextricably related to, that is, it is always and already engaged in dialogue with, the They. Authentic Dasein, though not *typically* fallen, cannot escape its thrownness, however much it can still resist the degree to which the They determines its existence. Corroborating Denis McManus's use of the term "modify" to denote how authentic Dasein comports itself toward the world, Daniel Dahlstrom explains that

> Fallenness and the public demands of discourse conspire to shape the way we "for the most part" find ourselves disposed and project (understand) our possibilities. Yet there is no authentic way of being-here that might dispense with these existentials. Authenticity is possible, ... according to Heidegger; yet it cannot eliminate, and can only modify, existentially fallen and palavering manners of being-here.[595]

Given that Dasein, even while authentic, cannot "dispense" its thrownness into the They, the question still then remaining at stake is whether Heidegger's stipulating the They as an impermanent quality of Being means that it is therefore to be understood as ahistorical, or as a *fixed set of circumstances* into which Dasein, across both personal and world history, is always thrown and would therefore be incapable of self-modification in relation to it. In other words, is the They, insofar as it is an onto-existential structure, thereby reified as a general situation bearing no reference to socio-historical particulars?

While the ultimate answer is "no," this requires qualification. Let us first look at why the They *is* such a general, permanent structure. Heidegger insists that it is essential to Being that phenomena ordinarily "show up" to Dasein as semblances, disguising themselves as what they are not. In the context of uncovering entities in their truth, he asks rhetorically: "When Dasein so expresses itself, does not a primordial understanding of its own Being thus make itself known -

---

[593] Ibid: 52.
[594] Ibid: 92.
[595] Dahlstrom 2009: 308-9.

the understanding (even if it is only pre-ontological) that Being-in-untruth makes up an essential

characteristic of Being-in-the-world?"[596] This is the "way" of the They; it is for Dasein

primordially, and either totally (as inauthentic) or often (as authentic) to be toward/with

phenomena in their disguising. The They is just the essential characteristic of Being-in-untruth.

Dasein's inclination, Heidegger explains,

> is to [fall] prey to the tradition of which it has more or less explicitly taken hold. This tradition keeps it from providing its own guidance, whether in inquiring or in choosing. This holds true - and by no means least - for that understanding which is rooted in Dasein's ownmost Being, and for the possibility of developing it - namely, for ontological understanding.[597]

Dasein is thrown into the cultural tradition of its social world, which we should infer here *is*

ahistorical insofar as Heidegger seems to suggest that it is the character of traditions to inhibit

onto-existential reflection.

"Our lostness in the 'they,'" Heidegger clarifies later on in *Being and Time*, is "revealed

as a fleeing in the face of death."[598] Resolute, Dasein "comes back from the possibility of death,"

as it must, for the possibility of death is "not to be outstripped." Dasein cannot do anything about

its being-toward-death barring its genuinely acknowledging it in order to identify and project

towards realizing, while it still is Dasein, its other possibilities. Unlike while it is inauthentic, it

does not "flee" to the They for (hollow) solace.[599] Viscerally confronting its mortality, Dasein

experiences its having been temporalized or singularized as a particular Dasein (Dasein is

"mine" ultimately because my death only can be my own). This experience is counteractive to its

mundane self-interpreting in which, as pre-consciously appropriating the They's "vulgar"

conception of linear time, it presumes itself to be temporally "dispersed" among an absent past

---

[596] Heidegger 2008a: 265.
[597] Ibid: 43 - my brackets.
[598] Ibid: 442.
[599] Ibid: 443.

and present "today" (that is again to say, as mere "actuality").[600] No longer "distracted" by the chatter of the They, where "chatter" for Heidegger means discourse that reflects this conception of time, resolute Dasein discovers that "the world has a temporal foundation."[601] Through that discovery, it comes to identify the world as They, as it self-identifies as a temporal "connectedness." "Coming back" from confronting itself as being-toward-death, it returns to its "birth" as socially thrown, "if only so that this existence may accept the thrownness of its own 'there' in a away which is more free from Illusion."[602] When Dasein is authentic, phenomena nevertheless typically "show up" as semblances. Contrary to when it is inauthentic, however, there Dasein discerns that "what is" (i.e., Being in its truth) primarily resists immediate understanding. In doing so, it discerns how the They is an *existentiale* of Being that has been fully concealed within modal authenticity, and that, as an existentiale, the "way" of the They still will remain hidden from Dasein, albeit to a lesser, and progressively lesser extent as Dasein experiences reoccuring moments of the non-being of its being. This is why our dissenting answer to the question of whether the They is ahistorical requires qualification. The They is characteristic of Being to the degree that, even as authentic, Dasein, first, is always tied to its facticity, and in correlation with that, second, does not understand immediately, nor can it ever understand perfectly, its own being. To say that the They is "ahistorical" is simply to refer to these interpretations.

Retrospectively, Heidegger both builds on this reading and intimates what I argue is a more complete, corrected reading not only of the They's historical status for Being, but, as entwined with the latter, the ontological status of sociality. In "Letter on Humanism," he writes:

---

[600] Ibid: 442-443.
[601] Ibid: 443.
[602] Ibid.

> What is said in *Being and Time* (1927), sections 27 and 35, about the "they" in no way means to furnish an incidental contribution to sociology. Just as little does the "they" mean merely the opposite, understood in an ethical-existentiell way, of the selfhood of persons. Rather, what is said there contains a reference, thought in terms of the question of the truth of being, to the primordial belonging of the word to being. That relation remains concealed amid the dominance of subjectivity that presents itself as the public realm.[603]

The idea of the They, he suggests, points not to any specific structures of societies or developments of psycho-social identity, and rather to the unavoidability of thinking Being without also thinking about society. If we are to be concerned with ontological truth, it is necessary that we be concerned with how such truth is secreted by They. This does *not* entail that the aim of the existential analytic or of Dasein's self-affirmation is, by bringing to light the They's association with untruth, to motivate asociality. Language ("the word"), Heidegger relays, both belongs to "the public realm" and conditions whether or how much the truth of Being can or will be unconcealed. In conjunction with the above, what should be inferred from this passage is that the term "the They" actually signifies how societies at large predominantly understand and expresses existence (even if, as mundane, such societies are unconcerned with understanding and expressing the truth of Being per se). Being is social Being, even while Dasein's sociality is mundane, at the very least for the fact that Dasein is always in relation to and mutually mediated by the They. Thus the They, in this specific sense, is ahistorical. What is more, we see how Heidegger must regard authenticity as something *always* to be achieved. If the They is essential to "being there," and its tendency is to conceal the meaning of Being, then Dasein always must effort to recover itself as potentiality-for-Being, or, as I continue to suggest, as consciousness fractured by non-identity.

In a moment, I will further justify why we should interpret Being in Heidegger as primordially social or as hermeneutically engaged with and co-conditional on the They. In part,

---

[603] Ibid: 243.

this justification presupposes the final answer to the question of whether the They is ahistorical. While the preceding quoted passages have helped to confirm that the They is ahistorical insofar as being thrown into a social world (and hence as more or less to *be* in untruth) is ontologically essential to Dasein, what remains to be determined is whether Heidegger's description in *Being and Time* of the They's more particular features - above all that of *readiness-to-hand* - is intended as a blanket portrayal of social characters across epochal and cultural gaps.[604] This is Adorno's reading, which primes his objections that Heidegger, first, reifies readiness-to-hand, and second, that he "did not foresee that what he named authentic, once become word, would grow toward the same exchange-society anonymity against which *Sein und Zeit* rebelled."[605] In other words, Adorno claims that Heidegger regards readiness-to-hand as ahistorical, and modal authenticity, which by Adorno's lights celebrates socio-ontological detachment from the practical world, as both oblivious to and revering of instrumentality. Although these claims will not be directly addressed until later on, what follows here supports the framework I have been trying to establish for the sake of doing so.

My proposal that the They is ultimately *not* ahistorical initially rests on the observation that, for Heidegger, even if the "way" of the They, as mundane social Being, is ahistorical, the particular ways in which societies understand and communicate about Being are always variable, both in relation to one another and over time.

> *The "they" is an existentiale; and as a primordial phenomena, it belongs to Dasein's positive constitution.* It itself has, in turn, various possibilities of becoming concrete as something characteristic of Dasein. The extent to which its dominion becomes compelling and explicit may change in the course of history.[606]

---

[604] In Chapter Four, I pose minor challenges and make minor revisions to parts of my reading here, for I have come to understand that Heidegger strictly associates neither readiness-to-hand with modal inauthenticity nor modal inauthenticity with the They. However, overall I do not regard the passages in the two chapters to contradict one another.
[605] Adorno 2008: 13.
[606] Heidegger 2008a: 167.

As bearing "various possibilities" for concretely manifesting itself, the They (I read Heidegger to have in mind) is socio-culturally contingent. This suggests the conclusion that, while the They in its general definition (as social character or discourse) *is* an onto-existential structure, many of the more specific aspects of it that are described in Division I are *not*. For, indeed, the They's current constraint in degree and form "may change in the course of history." This claim invites us to interpret Heidegger as intimating three crucial concessions: (1) Heidegger's description of the They is a phenomenological recounting of the particular social world that is to him and many of his readers most familiar, namely, late capitalism; (2) this *particular* social world's character is one of domination, as Adorno himself, against Heidegger, points out (within it the truth of Being is powerfully concealed, and the agency of Dasein is powerfully constrained); and (3) this social world, foremost including the extent of its domination, may at some time in the future no longer have the exact character it does now. I briefly explore these possible concessions and, as they are all entwined, I do so concurrently. This constitutes the second counter-objection I pose to Adorno's criticisms at hand.

To harken back to one of the main topics that has framed this dissertation so far, the ultimate agenda of Fundamental Ontology is to resolve or dissolve the problem of Being not only for individual subjects but, more comprehensively, for societies, in the setting of world history. This is why the Ontology requires a "destruction" of traditional metaphysics, through which the problem has been aggravated, for traditional metaphysicians have neglected to pose the question of Being correctly. However much it is essential to Dasein (regardless of whether it is interested in that question or not) to stand in the untruth of Being to some extent, Heidegger regards metaphysics as having helped to ensure that this extent for Dasein will typically be great. All the same, to identify metaphysics as solely culpable for this problem would be misleading, not only

because not all individual subjects participate in academic theory, but because academic theory reflects and is reflected by principles implicitly held to be true in a historically situated society as a whole. Permitting a moment to look beyond *Being and Time* toward Heidegger's later writings, I juxtapose his depiction of traditional metaphysics with the "calculative thinking" characteristic of modern science, which Heidegger indicates conditions the "way" of thinking that is now characteristic of most societies. In *Postscript to 'What is Metaphysics?'*, he states that "calculative thinking," by assuming for the subject an absolute "will," "[equates] beings with the actual, in such a way that the actuality of the actual comes to power in the unconditional attainability of pervasive objectification."[607] In comparison, he associates the They in *Being and Time* with the phenomenon of readiness-to-hand, or *equipmentality*, whereby Dasein relates to entities immanently merely for instrumental purposes. Entities are quite simply tools used "in order to…." Surprisingly, there he already suggests, albeit before quickly changing course, that as the They, Dasein "deals" with not only entities but with itself as if it were engaging in dealings of commerce: "Everydayness takes Dasein as something ready-to-hand to be concerned with – that is, something that gets managed and reckoned up. 'Life' is a 'business,' whether or not it covers its cost."[608] *As* a phenomenon, or a mode of factical existence, readiness-to-hand is not restricted to how Dasein comports itself toward other entities. Inauthentic Dasein typically self-identifies as something that is ready-to-hand rather than as hermeneutically "being there." It would be hasty at this point to argue with confidence that Heidegger's intention was to equate readiness-to-hand with "calculative thinking" (the idea of which is itself not far from the Frankfurt School's explanation of "instrumental rationality"), if only for the reason that Heidegger may actually think that inauthentic Dasein's being *for* itself as a mere thing holds

[607] Heidegger 1998: 231.
[608] Heidegger 2008a: 336.

equally across cultures, geographies, and the timespan of world history.[609] It may be the case, in other words, that Heidegger identifies the phenomenon of readiness-to-hand exclusively with Being's essential proclivity for concealment per the "way" of inauthenticity.

Two further pieces of evidence he offers in *Being and Time* together advance such a reading. The first is Heidegger's explanation that "on its negative side, this destruction [of "ancient ontology"] does not relate itself toward the past; its criticism is aimed at 'today' and at the prevalent way of treating the history of ontology.... But to bury the past in nullity (Nichtigkeit) is not the purpose of this destruction; its aim is positive."[610] The plan of the Ontology, he there insinuates, is to phenomenologically analyze the They that is historically and socio-culturally relevant to Heidegger's "today," as well as to harness this analysis for the purpose of critiquing the "past" of the They, especially as it conditioned by traditional metaphysics. Of course, writing in 20th Century Europe, what Heidegger must find relevant to his "today" is just the modern west's expanding "way" of instrumentality, which is not confined to metaphysics.[611] It is rather the "hopeless frenzy of unchained technology and of *the rootless organization of the average man*,"[612] he writes in the later *Introduction to Metaphysics*," suggesting that modern thinking conforms to that "dominant subjectivity of the public realm" in

---

[609] Christian Lotz notes the following in a 2013 essay that addresses the problem of reification by putting Marx and Heidegger in dialogue: "It is astonishing that [the later] Heidegger constantly focuses on two aspects, namely, on the modern tendency to use everything up, and on the total availability of everything for consumption. The Marxian terms to be used here would be consumption for the former and commodity form for the latter" (Lotz 2013: 10 - my brackets).

[610] Ibid: 44 - my brackets.

[611] In *Ontology: The Hermeneutics of Facticity*, he also argues that "today's" character is defined by philosophy's now being in a historically different "situation." For instance, philosophy today "keeps philosophy within history without historicism" (34), and more generally Heidegger faults it for failing to approach the question of Being per phenomenological interpretation. See, for example, Heidegger 1999: §8 (32-35, 46-47). Thank you to Christian Lotz for sharing this reference.

[612] Heidegger 2000: 41.

which *ontological difference* is erased; the meaning of beings is commodified, represented to be inevitably, temporally static.[613]

On this reading, "calculative thinking" would also signify social atomization, wherein it is assumed that the means by which one speaks to another - the "loud idle talk" of the They[614] that yields indifference "to whatever the day may bring"[615] - too is "natural" and inevitable. Keeping in mind that Heidegger associates the They with inauthentic discourse, Adorno, finding instrumental rationality to be mutually conditioned by popular discourse, writes that the "technical progress of the means of communication runs parallel" to both of these (intertwined) manifestations of calculative or instrumental thinking.[616] The ideology of the exchange-structure "has shifted into language."[617] *This* "way" of the They would burgeon the problem of Being's forgottenness, for as defined by instrumentality, it would amplify the subject's existing tendency to withdraw from interest in the question of Being. That Being and language are "so confused," is "because in all our bustling and chasing after beings, we have nevertheless fallen out of Being."[618] In that case, we should be compelled to conjecture that Heidegger associates, on the one hand, modernity's amplified disengagement with the meaning of Being, and on the other, a socially conditioned proclivity to "deal" with things in one's world as equipment.[619]

---

[613] In the *Black Notebooks*, "technology and uprootedness" are, together, central themes. In reference to them, Heidegger asks: "Seen in terms of the West and 'world history' - is an *ahistoricality* already *arising*?" (Heidegger 2016: 210). I am disappointed to find that this supports my reading here, namely, that the earlier Heidegger places his writings in the specific socio-historical context of late capitalism and associates the They with modern science, where these encourage among individuals a sense of ahistorical existence. For what Heidegger also finds topical to this problem is his anti-Semitism: the "world Jewry" contributes to calculative thinking vs. essential thinking. And: "What is intended [in uncovering essential thinking] is *only the decision* of the West," people who experience that they are "needed by' beying'" (ibid: 379 - my brackets for clarification). To note, I am pacing my readings of the *Black Notebooks* as these chapters unfold. In Chapter Four, section four, I directly address some of their key contents and the problems they pose for many of the interpretations that I present until then.
[614] Heidegger 2008a: 343.
[615] Ibid: 396.
[616] Adorno 2008: 62.
[617] Ibid: xix.
[618] Heidegger 2008a: 396.
[619] This may also inform why Heidegger abandons the term "the They" in his writings after *Being and Time*.

A second piece of evidence in favor of this reading is Heidegger's asking rhetorically whether "equipment and work and everything which Dasein dwells alongside" do not "belong to 'history' too."[620] Contextualizing this question are passages in which he rationalizes the significance of "authentic historicality": that which authentic Dasein gains as it fathoms itself as connectedly thrown and projective. Heidegger describes authentically resolute Dasein, upon returning to its origin as thrown into the They, to (re)discover entities as they *are* in relation to Dasein's temporally hermeneutic character of being, and thus to understand that what is ready-to-hand has "*already, in every case, been incorporated into the history of the world*. Equipment and work - for instance - have their fates; buildings and institutions have their history."[621] Utmost to be inferred here is that Dasein, returning to its thrownness, discloses Being as always and already social Being, and that social Being references entities, individual projects, and institutions that are historically contingent. With the two pieces of evidence combined, we see that Dasein recognizes that, as inauthentic, it has internalized the contemporary "way" of the They as relating to entities as mere equipment, and that belonging to the range of its possibilities is resisting this mode of relation.[622] To repeat Heidegger's remark above, "to bury the past in nullity (Nichtigkeit) is not the purpose of this destruction; its aim is positive."[623] As authentically resolute, Dasein indeed does not bury its past, but attends to it conscientiously. In doing so, it

---

[620] Ibid: 440.
[621] Ibid.
[622] With that said, and as I have mentioned within different contexts, equipmentality is not, strictly speaking, identity thinking. At root, the term denotes being-in-the-world as a set of holistic relations of significations. Although Dasein deals with entities as things "in order to…," or by manipulating them, that it conceives them in this way is fundamentally due to its understanding, first, that their being lies in potentiality, and second, that their meanings are inextricable from the meanings of other entities. In each case, Dasein pre-conceives that they are irreducible to their static concepts because those concepts are constituted by temporal relations. This is similar to Adorno's claim that individuals continue to think non-identically even while "[they] shrink to the nodal points of conventional reactions and the modes of operation objectively expected of them" (Adorno 1990: 21). The individual who actively attempts to resist the latter, however, is well-positioned to "recover" non-identity thinking, placing it at the forefront of consciousness, and (re)normalizing it.
[623] Heidegger 2008a: 44 - my brackets.

comes to understand that its thrownness into the character of its particular social realm does not entirely determine the possible choices it may make.[624]

Given all of the above, I propose that, following from Heidegger's claim that the extent of the "dominion" of the They "may change in the course of history" is, first, that insofar as the They refers to Heidegger's "today," it is historically contingent. Although the They as a social character (that is, as an existentiale of Being) is ahistorical, how it presents itself in the contemporary west (and of course anywhere, in any epoch) is not. Its presentation *as such* is an onto-existential structure for ones who "are there" in late capitalist society, but in the future the character of that structure may be modified or no longer be at all. This reading is on par with the Ontology's aim to dissolve the problem of Being. Aiming for such dissolution, Heidegger designates the existential analytic as a heuristic to facilitate this. A second but closely related upshot, then, is the likelihood of Heidegger's envisioning *intentionally thematic* existential analysis to be needed but only for the foreseeable future. After all, "our way of exhibiting the constitution of Dasein's Being remains only *one way* which we may take," Heidegger confirms.[625] Alongside this, authenticity is something to be "achieved" only so long as Dasein is thrown into the *contemporary* They; that is, so long as the dominant "way" of being-in-the-world is to be disengaged from the meaning of Being and occupied with instrumental relations.[626] "Resoluteness, by its ontological essence, is always the resoluteness of some factical Dasein at a particular time.... *The resolution is precisely the disclosive projection and determination of what*

---

[624] See ibid: 413 for Heidegger's remarks on how a thing that is ordinarily ready-to-hand becomes an object for hermeneutic critique while Dasein experiences a modification of its ontological understanding. Importantly, he notes that something that is ready-to-hand can become an object for critique while also not losing its character as equipment. In Chapter Four, I draw on this and similar passages to argue more broadly that Heidegger's existential analytic is conducive to immanent critique.

[625] Ibid: 484.

[626] To be sure, Heidegger distinguishes "the Being of Dasein" from "modes of Being (readiness-to-hand, presence-at-hand, Reality) which characterize entities with a character other than that of Dasein" (ibid: 273).

is factically possible at the time."[627] Through resolutely coming to terms with itself as thrown

projection, Dasein also comes to terms with its socio-historical location on the scale of world

history, a correct understanding of which is concealed while it lives as the They. I extrapolate on

what Heidegger gives us in *Being and Time* to suggest that, in consequence of recognizing how,

as the They, it has been conditioned to reify the concept, especially the concepts that constitute

its self-identity, authentially resolute Dasein no longer pre-reflectively assumes its facticity to be

isolated from a historically contingent context.

In comparison, Adorno's position is that the "administered world" impedes the subject's

ability to discern the need for constructing "constellations" around or for critically and

holistically grasping the intricacies of socio-material institutions and how consciousness

participates in the dialectics of their conditioning. For Adorno, identity thinking, while socially

conditioned, has become *a priori* in a similar sense to how Heidegger regards the *a priori* status

of the They.[628] Merging the preceding passages and the fact that Fundamental Ontology obscures

the traditional *a priori-a posteriori* dichotomy, I propose that Heidegger conceives most of

Being's *a priori* structures to be co-conditional on the societal and thus modifiable over the

course of history.[629] (To repeat an earlier observation, he and Adorno respectively regard

Dasein's inherent potentiality-for-Being, and the subject's inherently thinking non-identically, as

yet coming "before" the socio-historical; human being's particular sense of temporality can be

repressed by the social but cannot ever become ontologically invariable.) For further comparison,

note how Adorno regards his negative dialectics, as immanent critique, to be necessary only so

---

[627] Ibid: 345.

[628] For example, see Adorno 2005: 131-2.

[629] Toward a far more elaborate point, Schürmann extrapolates on Heidegger to propose "the practical a priori," or "a mode of thinking [that] is made dependent on a mode of living" (Schürmann 1987: 237). This notion assists in advancing reflection on the practical implications of authentic freedom, and in supporting the claim that the *a priori* in Heidegger does not transcend social conditioning.

long as "reconciliation" of the subject and object has yet to be achieved: "Regarding the concrete utopian possibility, dialectics is the ontology of the wrong state of things. The right state of things would be free of it: neither a system nor a contradiction."[630] With this, let us consider (here and throughout the next chapter) Heidegger's ultimate intention for individuals undergoing existential analysis, which is to discover their agency to conceptually *negate* "actuality," the "dominant subjectivity" into which they are thrown, along with Adorno's ultimate intention for negative dialectics: "Reconcilement would release the non-identical, would rid it of coercion;" it "would be the thought of the many as no longer inimical, a thought that is anathema to subjective reason."[631] Authentic freedom opens Dasein up to its potential to think and act according to its understanding of Being as non-being and consequently to its interpreting itself to be hermeneutical, which I continue to claim encompasses understanding of the concept's total identity with neither itself nor concrete phenomena. Akin to Nietzsche's *Ubermensch*, Heidegger's authentic Dasein recognizes the need and is enabled to "really and continually *make* something that is not yet there: the whole perpetually growing world of valuations, colours, weights, perspectives, scales, affirmations, and negations."[632]

Under the next of Adorno's heading objections, and then further in this dissertation's final chapter, I argue that Fundamental Ontology prefigures the possibility for individuals (as

---

[630] Adorno 1990: 11.

[631] Ibid: 6.

[632] Nietzsche 2001: 171. Though to be sure, Nietzsche continues this passage in *The Gay Science* with the claim that "[w]hatever has *value* in the present world has it not in itself, according to its nature—nature is always value-less—but has rather been given, granted value, and *we* were the givers and granters!" (ibid) I do not deny how easy it was for National Socialists to appropriate Nietzsche for their own anti-Semitic ideology (if Nietzsche himself did not also harbor nationalist or racist sentiments in his writings), as well as how easy it is to read Heidegger, especially in light of the publications of the *Black Notebooks*, to do the same. What I want to distinguish in Heidegger against Nietzsche, however, is that for Heidegger it is not simply the case that "we" (Dasein, or perhaps especially authentic Dasein) "give" the natural (perhaps we should read "practical) world its value; for Heidegger, as I continue to argue, Dasein is equally given and gives to the world. Still, Nietzsche here does influence Heidegger's objection against the notion of temporal "presence." While for Heidegger "the present world" *does* have value in itself so long as it conditions Being, he is far from adamant with Nietzsche that the meaning of presence ("actuality") is negligible for individual agency.

authentic Dasein) to effort toward reconciliation in the Adornian sense. Especially given that this argument presupposes the meaning of Being as largely referencing Being's primordial sociality, before moving on I will first substantiate the latter claim. This constitutes my third proposal against Adorno's criticisms at hand.

The proposal is motivated by addressing the expected worry that Dasein's call of conscience refers to nothing but Dasein "itself." This is another means by which to challenge Adorno's claim that authentic Dasein is an idealist notion. Although Adorno does not legitimize this worry extensively, its inclusion is assumed in the repertoire of his critique of authenticity (which rests on his more general critique of the Ontology as well as existential phenomenology at large). He does note it, however, from within the context of his objection that Heidegger glorifies death, from which stems his more wide-ranging allegation that "authenticity, as jargon, is ideology."[633] Insofar as the call of conscience is identical to Dasein's (reified) conceptuality, what it appeals Dasein to, namely, its "own" being-toward-death, is none other than Dasein's self-identification with an abstract idea: "Being-unto-death becomes subject, pure will" in authentic Dasein, Adorno contends.[634] Francois Raffoul also notes how the call may be construed as solipsistic, albeit before defending it as "[manifesting] the heteronomy of the self;"[635] what the call appeals to is the "otherness" of Dasein.[636] Why the call requires a defense against idealism is supported by many of Heidegger's own disconcerting remarks: *What if this Dasein*," he asks, "*should be the caller of the conscience?"*[637] He then answers affirmatively: "the call comes from that entity which in each case I myself am."[638] *In conscience Dasein calls itself.*"[639]

---

[633] Adorno 2008: 132.
[634] Ibid: 131.
[635] Raffoul 2010: 253.
[636] Ibid: 205.
[637] Heidegger 2008a: 321.
[638] Ibid: 323

It might be tempting to cherry pick these remarks to arrive at the simpler conclusion that Dasein's resoluteness is ungrounded in its facticity, that what Dasein calls itself and is called to still belongs to its own "transcendent conceptual realm," or, to consider it specifically from Adorno's standpoint, that Dasein's hearing and responding to the call is just Dasein's positing a relation of identity between its self-understanding and an absolute concept. More generally, taking these remarks in isolation would support the fallacious rationale that authenticity is an idealist notion, and the call of conscience, solipsism. Adorno obviously finds these outcomes to be inevitable, especially since (his) Heidegger already in Division I describes mundane Dasein as a substantive subject, destined to think identically despite when it resolutely reenvisions its being-in-the-world.

Extracting the remarks from the greater context of *Being and Time* promises an unfaithful interpretation of authenticity. The latter would neglect how, for the majority, Heidegger explicitly describes the caller as not quite Dasein itself: "The call comes *from* me and yet *from beyond me and over me*," he adds in the above passage.[640] The fact that the caller both *is* and *is not* Dasein should be received as less mystifying than it expressly appears, at least given what has been said in this dissertation's preceding passages (and in *BT* Division I) about Dasein's identity. Concluding, as Adorno does, that Dasein's hearing and responding to the call refers to nothing that is *other to* Dasein "itself" indicates that one is working from the false premise that the term "Dasein" is equivalent with traditional ideas of subjectivity as non-constituted by anything less than absolute concepts. However, the entire motivation of the Ontology, we know, is concern for non-being's purported historical exclusion from Being, which is culpable for the failure of metaphysics to attend to the subject as it is pre-reflectively in-the-world. This in turn

---

[639] Ibid: 320
[640] Ibid.

leads to a hypostatization of subjectivity, which is finally culpable for the penchant among metaphysicians to designate "freedom" as variations of voluntarism,[641] or, as Adorno puts it in his own case against Heidegger, freedom as "pure positivity."[642] Toward the twofold aim of clarifying "who" is Dasein as the caller (and thus also who it is not) and challenging Adorno's implicitly-given objection that the call is but a self-vindication of the idea of a "pure will," how Heidegger corrects these conjoined ontological errors is important to iterate.

Dasein "is not a free-floating self-projection" as it is for traditional ontology, "but its character is determined by thrownness as a Fact of the entity which it is; and, as so determined, it has in each case already been delivered over to its existence, and it constantly so remains."[643] Here Heidegger succinctly references his three most crucial responses to the respective problems above (though naturally they all belong equally to the holism of his account). First, as noted, the question of Being is indivisible from the question of what lived experience is like, for Dasein "always exists factically."[644] This is just why Heidegger's weapon against metaphysics is an onto-hermeneutic, phenomenological approach; its starting point already presumes that "what is" *for* one that "is there" can only be truthfully understood by attending to one's ordinary and immediate environments (contentiously, this is its sole presumption). What is precisely there grasped is Dasein's impossibility to ever be strictly "present," so long as this term is associated with the idea of linear time. Thus, second, even when Dasein is inauthentically resolute, or when it self-identifies and makes decisions per the norms of the They, it is temporally fractured, never existentially "whole" (inasmuch as by "wholeness" Heidegger is alluding to an impossibly absolute subjectivity). Third, Heidegger adverts to how Dasein's interpreting its identity (and

---

[641] Ibid.
[642] See, for example, Adorno 1990: 89-92.
[643] Heidegger 2008a: 320.
[644] Ibid.

therefore, Being) shapes its intepretation of the meaning of freedom. If Dasein is oblivious to the

foundation of its identity as potentiality-for-Being, by matter of course it will be oblivious to its

primordial freedom to be potentially for itself, wherein it would test the extent of its confinement

to the "way" of the They. Attached to the comfortable concepts and language of the They, in

which its denial of always and already being on a trajectory toward death is readily supported,

inauthentic Dasein participates in its own incapacitation to understand or maintain understanding

of these connected ontological truths.

These truths are precisely that to which the authentically resolute Dasein, by the call of

conscience, is "appealed" to know. As Mahon O'Brien summarizes,

> Resolve is characterized as an open willingness to be 'claimed' by the call of conscience, to
> acknowledge openly the fact that rather than free floating, autonomous self-determining authors
> of our own destiny, we find ourselves *thrown* into a world with an horizon of possibility
> determined by our finitude. The projection of the early account [in *Being and Time*] is not
> decisionism; it's an 'acceptance' of the way we have been thus 'claimed.'"[645]

Referring to the purview of the individual who is anticipatorily resolute to hear the call, O'Brien

here matches Heidegger's succinct explanation (above) of how Dasein, in whichever modality, is

essentially constituted by thrownness, projection, and therefore a readiness to recover its identity

as neither conceptually absolute nor as marked by the possibility for affirming a meaningless

"free will." Authentically resolute Dasein, which, as anxiously disposed, casts itself "back" as

thrown, discovers that it is exactly because of its thrownness that its identity and agency are

"released" into the openness of non-being. The caller, then, though it is Dasein, is not Dasein as

it would be represented as traditional metaphysical subjectivity. The call is provoked by Dasein's

own *curiosity* of itself, which under the They is restricted to Dasein's concern for everyday

business and what is imagined to be able to be conclusively known.[646] As resolute, Dasein's

---

[645] O'Brien 2011: 58 - my brackets.
[646] Heidegger 2008a: 214-217.

curiosity is "freed" for existential reflection in which it grapples with its abandonment and thus its incapability of answering the ultimate question of *why* it "is there" at all. The call ultimately releases Dasein to find its existence as an unsolvable obscurity. "The caller," Heidegger writes, "is Dasein in its uncanniness: primordial, thrown Being-in-the-world as the "not-at-home" - the bare 'that-it-is' in the 'nothing' of the world."[647] In the same stroke, the caller is just Dasein's explicit realization that it can never know how its finite possibilities and their actualizations precisely will take shape. What Dasein is called *to*, then, is nothing in particular; Dasein locates in "nothingness" no particular possibilities to which the call summons it. As the caller, Dasein is *indefinite*; it is its own self as primordially thrown by and projected toward non-being. As Jean-Jean-Louis Crétien explains, "the source of the call is 'indeterminate,'" and "the indeterminacy lends itself, at the very least, to interpretation."[648] This is why authenticity, or the call that summons Dasein to "itself," is not, as Adorno would have it, an authoritative set of dictates issued by a specific, divinely omnipotent "Being" (which is presumably both institutional ideology and Heidegger himself, who allegedly mirrors it in false consciousness).[649] "That which calls the call"

> simply holds itself aloof from any way of becoming well-known, and thus belongs to its phenomenal character. To let itself be drawn into getting considered and talked about, goes against its kind of Being. The peculiar indefiniteness of the caller and the impossibility of making more definite what this caller is, are not just nothing; they are distinctive for it in a *positive* way.[650]

---

[647] Ibid: 321.

[648] Crétien 2004: 47.

[649] Adorno 2008: 71, 87. Here, Adorno discusses authenticity as authoritarianism. In Chapter Four, I address his objection that authentic Dasein, and thus Heidegger himself, simply represents false consciousness. Heidegger's anti-Semitism and fascist nationalism is indisputable; it is far from fine to defend "Being" against Adorno's objection when Heidegger, throughout the *Black Notebooks*, does claim it to be "divine" and "needed" by "a certain people" (For example, see Heidegger 2016: 248, 256). There still remains the question as to whether or to what degree we can or should think positively about the contents of Heidegger's earlier work while also not losing sight of his fascism. I will address this issue in Chapter Four, section four, as well.

[650] Heidegger 2008a: 319.

Dasein's conscience belongs to Dasein's own intuition of the human condition as uncanny, an intuition that always "is there" as co-defining the meaning of Being. For, as "a phenomenon of Dasein, conscience is not just a fact which occurs and is occasionally present-at-hand. It '*is*' only in Dasein's kind of Being, and it makes itself known as a Fact *only with factical existence and in it*."[651] It is *through* Dasein's reflecting phenomenologically on its own factical life that the latter's onto-existential conditions can truly be understood. This all means that (1) Dasein's conscience is just its explicit understanding of Being as non-being, (2) such explicit understanding is tantamount to Dasein's modal authenticity, and, by transition, (3) Dasein, while modally authentic, discerns its freedom not as voluntarism (which would contradict the first two points), but as an *indefinite* range of possibilities that are "dependent upon the 'they' and its world." "The understanding of this," Heidegger continues,

> is one of the things that a resolution discloses, inasmuch as resoluteness is what first gives authentic transparency to Dasein. In resoluteness the issue for Dasein is its ownmost potentiality-for-Being, which, as something thrown, can project itself only upon definite factical possibilities. Resolution does not withdraw itself from 'actuality,' but discovers first what is factically possible for it as its ownmost potentiality-for-Being in the 'they.'[652]

To remind, what Heidegger means by "actuality" in this context is not the "real world." Rather, the term indicates the hypostatized concept, time as linearly construed, one's reified self-identity, and the norms of (what we should take to be) the historical They. It is by virtue of authentic Dasein's negating *this* signification of "actuality," *while* still tied to the "actuality" of the They, that the analytic's "positive aims" are made manifest.[653] As Michael Zimmerman puts it, Heidegger avoids both subjectivism and voluntarism "by claiming that the call of conscience

---

[651] Ibid: 313.
[652] Ibid: 346.
[653] Ibid: 44.

lays outside the power of the will, that one is *summoned* to be open to one's possibilities, and that these possibilities are found in an historical world."[654]

To return to our original question, then, resolute Dasein *is* the caller of its own conscience only to the degree that, as preparatory to finding its modal authenticity, it understands itself from within its situation as thrown projection.[655] It is its "own" caller exactly because it distinguishes this situation from its typical conformity with the They. Its conscience is its own repressed voice that Dasein is finally ready to hear, for it references the non-being in Being, the "negative moments" in consciousness, that the They and metaphysics have concealed. "[T]he call comes from that entity which in each case I myself am" just insofar as it originates in the insight that I am never the anonymous being that is represented (by both myself and institutionalized society) in a reified present.[656] What reveals such insight is a return of my attention to the "how" of my lived presence, so long as this entails that I attend to it as a presence in which I find myself always "running ahead," and consequently always constituted by that which lies "before." For some moments, I *reticently* tune out the language of the They to phenomenologically engage my "being there" first-hand and to self-express this honestly, apart from the calculative tendencies of the They.[657] This is fundamentally what it means to make my Dasein truly "mine," authentically.

Still not totally settled, however, is why resolute Dasein, as it self-individualizes, does not therefore reverberate the principle of individuation. Heidegger, far from helping in his word choice to alleviate the worry that Dasein as such extols a sense of detachment from society, claims that, upon the call of conscience, "the *'they'* collapses"; the call "passes over" it: "the fact

---

[654] Zimmerman 1986: 149.
[655] Heidegger 2008a: 346.
[656] Ibid: 323.
[657] Ibid: 343.

that the call *passes over* both the "they" and the manner in which Dasein has been publicly interpreted, does not by any means signify that the *"they"* is not *reached too*. While I will address this worry more extensively in Chapter Four, I end this chapter with a few preparatory responses. My general position is that, in passing over or "transcending" the They (keen as it is for public repute), the call challenges its authority.[658] Insofar as, first, the They points to the values and traditions that distinguish a society's character, I suggest that we regard it as akin to the Marxian notion of "superstructure." This reading is helped along by bearing in mind that authenticity, *as* a modality, is by definition a *comprehensive* shift in how Dasein cares for its being-in-the-world. This tentatively means that Dasein, when it resolves to transcend the They, does not thereby resolve to disengage from its social world. Indeed, it transcends in order to negatively critique that world toward inciting positive social change, and to do so as a mundane practice. In Chapter Four, I will unpack what these interpretations specifically entail for Adorno's critique by juxtaposing them with Adorno's own idea of trancendence, which roughly amounts to taking critical distance from the "exchange society" toward engaging in determinate negation, to argue that, given the respective goals of Fundamental Ontology and Negative Dialectics, Heidegger's and Adorno's ideas of transcendence are mutually supportive. Before proceeding to that argument, however, we need to confirm conclusively why exactly Dasein's responding to the call of conscience does not equate to mere tautological "dialogue." For, it is vital to Heidegger's idea of transcendence to recognize that Dasein "always and already" refers to socially collective being.

While Dasein resolves to regain its previously "lost" self is from the They, it does not on that basis surmise itself to have somehow lost its social character. I suggest we be skeptical of

---

[658] Ibid: 317.

readings for which Division I describes a kind of "ontological socialism," authenticity in Division II staunchly refers to and encourages a "psychological individualism," and that the two parts appear to be in unresolvable tension.[659] Though authentic Dasein in its recovery of lived experience *does* intend to distinguish itself from the They, heading that intention is its understanding, already pre-thematically but now explicitly, that it cannot extricate itself from Being, which is primordially social. To the question of "who" is the They, Heidegger responds: "Everyone is the other, and no one is himself."[660] While this response informs his criticism of the They (wherein the self, conforming to culturally conventional habits, loses its unique identity), it also informs the truth that an individual is "nobody" if she is not onto-existentially constituted by a "being-among-one-another." That for Heidegger Being is always "being-with" must already be case simply given his founding assumption that "being there" is essentialized by hermeneutic temporality. In consideration of the historical nature of Being that is given by Dasein's hermeneutic temporality, Marcuse corroborates this reading by signaling how the meaning of Dasein's historicality is, fundamentally, always to be in dialogue with others (even if this dialogue occurs without vocalization and rather just through socio-material dynamics, we might add): "Human Dasein, as something historical, is in its essence a being-with [Mit-sein] with others, and the historical unity is always a unity of being-with-one-another, of "social" being -- it is always a "society."[661]

Later in *Being in Time* we find Heidegger's remark that "Dasein is 'in each case mine,'" by which he appears to suggest that modal authenticity is merely a matter of self-affirmation

[659] This is, for example, Taylor Carman's observation in his *Forward* to MacQuarrie and Robinson's translation of *Being and Time*. Blattner and Dreyfus also seem to presuppose it. And, it is roughly one of Scheler's main points of contention against the Ontology (for instance, see Dahlstrom's "Scheler's Critique of Heidegger's Fundamental Ontology" in Schneck 2002: 67-92)
[660] Heidegger 2008a: 120.
[661] Marcuse 2005: 49.

against one's society at large. However, he quickly qualifies this by emphasizing that it "means neither that [Dasein] is posited by me, nor that [Dasein] is confined to an isolated ego." Rather, "Dasein is *itself* by virtue of its essential *connection* to Being as such,"[662] and while "the call comes *from* me," it comes from "yet *from beyond me and over me*."[663] With this, Heidegger suggests that the term "Dasein" represents an *intersubjective* hermeneutic; to "be there" is necessarily to be in dialogue with other temporally hermeneutic entities.[664] That "Being as such" is Being as hermeneutical and as not confined to one's own subjectivity holds significant implications for interpreting the "happening" of the call of conscience. So long as one inherently understands "Being as such," resolutely modifying one's being-in-the-world must coincide with recovering that understanding explicitly to recognize that any modifications will or must impinge on how one is in-the-world as an intersubjective agent, that is, how one resolves to relate to other individuals in one's (social) environments. Specifically, I argue, this pre-understanding comes to the fore in authentically resolute acts in two major ways. First, when Dasein hears the call of conscience, it engages in critical dialogue (whether alone or collaboratively) with the character of its society as a whole, including the habits and norms which it shares with others. This is largely why Heidegger insists conjunctively that "the caller" is Dasein "itself" and that sociality is essential to Being. As Dasein is called to reflect phenomenologically on its Being, it understands that such reflection cannot meaningfully occur when beginning from the assumption that honing in on its first-person perspective demands imagining that perspective to not be affectively co-constituted by historical, socio-material dynamics and therefore the lives of others. As K.M. Stroh, building on the work of John Haugeland, expresses this for Heidegger,

---

[662] Heidegger 2014: 32 - my brackets for clarification.
[663] Heidegger 2008a: 320.
[664] In *Dasein Disclosed: Haugeland's Heidegger,* John Haugeland illustrates Heidegger's meaning of collective Dasein with the simple example that "Italian speakers in each case *are* Italian." Speaking Italian, as a collective "way" of life, is comprised by individuals whom "in each case *are* Italian" (Haugeland 2013: 82).

"community is the necessary *collective* first-person perspective that underlies the singular first-person perspective of one's 'case of Dasein.'"[665] Given that Dasein's response to the call of conscience majorly entails acknowledging the essential intersubjectivity of Being, included among the possibilities that the call reveals is that of involving oneself in social critique. This is also and especially in view of Heidegger's describing resolute Dasein to be concerned with modifying how it *cares* for its existence, where this must include care for how it relates to, that is, how it chooses to *be in* dialogue with others in-the-world. The "type of Self" of the They, "which covers up our collective first-person perspective in favor of a singular first-person perspective—is inauthentic," Stohr adds.[666] In contrast, the authentic self "would be a Self that is able to perceive and understand its own 'case of Dasein'—indeed, all 'cases of Dasein'—from the collective first-person perspective of its community, which would then allow it to achieve authenticity."[667]

What Heidegger specifically means by Dasein's "mineness," then, is significant for interpreting not only what he means by "Being" per se, but what he identifies as the conditions and possibilities of authentic resoluteness. Modal authenticity remains an impossibility so long as one fails to detach from traditional metaphysical approaches to examining the nature of existence, a problem that lies at the heart of Adorno's critique of authenticity in Heidegger. In the following chapter, I will rely on these interpretations together as a framework for exploring whether or how Heidegger's existential analytic is supportive of, if not also preparatory to, Adorno's style of engaging in immanent critique. In that chapter's final section, moreover, I will return to the notions of being-with and authentic care to consider how the analytic may encourage ethical relations with others.

---

[665] Stohr 2015: 249.
[666] Ibid.
[667] Stohr 2015.

CHAPTER FOUR:

Recovering Non-Identity as a Possibility for Being, Part Two: Authentically Resolute for Social Critique and Care

I.   *Heidegger's existential analytic as critical social practice: next steps*

The central task of Chapters One and Two was to provide an exegetic infrastructure for Chapter Three's proposal that modal authenticity entails, and is co-conditional with, (re)discovering the essentiality of non-identity thinking for Being. In Chapter Three I argued that, to the extent that the existential analytic is a heuristic through which authentic living (or living with intent to not uncritically adopt societal habits and values which, contradicting individual interests, subdue psycho-social freedom) is disclosed as a course of action, it is a heuristic for recognizing that and particularly how our mundane attitudes towards our beliefs and actions are inculcated and delimited by multiple layers of ideological discourse. Catalyzing such recognition is understanding Being as determined by the prioritization of potentiality over actuality as a primordial, onto-existential structure of factical life. As we attend to and refine our ontological understanding, we become empowered to play with how we interpret our existentiell (tangible) possibilities for action, specifically by coming to terms with how ideological or identity thinking[668] conflicts with, distorts, and suppresses embodied instinct and desire; viz., our mimetic or empathic bond with "nature."[669] Thereby realized is that identity thinking, now also understood through a critical, socio-ontological lens, while taking form in real institutional

---

[668] "Identity is the primal form of ideology" (Adorno 1990: 148).

[669]   Agreeing with Marx and Freud (and drawing on Nietzsche and Sade), Adorno and Horkheimer narrate the contradictory relation between, on the one hand, the bourgeois work ethic as it is expressed in commodified labor markets and the instrumental, public form of rationality that underpins totalitarian capitalism ("culture"), and, on the other hand, the renunciation and subjugation of the human body and non-human entities ("nature"). Mass internalizations of such a "stereotyped scale of values" is how the ego comes to dominate over empathy and inclinations for rational social critique, both which presuppose a "letting go" of control to bring mimesis (as it is "originally," and not as it is in its distorted state as mindless tautology) out from its repression by industrialized culture. See, for example, Horkheimer and Adorno 2007: 16-20, 42-43, 154-165, 192-196.

apparatuses of increasing damage to quality of life, is nevertheless a mere fiction. For, Dasein

can but only fantasize its concepts to correspond to entities without remainder.[670] This state holds

equally for modally authentic and inauthentic Dasein.[671] Metaphysically and epistemologically,

identity thinking cannot truly be carried out because, to help answer the question of the "Who"

of Dasein, "being there" is possible first and foremost inasmuch as it originates in an ecstatic

sense of temporality. Dasein's *ecstasis* is responsible for its connate mode of relating to itself and

other entities from within its holistic and, because of this, fragmented horizon of experienced

time.[672] Always existing "beyond" itself, how Dasein immediately makes sense of things always

depends on preserving and anticipating experiences outlying the immediate present, whether they

be first-hand or, as I will explore further in section four, held within a shared framework of

meaning for a public community. By contrast, and Adorno's and Heidegger's locutions are now

again integrated here, identity thinking squares with the false idea of a perspective that is capable

of transcending temporality as a dialogical structure. For it, sense-making is presumed

---

[670] By analogy, if not equation with (for, broadly, identity thinking is idealism and vice versa), Adorno, pointing to Husserl to speak of "correct appearances of a false world," clarifies that idealism "is not simply untruth." As a system developed along with other contradictions in and of the (real) material world, "it is truth in its untruth" (Adorno 1984: 234).

[671] For example, just as (inauthentic) male and white supremacists "are there," thrown into a world affixed by norms of stereotyping and violating others, "[making] use of the doctrine of immediate data," i.e., inculcated by propaganda regimes and notions of biological essentialism rather than immanent critique of the administered concepts that shape their worlds, the work of (authentic) anti-sexism and anti-facism and -racism advocates engaged in immanent critique is nurtured by respect for the divergence of their concepts from the particular *situations* of the suffering other (Adorno 1990: 194). For more on inauthentic Dasein's groundedness in ecstatic temporality, see, for example, Heidegger 2008a: 414-416.

[672] Heidegger writes: "Ecstatico-horizonal temporality temporalizes itself *primarily* in terms of the future. In the way time is ordinarily understood, however, the basic phenomenon of time is seen in the '*now*,' and indeed in that pure "now" which has been shorn in its full structure - that which they call the 'Present.' One can gather that from this there is in principle no prospect that *in terms of this kind of 'now'* one can clarify the ecstatico-horizonal phenomenon of *the moment of vision* which belongs to temporality, or even that one can derive it thus" (Ibid: 479). By "*the moment of vision*," he refers broadly to Dasein's innate self-understanding as a being whose concepts and experiences are constructed by virtue of hermeneutic interchanges between historicality and anticipation. To return to the example in footnote 3, the authentic individual is authentic precisely because she acknowledges that her identity (situation, concepts, etc.) and the identity of the other are splintered by experienced time; the indistinct past and future are together the origin of the concept and, because of this, the reason for the concept's limitedness. As I will motion to in section three, this acknowledgement centers her mundane being-in-the-world on values and norms that nurture care and responsibility for the other.

conditional on what is simply perceived to be the "pure" and static "now."[673] It is spurred on by a

socially managed, communal forgetfulness that absolute ("present") concepts are non-identical to

their referents, a forgetfulness that is dialectically informed by a historical forgetfulness of Being

- hermeneutic Being; Being's essentialization by non-being; Being as primordially or temporally

authentic - for which this notion, admittedly and unfortunately, the earlier Heidegger does not

sufficiently connect with particular, historicized examples of the phenomenality of social

experience.

In the last section of this chapter and dissertation I will offer some reflections on the

perennial question that this problem in Heidegger engages, namely, is it possible, and if so, is it

ethically reasonable to distinguish one's interpretation of a text from the personal beliefs and

political commitments of its author. Intimating parts of those reflections, I would like to propose

here that, in spite of this problem, or at least in consideration of his work from a present-day

purview, Heidegger's existential analytic (and most phenomenology more broadly) shows

promise for, if is not vital to, the success of critical social analysis, including and especially

analysis relying on Adorno's negative dialectical approach. Making clear that "only 'in me' is

[ecstatic] 'time' experienced," and that metaphysical assumptions detached from this fact

consequently thematize time, Heidegger, no matter how tacitly or inadvertently, suggests a

positive correlation between the absence of phenomenological, especially fundamental

ontological meditation, and the presence of reification. This correlation further indicates a

---

[673] If by "identity thinking" we fundamentally mean thinking that hypostasizes objects of thought - historically, socially, spatially, temporally - then it cannot be essential to Dasein, which "constantly lags behind its possibilities. It is never existent before its basis, but only from it and as this basis. Thus 'Being-a-basis' means never to have power over one's ownmost Being from the ground up" (ibid: 330).

necessary relation between ecstatic temporality and non-identity thinking as onto-existential structures, a claim that performs as the backbone of this dissertation.[674]

In Chapter Three, I had begun drawing out the promise of the existential analytic for explicitly identifying these connections between how we ordinarily conceive of time, society, and agency, and more precisely between historical normalizations of identity thinking (hegemony, reification) and popular disinterest in or obfuscations of the meaning of Being. The upshot of the analytic's capability for guiding us through these kind of reflections is recognizing the need of and being willing to self-nurture our inherent potentiality, qua "being there," for critically interpreting and adjusting our identities in relation to the conceptual, cultural, and political climates of the particular societies within which we live. At a certain point in its development, through the analytic we *authentically historicize* our facticity, that is, we come to interpret ourselves as ecstatically temporal beings by tracing our perceived possibilities back to their "heritage"[675] in a factical past, a past that "is" and of which we can make sense only because, as potentiality-for-Being, we always and already distinguish it from what "is not." When it carefully attends to material, real-life contradictions between the ways in which we are socio-historically conditioned to reify the identities of ourselves and other beings, and the truth that potentiality, and thus non-identity, is the most basic ontological structure of Dasein, authentic historicizing, I have suggested, is a means by which we bring to bear our being-in-the-world with concern for ourselves as *particular social agents*.[676] While continuing to examine the

---

[674] Ibid: 348.

[675] On Heidegger's notion of "heritage," see, for example, ibid: 434-439.

[676] Examining ourselves as particular social agents is not a viable possibility in Adorno's Heidegger. What the existential analytic can only allow us to consider, rather, is a universally abstract, ahistorical world - a world not truly "social" at all. Adorno's stance on this is centrally guided by Heidegger's stressing, on the one hand, that Being can only be questioned by examining Dasein's relations to entities (otherwise put as examining the being of entities "themselves"), and on the other, that such an examination requires "an idea of Being in general" that has been "adequately illuminated in advance" (ibid: 382). What is illuminated and then carried into existential analysis as, to use Adorno's words, a "premature generalization," (Adorno 1990: 83) is the necessity of formulating the

implications and possibilities of embracing such concern is the leading aim of this chapter,

towards this end it is beneficial to recapitulate and enlarge upon the general, existential

circumstances that make practicable what I am referring to as authentic social critique.[677]

Dasein's authentic experience of time, its vividly understanding lived temporality as

originally ecstatic, is through which the possibility of recognizing being-in-the-world as a state

of being "outside of" or non-identical with oneself, and with entities that relationally constitute

the self, is actualized. Such experience is mutually dependent upon Dasein's candidly

understanding the concept as a limit-concept in Adornian terms, I have argued. Dasein is

authentic not only when, but because it takes care to understand conceptual (ontological and

epistemological) negativity as the cardinal conditions of its possibility for "being there," as it

specifically is, at all. A primordial mode of being-in, authenticity is recovered as a possibility as

one faces up to the fact that the referent of a judgment is, as Adorno puts it, "always the entity

due to be judged *beyond* the particular that is included in the judgment," where what is "beyond"

is inaccessible for codification in the present moment in which the judgment occurs (e.g., such as

in the experience of getting to know someone over time) and, to a certain degree, at any given

moment in the future (there is no measure of time in which one can conclusively judge the

psychic complexion of another).[678] Dasein understands the essentially hermeneutic and thus finite

---

question of Being as a question concerning the essential character of human entities; we are not initially to be concerned with "telling a story" about the origins of particular human (or non-human) entities (Heidegger 2008a: 26). For Adorno, Heidegger's notion of "ontological difference" parades as concern for a phenomenon's alterity to its concept, whereas for Heidegger (and this is an argument I will recapitulate further in the next pages) authentic self-examination as a particular individual presupposes that individual's understanding the alterity of Dasein - that is, its understanding Being as negative relationality, where this entails recognizing contradictions between the individual's sense of self-agency and the particular social world into which she is thrown. In short, Adorno's qualm here is that Heidegger encourages but only theoretical, impersonal reflection on a set of impersonal experiences.

[677] Except in cases where I specify that a particular point has already been unpacked in a previous chapter, readers should assume that passages in the remainder of this section do not just recapitulate earlier material and instead serve to suggest different or fuller ways of understanding a point that has already been introduced, or, by integrating new ideas, to build on earlier material that is relevant to the focus of this chapter.

[678] Adorno 1990: 152.

nature of thinking, where this demands settling within its vulnerability to take a harsh look at non-identity in identity.

I explained how these manifold, coinciding realizations of the non-being or non-identity in Being[679] are set in motion as Dasein, reconciling itself to its anxiety over having been and having to be *thrown*, or as having inevitably to exist finitely while also to be animated by historical projectiveness, must choose its actions conscientiously, with recourse to neither certainty of judgment nor the comfort of dreaming "there is always more time."[680] Viscerally facing itself as being-towards-death - its greatest "limit-Situation" that, while falling into the They, it denies, is indifferent to, or misunderstands - Dasein faces its responsibility, fundamental to it first because its existence is temporal ecstacy,[681] to critically reflect on how it has been, is, and anticipates it will be in the world in relation to the fact that its existence will always be tied to its primary environments and the values and norms they embody.[682] Finding its conscience, Dasein is "brought back from its lostness by a resolution" *to be as authentic care*.[683] This is a hermeneutic event of disclosing the hermeneutic nature of Being. For Dasein to submit to its guilt over having been thrown while also not having been or being resolute, or as not acting intentionally to distinguish and practice ways of being that resist thoughtless conformity and institutional dogma, it must reveal how it (irrationally) identifies itself and other "entities" from under indiscriminate

---

[679] In Chapter Three, I drew on Chapter Two's joining non-being in Heidegger with non-identity in Adorno. I argued in Chapter Two against Adorno's expected objection that non-being in Heidegger should not be taken as interchangeable with non-conceptuality (which roughly connotes Adorno's meaning of non-identity) because it still refers tautologically to "pure" Being itself (i.e., a transcendent concept).

[680] Heidegger 2008a: 477.

[681] I say "at least" because Dasein's fundamental responsibility, as originating in its ecstatically temporal character, also originates in an originary readiness for *releasement* [*Gelassenheit*] - viz., by way of readiness to "let things go" and not to pressurize them into rigid conceptual frameworks. First explored in Chapter Three, Heidegger's notion of releasement will be elaborated on and will lend to concrete examples in the following sections.

[682] "*The primary phenomenon of primordial and authentic temporality is the future*" (ibid: 378). "The inauthentic temporality of everyday Dasein as it falls, must, as such a looking-away from finitude, fail to recognize authentic futurity and therewith temporality in general. And if indeed the way in which Dasein is ordinarily understood is guided by the 'they,' only so can the self-forgetful 'representation' of the 'infinity' of public time be strengthened" (ibid: 425).

[683] Ibid: 400.

coercion by the They. (So long as Heidegger names it as a world's public character, associates it with modal inauthenticity, and assumes modality is always open to change, I have interpreted the term "the They" ["Das Man"; "the One"] as pointing to societal structures that controvert human agency - its conscious realization, its efficacy in praxis.) In return, Dasein's "complete structure of care" - how it apprehends and directs its being-in both thematically and mundanely, is modified; new opportunities for conscientiously deciding whether to accept, reject, or remodel the standardized practices that shape typically immediate ways of thinking and doing show themselves possible.[684] When Dasein "chooses to make the choice" to curate its life with such sort of form and degree of care, *it encourages itself* as *authentic potentiality-for-Being*.[685] I have expressed this modal shift as a recovery rather than a discovery, because, Dasein is always care already; care is "structurally articulated [in itself]."[686] An instinctive "call" for caring authentically as an experiential norm has simply been silenced by historical de-valuations of socio-ontological critique. While this means that Dasein must somehow "urge itself on" to be "freely" as authentic care, it cannot do so by any "special acts or drives like willing or wishing or urge or addiction," as it is similarly for Adorno that non-identity thinking cannot be engaged through efforts of an absolute will but instead by delicately molding rationality to be receptive to what is potential and particular.[687]

Interpreting them holistically, these moments of reflection, as they motivate modal authenticity in these ways, also motivate non-identity thinking. Or, we could say that they

---

[684] Ibid: 240

[685] Ibid: 313. Importantly relevant, and here recollecting my counter-objection in Chapter Three to Adorno's charge of voluntarism, Heidegger qualifies that, "In pure urge, care has not yet become free, though care first makes it ontologically possible for Dasein to be urged on by itself" (ibid: 240).

[686] Ibid: 241 - my brackets. Moreover, see ibid 241-244. For example: "Man's *perfectio* -- his transformation into that which he can be in Being-free for his ownmost possibilities (projection) -- is 'accomplished' by 'care.' But with equal primordiality 'care' determines what is basically specific in this entity, according to which it has been surrendered to the world of its concern (thrownness). In the 'double meaning' of 'care,' what we have in view is a *single* basic state in its essentially twofold structure of thrown projection."

[687] Ibid: 238-240.

motivate authentic non-identity thinking, with "authentic" added to stress that non-identity

thinking, which I take to be the driving factor of modal authenticity, continues to belong to the

meaning of Being regardless of whether Dasein has made blunt engagement with its finitude and

guilt a rhythmic practice.[688] An idea I will continue to explore is that, largely because examining

the relationship between temporality and everydayness is a central means of instigating social

critique (in Adorno's fashion), the existential analytic functions simultaneously to nurture

increasingly frequent moments of non-identity thinking in which de-reifying consciousness and

its environments becomes an evident need and possibility. Experiencing "primordial" time,

Dasein makes its *situation* self-transparent - a situation which must be all onto-existentially,

socio-historically, and materially grounded - toward realizing the discrete ways in which it has

manifested self-denial as a future-oriented, fatefully finite and responsible being; as one who

experiences *releasement* [*Gelassenheit*] of a world otherwise perceived to be absolute, who "lets

things be," and for whom releasement entails an organic demand for fostering social critique and

caring intersubjective relations and thus, I maintain, in recognition of the limit concept.

("Philosophical thinking is a gentle releasement that does not renounce the concealment of being

as a whole." [689]) Authentically resolute Dasein becomes self-aware of having aided in the

suppression and oppression of itself and other entities by tacitly projecting Being, and with it,

social "totalities," as inanimate things transcending subjective influence rather than a variable

series of hermeneutic acts motioning between the three temporal ecstases (that successively

shape hermeneutic subject-object relations). Dasein "awakens the Present" not to reify the

---

[688] Alongside this, it is important to remind, in seeming opposition to Adorno's reading, that modal authenticity neither occurs all at once and permanently, nor is it a homogenized state. As explained in Chapter Three, resolute Dasein, because it is always still tied to the They, will always find itself wavering between inauthentic and authentic modes of being, and, because the essence of authenticity is to singularize phenomena, or to experience them as standing out in their particularity, there is no one exact, universal modality that would count as "authentic."
[689] Heidegger 2008c: 135.

present and fetishize the entities that presently appear to it, but to be present *for* existence as temporally hermeneutic projection.[690] It experiences the meaning of Being through lived immediacy rather than treating it as thing for objective scrutiny. On that basis, it is "called," it invites itself and is invited by others who inform the self, to participate in moments of de-reifying its situation, as it opens itself up to exploring its potential as an agent for social critique and change.[691]

Arguing further that modal authenticity and non-identity thinking are co-conditional, I have fleshed out the meaning of the They as the public character or discourse of "today's" society, drawing lines between it and modern, instrumental reason, and considering the usefulness of thinking about it in terms of a society's superstructure;[692] I have supported readings of *Being and Time* that interpret "Dasein" to refer to *communal* being, or phenomenal experience as always and already structured by relationality *as* intersubjectivity; and I have suggested that, together, these points hint at the untenability of Adorno's critique of existential freedom in general and Heidegger's sense of modal authenticity in particular. I have framed this suggestion by examining not only the "how" of Dasein's modal shifts but also two of Adorno's key, connected grievances against the ontological coherence and societal relevance of modal authenticity in Heidegger: that authentic Dasein is ahistorical and asocial, and that this signifies

---

[690] "If world time thus belongs to the temporalizing of temporality," that is, if it belongs to Dasein who, as a social being, critically negates it, it can neither be volatilized 'subjectivistically' nor be 'reified in a bad objectification" (Heidegger 2010: 385). (Here I employ Stambaugh's translation, which more carefully preserves Heidegger's use of the word "Vorhandenheit" ["presence-at-hand"; "the One"], which MacQuarrie and Robinson infrequently translate as "reification" in appropriate passages.

[691] Heidegger 2008a: 378

[692] The They, put more often in Heidegger's later writings as "publicness," both conditions and reflects how Dasein interprets itself: "A mode in which the today makes itself present, in which therefore one already sees something like Dasein, is the *open space of publicness* which belongs to the being-there of Dasein. The publicness actualizes itself by passing around and sustaining definite kinds of discourse about ..., opinions about. [...] The discourse circulates everywhere and about everything - in a characteristic fashion - and thus presumably also about what is after all not so very far from Dasein, namely, *itself*" (Heidegger 1999: 38). When an investigation into "today's" publicness concerns Dasein's relating to things as mere instruments, for example, the essentializing character of that publicness may be identified as the capitalist mode of production.

for its concept freedom as a voluntaristic transcendence of social reality. For Adorno, the idea of authenticity both is a product of and reinforces the fiction of identity thinking. Imagined to transcend forms of socio-material and cultural mediation, it is a "mythically imposed fate," with the so-called authentic individual imagining himself to be "sovereignly at his own disposal; as though he were his own property" and not instead tethered in his identity and realm of possibilities by others, histories, materials (from the forces of production, to his own body) and the ideologies imprinted by their impacts.[693] Reckoning these grievances to rest on several false assumptions about Being in Heidegger, I responded by tracing out the ramifications of explicitly interpreting the They as socio-historically contingent, public discourse, as well as Dasein in its fundamental meaning not as a specific individual but as primordially "being in" social relations; the possibility of a particular being that is Dasein is just determined by the possibility of social, hermeneutical affectivity. Building further, here in sections three and four I will consider how the "caller" of Dasein's conscience, while strictly speaking is "a" Dasein "itself," ultimately refers to Dasein's questioning its existence in relation to the They. In not only this way, the They are the others with whom one shares a (perhaps very) general or particular set of cultural and political conditions who both refer and are referred to by the call. There I will also advocate the idea that Heidegger's existential analytic can lend to disclosing authentic care as a community value.

Especially towards these ends, it has been important to emphasize that existential analysis overwhelmingly involves revealing the They, the particular social environment(s) into which one is thrown, to be a both contingent *and* necessary structure of Being. As contingent, the They spells a society's discrete public character, and as necessary, it points to the meaning of Being as

---

693 Adorno 2003: 79, 104.

tied by an implicit understanding that Being reciprocates sociality. Like the dextrous PI of Husserl's epoche, Dasein, authentic or not, cannot by virtue of thought experiments extricate itself from society in any way that is indeed less than fictional, notwithstanding Adorno's insistence that Heidegger (as do all unwitting advocates of idealism and identity thinking) reserves a "special domain" for concepts ideated to be untouched by mediation.[694] Drawing on Heidegger's own claim that "in anticipation any Dasein can have wrenched itself away from the 'they' already,"[695] Adorno surmises that Fundamental Ontology envisions authentic Dasein's final "destiny" to be one of transcending, and thus of strengthening, its denial of and disempowerment for critiquing actual societies.[696]

Heidegger's meaning of Dasein's "wrenching itself away from" or transcending the They runs contrary in comparison to Adorno's reception of it. Viscerally coming to terms with its facticity, Dasein provokes *moments* of critical distance from the They within which it "stands back" from, in order to "stand out" in, its immediacy (an immediacy Adorno claims the individual irrationally believing herself authentic holds only the more dear).[697] Authentically resolute, Dasein deliberately seeks pauses for musing on its uncritical experience of being-in, which importantly means of being-with, very often for the sake of interpreting (to borrow from Marx, Lukács, and Adorno et al.) the "totality" of objective contradictions and the subjective conceptual and emotional mechanisms that mirror and rationalize them, where, dialectically entwined, these objectifications and internalizations (exploitation, alienation, false consciousness) constitute the typical, immediate consciousness of one living in late capitalist

---

[694] Ibid: 101.
[695] Ibid: 124, Heidegger 2008a: 307.
[696] The personally political notes of Adorno's objection must be embraced. In Chapter Four I speak to them explicitly.
[697] On Adorno's reception of the role of immediacy in phenomenology and particularly in Heidegger, see for example, Adorno 1984: 7-8, Adorno 1990: 73-74, 80-85, Adorno 2005: 25-29.

society (really regardless of what situation one is in.)[698] Simply enough, reflecting on one's

facticity, towards disclosing the meaning of Being, yields disclosing for that meaning sociality as

an essential foundation. More significant to address in this chapter, however, is how the

implications of this disclosure bear on one's resoluteness for authentic care, where this is

mutually dependent upon one's resoluteness for rational social criticism (points to which I will

give detail in sections two and three). Disclosing the truth of Being a là Heidegger is in a large

sense a disclosure of, as Adorno speaks of it, "the truth that society comes before the individual

consciousness and before all its experiences";[699] that the deep, psychical coercion of socialization

processes ("second nature") already proves that "we are preformed by … being-for-others to the

very core of our being," and that, consequently, resisting identity thinking and institutional

power depends on a form of critique that straightaway assumes intersubjectivity to be mutually

mediated by metaphysical, epistemic, and psycho-social conditions.[700] Granting this as a

precondition of philosophical investigation grants in turn the possibility of immanent critique, a

specific mode of investigation that Adorno perceives to be the antithesis of transcendental and

phenomenological philosophy, which, as allegedly concerned with "immanence" alone, extends

history's risk of engendering yet new idealisms still all resting on binary, identical thinking. The

absence of this possibility hinders rational understanding of the difficult interconnections

between subject and object and, for that reason, of tending to ethical relations with others.[701]

       The following and last sections of this dissertation are concerned with developing these

arguments further. This will in part involve considering the readiness of existential analysis and

---

[698] Adorno 1990: 152.

[699] Ibid: 181.

[700] Adorno 2006: 71.

[701] As I clarified in Chapters One and Two, however, Adorno accedes the need of immanent critique for retaining a certain degree of attention to the immediate. "No immanent critique can serve its purpose wholly without outside knowledge, of course -- without a moment of immediacy, if you will, a bonus from the subjective thought that looks beyond the dialectical structure" (Adorno 1990: 182).

modal authenticity for supporting realizations of rational public cultures fundamentally defined

by recognition of (negative dialectical) subject-object mediation, where this motivates and is

motivated by mimetic engagements with phenomena (consciousness, the material, others) vis-à-

vis social criticism. Adorno understands this "alternative" (placed in scare quotes because he also

understands it to be our primordial) form of relationality as the thrust of non-identity thinking,

from within which a mode of intersubjectivity embedded in respect for the conceptually elusive

particularity of the other can develop, and which is mutually dependent on acknowledging the

value of practicing immanent critique. Given that at the heart of Adorno's polemic is his

conception of the role that historicizing takes on in Heidegger, further addressing this notion will

be necessary. His accusation that Fundamental Ontology is idealism emanates from his

problematization of phenomenological approaches, which (he purports) do not register that "the

only way to capture reality and the true experience of it is to go beyond the immediate givens of

experience."[702] Immanent critique cannot truly be practiced so long as philosophical meditation

is disinterested in uncovering the historical contradictions of social experience in order to

determinately negate the appearing "totality" of institutional structures that reproduce identity

thinking today, and for Adorno the notion of historicizing in Heidegger is entirely unsuitable for

this task. My primary interest in section three lies with how, as a heuristic for coming to be

authentically resolute for potentiality-for-Being, Heidegger's existential analytic can be a course

of action for reflecting on the historical facticity of the possibilities to which one is handed as

one is thrown into a particular social environment.

　　　To better frame my proposal that the existential analytic - especially as it facilitates

critical reflection on Being and society/sociality through a historical lens - is conducive to

---

[702] Adorno 2006: 30.

immanent critique, in section two I will briefly explain the latter's purpose, conditions, and possibilities per Adorno. There I will also examine Adorno's interpretations of "immanence" and "transcendence" as they pertain to his critique of Fundamental Ontology and phenomenology in general. I will then introduce a few of Adorno's key remaining objections to what he dubs as Heidegger's "jargon of authenticity."

Finally, in section four I will attend to the areas of Adorno's critique that are more explicitly devoted to examining the relation between modal authenticity and intersubjective experience in Heidegger. Above all, this will require responding to Adorno's contention that the real upshot of the idea of authenticity is authentic Dasein's (a "supreme" being's) legitimizing domination over others ("the lesser people, of the They") as this goes hand-in-hand with Dasein's indifference to others' non-generalizable experiences of being-toward-death.[703] There my concern will be with the connection between morality and modal authenticity, and, accordingly, with the potentiality of authenticity for motivating social relations mediated by non-identity thinking. Recalling that, for Adorno, non-identity thinking is the fundamental condition of critical reason and critical reason the fundamental condition of ethical life, and that I interpret non-identity to be the essence of Being in Heidegger, I will close the last section by considering how authentic Dasein's intent to recover non-identity thinking in its everyday experience may contribute to recovering critical reason - promoting *more* of a particular kind of subjective agency - on a socially collective scale. As encouraging of and perhaps even preparatory to immanent critique, Heidegger's existential analytic can readily animate one to engage in immanent critique with others, where by virtue of this one can become well-positioned to help

---

[703] Adorno 2008: 128.

recover "being-with" - an onto-existential structure of *empathic* care - as a norm for mundane social interactions.

We can continue to summarize the guiding intent of this dissertation, then, as that of questioning whether or how immanent, negative dialectical criticism might be further advanced by integrating it with Heidegger's model of existential analysis, and vice versa. While my focus remains with Adorno and Heidegger, however, this is ultimately out of what remains my wider concern for how the two predominant areas in 20th Century European Philosophy that they have each largely come to represent can or should be regarded as equally supportive.

II. *Immanent critique, freedom of consciousness, and Heidegger's "jargon of authenticity"*

Toward elaborating on and helping to measure this dissertation's guiding thesis - that Heidegger's Fundamental Ontology, as both an idea of and practice in disclosing the meaning of Being, holds intrinsic value as an approach to critical social philosophy, especially where Adorno's negative dialectical approach is in question - Adorno's understanding of the conditions and aims of such an approach requires further clarification. Lukács' earlier interpretation of the essence of critical social philosophy is helpful to this end. "Critical philosophy," he stipulates, "dissolves the rigid, unhistorical, natural appearance of social institutions; it reveals their historical origins… of the changes they undergo *as* institutions which bring men together in societies."[704] Despite Adorno's having hard qualms with Lukács' allegedly uneven attachment to the subjective "pole" of thinking (which for Adorno makes much of his studies fall yet under the heading of transcendent critique), his vision of immanent critique is heavily indebted to Lukács' Marxist theory of reification - of a mode of alienation precipitated by the generalization and internalization of commodity fetishism, by which capitalist value systems take shape around the phenomenon of treating human relations as sovereign things, and which setting this definition of critical philosophy functions inceptively to dispel.[705] We recall that Adorno specifies reification as fundamentally a "forgetting" that knowledge is a mediated process, resulting in the subject's activity being credited as the exclusive site of (absolute) knowledge production (and for that seemingly contradictory reason, in the subject's reinforcing the autonomous power of

---

[704] Lukács 1972: 47-48.

[705] Adorno faults Lukács for failing (with Hegel) to attend sufficiently to the negative moments of dialectical thinking and for championing classical Marxism's overly-optimistic sight for the proletariat's freedom. Considering the pervasive reproduction of false consciousness in contemporary times and thus the intransigence of irreconciliation, he insists "there is no freedom yet" (Adorno 1990: 218). "Absolute reification. . . is now preparing to absorb the mind entirely. Critical intelligence cannot be equal to this challenge as long as it confines itself to self-satisfied contemplation" (Adorno 1974: 34).

238

"objective" activity), in the object's coming to be nothing more than "the result of the labor that has congealed in it - a dead thing," and, consequently, in the subject's inadvertently serving as an apologist for instrumental thinking and the institutional powers through which it is legitimized as a value and habit.[706] It is a (or the) correlate of subjectification, the present establishment of which (in the sphere of disciplinary philosophy) is owed to Kant's transcendental form of critique,[707] and which Adorno, I have intimated, accuses Heidegger of deluding himself into believing Fundamental Ontology has definitively revoked. Deceptively claiming the Ontology to be a critique of reification,[708] Heidegger, he claims, "[pushes] reification back into Being and into a history of Being, to mourn and consecrate as 'fate' what might perhaps be changed by self-reflection and by the action it kindles" - a type of self-reflection that requires skepticism of overarching concepts and interest in concrete historical analysis, and which is purportedly lost in the strictly transcendental tradition.[709] This means for Adorno that Heidegger, who is "anti-thing" inasmuch as he bounds the object by a subjective foundation (Being) that deprives it of its historical dynamism and mediatory function,[710] equally fails to recognize the "human conditions in the concepts," leading the subjectification of Being to yield not too much, but too little subjectivity or agency.[711] These key reasons form the basis of Adorno's verdict that the Ontology, as established by the existential analytic, is structurally ill-prepared for immanent critique. For, the goal of immanent critique is to uncover contradictions between subject and

---

[706] Adorno 1990: 91.

[707] "It was transcendent and not immanent critique that clings rigidly to that standpoint, whose very fixity and arbitrariness of which, philosophy turned against in equal measure. Transcendent critique sympathizes with authority in its very form." (Adorno 1994: 146).

[708] This is Adorno's interpretation, which I find to some extent to be a distortion of the earlier Heidegger's concern with "reification." Despite agreeing that this is at least its tacit aim, I strongly hesitate to read Heidegger to claim that Fundamental Ontology is a critique of reification, particularly given how sparse is the space *Being and Time* gives to analyzing the notion (there is, for example, Heidegger 2008a: 414).

[709] Ibid.

[710] Ibid: 89-91.

[711] Ibid: 84.

object by examining them in their discrete, historical contexts, and the possibility of philosophy

for doing this work is decided first by whether subject-object mediation is presupposed.[712] (Here

we may recall how, largely by surveying the meaning and implications of hermeneutic

experience and thinking for Fundamental Ontology, in Chapters One and Two I challenged

Adorno's claim that subject-object mediation is absent in Heidegger's idea of Being.)

With the foregoing in mind, we may (as informed by Marx and Lukács, and with Adorno

and the Frankurt School) delineate immanent critique as the practice of constructing

constellations within the manifesting *totality[713]* of institutional structures (the political, economic,

philosophical, cultural, and so forth) so as to interpret its appearance of dissociation from the

"subjective" sphere, revealing its reality as subjectively mediative and historically contingent.[714]

To critique identity thinking as ideology[715] is to critique the structures that violently arbitrate

consciousness and its concepts that subliminally reinforce the false portrayal of "'society' as an

abstraction over against the individual" - of the individual as not "*social being*."[716]

Immanent critique is a practice in deconstructing modern rational, transcendental, and

positive dialectical narratives that portray reason and reality to be wholly unified with one

another; viz., narratives that nourish the appearance of a monolithic social order by fortifying

identity thinking as a benchmark for mundane experience. In its negative dialectical fashion,

---

[712] The Husserlian tradition, by its very own positing of "first" principles, Adorno details in *Against Epistemology*, cannot accommodate this presupposition. "The first of the philosophers makes a total claim: It is unmediated and immediate. In order to satisfy their own concept, mediations would always just be accounted for as practically addenda to thought and peeled off the first which is irreducible in itself" (Adorno 1984: 7).

[713] "The semblance" of socio-cultural harmony "has become total in a phase in which irrationality and objective falsity hide behind rationality and objective necessity" (Adorno 2000b: 204).

[714] In addition to "reification," Marx and Lukács first used the term "totality" to describe how subject and object relate dialectically in the context of socio-historical processes, and Adorno's use of both terms preserves and expands upon their original meanings (Jay 1977; Lukács 1974: 54-56).

[715] Offering a succinct definition in his essay, "Cultural Criticism and Society," Adorno writes: "Today, ideology means society as appearance" (Adorno 2000b: 207). "Ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence," goes Althusser's first thesis on ideology (Althusser 2001: 109).

[716] "Man, however much he may therefore be a *particular* individual - and it is just this particularity which makes him an individual and a real individual communal being - is just as much the *totality*, the ideal totality, the subjective existence of thought and experienced society for itself" (Marx 1992: 351-352).

immanent critique opposes the pretense of totality "by convicting [totality] of nonidentity with itself - of the nonidentity it denies," and importantly it does so "according to [the totality's] own concept."[717] This requires first from the critic that she relinquish control over the concept to acknowledge that totality cannot be apprehended absolutely. As a semblance never revealing itself, there is always something "more" about totality to connect toward one's understanding of it.[718] More generally, uncovering contradictions and challenging reification, far from being an instantaneous process, must unfold gradually given the epistemological negativity and hence the limitudes of subject-object relations. To figure otherwise would be to chance reproducing, through critique itself, the structures of the totality that appears (as Lukács tells us, in the interests of the bourgeois the "plenitude of the totality" shows itself as either a candidate for immediate invalidation or not a rational candidate for invalidation at all).[719] For it is in this way that the critic advances an attitude concerned with subverting the (simultaneously real and illusive) authority of identity thinking and the ideologies in which it is concretized. It is how she resists the institutionally manufactured and managed tendency for dominating the non-I: objects as they exist, non-codifiable, in their irrefutable, elusive particularity. Through it, "thinking heeds a potential that waits in the object."[720] If to reify an object is essentially to constrain

---

[717] Adorno 1990: 147 - my brackets.

[718] Importantly, the goal of immanent critique is not to eradicate the fact of there always being something "more" in the object and its relation with the subject. That is, for all its talk of efforting toward reconciliation, negative dialectics does *not* actively intend to effort towards "harmony" between subject and object. For Adorno, the critic must not intend to reconcile the contradictions revealed through cultural critique, for it is the contradictoriness of subject and object that preserves the possibility of experiencing the object in its primacy and particularity, or as it is perceived when disentangled from "the logic of classification" that dominates it (Adorno 1990: 36). "A successful work" of cultural criticism "is not one which resolves objective contradictions in a spurious harmony, but one which expresses the idea of harmony negatively by embodying the contradictions, pure and uncompromised, in [a culture's] innermost structure" (Adorno 2000b: 203).

[719] Lukács 1972: 197-198.

[720] Adorno 1990: 19.

thinking to the hypostatization of a discrete moment of perceived actuality, then dialectic that

takes the form of immanent critique "means intransigence towards all reification."[721]

While the critic must accede the limits of ("total") theorization, she must also and

because of this work to fortify a more cohesive and robust sense of self, as we recall Adorno's

appeal, in allusion to transcendental and fundamental philosophy's "robbing" the subject of

herself, for not less but *more* subjectivity.[722] Critique must accordingly be positioned from

"within" the concept that is the object of critique, as this dissuades the critic from narrowing her

focus on problematizing a specific concept or object "in itself hermetic."[723] Adorno amply

accentuates this precondition in *Negative Dialectics*, *Jargon of Authenticity*, and *History and

Freedom*, respectively:

> The whole which theory expresses … is contained in the individual object to be analyzed.[724]

> It remains true that the factual particular has meaning to the extent that the whole, above all the system of society, appears in it; that the dispersed facts are always more than what they immediately seem, even if such meaning is madness.[725]

> The cultural critic evaluates and hence is inevitably involved in a sphere stained with 'cultural values,' even when he rants against the mortgaging of culture."[726]

---

[721] Adorno 1967: 31.
If a system (like Hegel's) "is in fact to be closed system, to tolerate nothing outside its domain, it will become a positive infinity -- in other words, finite and static" (Adorno 1990: 27). The power of negation lies rather in proving that what appear to be closed systems are in truth still primordially rooted in non-identity thinking and, because of this, are susceptible to a stripping away of their authority, opening space for recognition of conceptual infinity. Moreover, Adorno frequently reminds us that reconciliation is not possible in today's society, however much we can still imagine it as the gentle union of subject and object, unified in terms not of identity but of the subject's releasement of the object from its reified concept. Adorno refers to "happiness," "harmony," "freedom" and, cumulatively, "utopia," as an ideal state wherein such releasement, and thus non-identity thinking, would be at the center of a society's value system (e.g., see Adorno 1990: 95, 150). Against Hegel's theodicy, Adorno's pessimism stems from understanding that, barring radical institutional change and restructuring cultural value systems, non-identity thinking cannot be recovered ("ideology has a material existence," goes Althusser's second thesis; Althusser 2001: 114). Vindicating the material basis of his pessimism, Adorno attests that "[i]f no man had part of his labor withheld from him any more rational identity would be a fact, and society would have transcended the identity mode of thinking" (Adorno 1990: 147). So long as the capitalist mode of production has yet to be revolutionized or dismantled (and then there would still be long-term, psycho-social de-habituation to face), for Adorno utopia is indeed an imagined state. Indeed, in *Aesthetic Theory* Adorno goes as far to claim that "[t]he emancipation from the concept of harmony has revealed itself to be a revolt against semblance" (Adorno 1997: 139).
[722] Adorno 1990: 52.
[723] Ibid: 33.
[724] Ibid: 47.
[725] Adorno 2003: 33.

The critic's task is to expose more widely what the concept under consideration, when examined in its mutual mediation by its object, divulges about modern social experience in its formation of historical antagonisms between appearances and reality.[727] (This kind of holistic approach also stands against the value assumptions of occupational specialization, social atomization, and the reification of identities.) The critic must remain internal to, that is, she must study her existing standpoint in relation to, the specific system of thought with which she is concerned. Entering critique calls for relying on the same values and measures of knowledge that characterize the society or stratum of society in which a particular object (and the corresponding concept) is to be analyzed.[728] This means that the critic must unhitch from her imagination the idea that her concepts are or can be value-free ("ideal"), so as to register her own culpability in the mendacity, tenacity, and domination of ideological paradigms. As Adorno enjoins in his essay, "Cultural Criticism and Society," dialectical practice "must relate the knowledge of society as a totality and of *the mind's involvement* in it to the claim inherent in the specific content of the object that it be apprehended as such."[729] Without preserving subject-object duality, by which the critic is able to stand back from the object in its distorted, "totalized" meaning to experience both it and her own mode of consciousness from new interpretative angles, she risks reverting to identity thinking (which she otherwise sets forth to accuse and disrupt) and thus to false assumptions about subjective influence in productions of meaning.

On account of its negativity as it "seeks to grasp, through the analysis of their form and meaning, the contradictions between their objective idea and pretension," immanent critique

---

[726] Adorno 2006: 199.
[727] Adorno 1990: 47. See also: ibid: 6, 47, 152, 163.
[728] For, "[s]ocial critique is a critique of knowledge, and vice versa," Adorno stipulates (Adorno 2000b: 143). And, as he clarifies with Horkheimer, "[k]nowledge does not consist in mere perception, classification, and calculation but precisely in the determining negation of whatever is directly at hand" (Horkheimer and Adorno 2007: 20).
[729] Adorno 1967: 33 - my italics for emphasis.

unfolds in moments of revealing discrepancies that indicate social forces that dictate perceived distinctions of form from content, the idea from its object, semblance from reality, under the public eye, where by the same strokes these are moments of contradicting those forces themselves by spoiling their guises of sovereignty, permanence, rectitude, and normative neutrality.[730] Its final wager is to bring into the open the absurdity of heedlessly pretending that production has not become the veneer of life and life as production has not become an end in itself.[731]

To take an example, immanent critique of both the idea (as a normative value) and the reality (as the normative practice) of canine domestication in today's western world calls on a historical look at European hunter-gatherer society, in which canines were tamed for need of bringing down large prey, and at how, with an influx of city populations and agriculture increasingly industrialized, canine domestication was repurposed as capital. The critic pauses to understand the contemporary meaning of the concept as it relates to the real social interests and needs that developed in response to complex alterations in the social fabric of western publics.[732] There connected are two points of the constellation the critic in this case constructs. This historical knowledge must then itself be contextualized by evaluating capitalist, industrialized culture as a broader value system ("totality"), and the critic's own "mind's involvement" in reproducing the identity thinking that undergirds today's commodity fetishism of not only canines, but of other non-human animals as well as human subjects and non-sentient or inanimate things. With this work in tow, her understanding of the concept, both particularly of canine domestication and, at least to some extent, "*the*" or "*a*" concept in general, becomes

---

[730] Ibid: 32.
[731] Here I paraphrase a passage from *Minima Moralia* (Adorno 2005: 15).
[732] I do not intend to indicate that the order of actions in this example is necessary for any given immanent critique, especially as Adorno eschews, on epistemological and ethical grounds, adhering to pre-fixed, firm methods.

enlightened. To the critic's thematic understanding and, over time, her everyday perception, commodity fetishism as both an idea and practice becomes more complexly dynamic, the "frailty" of its character becomes more apparent, and, insofar as its idea is discovered to illustrate and correspond to identity thinking, justifying the practice of commodity fetishism for its coherence and ethicality is beset with increasing difficulty.[733] In this case, the critic critiques the concept of canine domestication specifically and, to a certain extent, the capitalist mode of production as a whole, by relying initially on the concept itself as it presently is for the subject (where I am presuming that the critic's initial concept corresponds to her unreflective acceptance of canine domestication as an essential, unassailable matter of fact). For, "an immanent generality of something individual is objective as sedimented history."[734] Differentiating the concept from its object, these motions lead her to critique the reality of canine domestication and, in doing so, to advance what must be her interminable critique of commodification as a mode of relationality. She begins by objectifying the object, not to reify it, but by all means to de-reify it; to identify its very meaning as a fetishized, "cultural good."[735] Through all this, ideally she reveals a series of manifesting contradictions: 1) the presenting, fetishizing concept of canine domestication contradicts the latter's historical reality (subject-object mediation is retrieved, for analysis, from its historical obscuration under identity thinking); 2) this concept, and perhaps, the critic sees, the concept of commodity fetishism as a whole, but only portrays itself as a "closed system," and it is actually open to critique, resistance, and change; 3) the critic begins to experience the real beings at stake - canines - in their particularities rather than from within the systems that reify them; she grants recognition of their otherness, recognition that means no less than that their own experiences, emotions, interests, and needs cannot

---

[733] See, for example, Adorno 1967: 27.
[734] Adorno 1990: 163.
[735] Adorno 1967: 22.

metaphysically and epistemologically, and must not ethically, be imagined to have sense without remainder under her corresponding (absolute) concepts.

What this example further accentuates is that, while Adorno is sure to distinguish transcendent from immanent styles of critique, he tempers this distinction by claiming immanent critique really to be a "transcendent criticism of culture." After all, critical theory by its own nature cannot accept either/or choices, including one between immanent and transcendent approaches to exposing the fragility of dogma.[736] Its "position transcending culture," Adorno clarifies, "is in a certain sense presupposed by dialectics as the consciousness which does succumb in advance to the fetishization of the intellectual sphere."[737] This double level of the critical standpoint is owed to the critic's taking up the objective idea of an ideological system and "confronting it with the norms which it itself has crystallized."[738] Similarly to how in Chapters One and Two I presented Dasein as having to engage in existential analysis simultaneously and repetitiously from the perspectives of both lived immediacy and thematic reflection, Adorno's critic must initially both take stock of her immediate experience (phenomenologically) and stand back from that immediate (which again, for Heidegger Adorno associates with her "irrational") experience and the particular object of her critique so as to clear room for deliberate, rational interpretation of the subject-object relation in the context of specific social mores, material conditions, or theoretical frameworks.[739] Ultimately, immanent critique is

---

[736] Critical theory's refusal to accept this choice is primed by its broader refusal to participate in the binary thinking on which institutions stand and from which their authority favors. "We like to present alternatives to choose from, to be marked True or False. The decisions of a bureaucracy are frequently reduced to Yes or No answers to drafts submitted to it; the bureaucratic way of thinking has become the secret model for a thought allegedly still free" (Adorno 1990: 32).

[737] Adorno 1967: 22.

[738] Ibid: 31.

[739] To note, here the both positive and negative Hegelian dimensions of Adorno's understanding of critique are most prominent. Hegel proposes in *Elements of the Philosophy of Right* that "ethical life," within which the subject relates to "the state" by way of a simultaneously immanent and rational (dialectical) standpoint toward social reality, is the ideal form of experience as it entails the development of robust agency, which manifests particularly in a more

an act of interrogating and disempowering systems that fail to confess the normative standards

by which they are modeled. Its purpose is to expose, through utilizing the same concepts and

standards that characterize (and as they are typically assumed or employed by the critic within) a

certain system of ideas and practices, that that system, on the basis of its very own terms, helps

to sow the conditions for identity thinking, for "life [transformed] into the ideology of reification

- a death mask."[740]

Importantly, the meaning of "transcendence" here is set apart from Adorno's

understanding of the notion in Heidegger and what Adorno advises is Heidegger's strictly

transcendental phenomenological method, especially as neither the notion of "method," for its

rigidity, nor the transcendental alone, for its (supposed) sterility and inherent risk of

metaphysically paralyzing subject and object, does Adorno espouse.[741] On his count, from the

outset Heidegger, compounding the limitations of transcendental phenomenology for immanent

critique, jeopardizes the possibility of discovering contradictions. The analytic, not having

carved out the tools for critically differentiating what concepts (falsely) appear to represent and

what are the (real) institutional apparatuses engendering social harms, is not an invitation to

participate in negative dialectical examinations of reality *as* a socially dialectical process. Being,

as allegedly transcendent to subject and object alike, "blinds our cognition of [negative

dialectical] moments," Adorno contends.[742] This is in spite of Heidegger's would-be agreement

---

robust sense of responsibility ("freedom") for nurturing the collective good (for example, see Hegel 1991: 185-196).
Though Adorno of course works within this paradigm, he problematizes it for its reinforcement of the
Enlightenment assumption that, as positively dialectical with reality, rationality is identical to it. Hegel's idea of
"ethical life" does not accommodate a form of rationality that is prepared to detect contradictions between concepts
and their objects.

[740] Adorno 2000b: 206.

[741] "[M]ethod must constantly do violence to unfamiliar things, though it exists only so that they may be known. It
must model the other after itself. This is the original contradiction in the construction of freedom from contradiction
in the philosophy of origins" (Adorno 1984: 12). For more on Adorno on method, see, for example, Adorno 1984:
11-14 and Adorno 1990: 47-48.

[742] Adorno 1990: 104 - my brackets for clarity.

with Adorno's claim (occasioned by the "naïvete" of phenomenology) that "immediacy does not maintain its immediate pose. Instead of becoming the ground, it becomes a moment,"[743] as well as with Adorno's problematizing how, in the Kantian tradition, "the transcendental subject constructs the object out of undifferentiated material;"[744] that, "fearlessly passive, [the subject] entrusts itself to its own experience."[745] It is also in spite of Heidegger's describing the analytic as a mode of investigating "the totality of items" that constitute "natural science," where the latter serves as Heidegger's catch-all word for archaic methods of "pure" theoretical inquiry that do not account for ecstatic temporality in their tests for truth, and that, as I suggested in Chapter Three, should be treated as inextricable from Heidegger's hermeneutic critique of the conditions that drive "today's" public character as equipmentality or instrumentality. Finally, it is in spite of what I have preliminarily identified as Heidegger's interest in interpreting that public character through a historical lens - to trace the the meaning of an appearing phenomenon to "its *primordial roots*" - where this demands considering the phenomenon not historiographically, or from within the interests and methods of history as a disjuncted discipline that hazards reifying the past by abstracting it from ecstatically temporal experience (i.e., historiography is practiced according to objective, "public time"),[746] and rather by remodeling history to be concerned with "the specific occurrence of existing Dasein happening in [lived] time." Since both history, which "signifies a [temporal] 'context' of events and 'effects,'"[747] and "world," as relationality with/of an environing society, "belong to the being of Dasein" as care,[748] the existential analytic is as a matter of course concerned with uncovering the "world-historical" character of entities through

---

[743] Ibid: 40.
[744] Adorno 2000b: 141.
[745] Ibid: 146.
[746] "[T]he time which makes itself public in the temporalizing of temporality is what we designate as 'world-time'" (Heidegger 2008a: 414).
[747] Ibid: 430 - my brackets added to indicate Heidegger's remarks on the relation between history and temporality that are included in the following clause of this quote.
[748] Ibid: 429-434.

examinations of historical consciousness, i.e., of *historizing* [*Geschehen*] what "being there," as

a nexus of relational acts, is particularly like in a certain space and time.[749] At the outset, this

involves understanding that interpreting historicality is "a more concrete way of working out of

temporality," with which once we become engaged, we become engaged with Dasein as a being

that is historically mediated by historical objects, situations, and processes; viz., by socially

material phenomena. Engaging with the meaning of Being as such frees the possibility of

fracturing the fantasy of the reified concept and, accordingly, of working toward a holistic

understanding of commodity fetishism (its real, historical structures that contradict the values

and ideas that it socially prescribes; e.g., the idea of agency unencumbered by materiality, and

the value of the protestant work ethic, distort perceptions of real experiences of dehumanization

and exploitation).[750] I will begin the next section by examining in more detail the meaning of

history and historicality for Heidegger, before proposing that authentic historizing, as a way of

coming to terms more deeply with Dasein's essence as Being-for-potentiality and discerning

one's own concrete social possibilities, encourages immanent critique.

Acknowledging this dissertation's foregoing claims that Heidegger realizes Dasein to be

primordially socio-historical and its mode of existential relationality to depend upon the extent to

which it has taken up authentic concern for historical, temporal being, here my central aim is to

show how the existential analytic, *as a concurrently immanent and transcendent form of socio-*

ontological critique, makes provisions for practicing immanent critique as negative dialectics. To

do so, I will first take into account several of Adorno's objections - the majority of which in the

last three chapters have been only implied, briefly mentioned, or addressed toward different ends

---

[749] To be sure, Adorno objects that "historicality immobilizes history in the unhistorical realm"; Heidegger's historical approach cannot lend to genuine immanent critique (Adorno 1990: 129). A large part of my aim in this section is to challenge this objection, at times overtly but more often implicitly in passages directly related to this topic (e.g., passages on mediation, false consciousness, and freedom, agency, and imagination).

[750] Ibid: 434.

- against the idea of authenticity in Heidegger and the idea of freedom in the existential

phenomenological tradition more widely.

Within the framework of Fundamental Ontology, if Dasein is to uncover the "world-

historical" character of another entity, it must admittedly begin by focusing on its *own* facticity:

its "being there" in "its own time."[751] Keeping sight of Chapter Three's having corroborated

interpretations of Dasein as *communal* being, such focus entails that "*Dasein must transcend* the

entities themselves,"[752] and that "the transcendence of Dasein's Being is distinctive in that it

implies the possibility and the necessity of the most radical *individuation*",[753] conditions which,

as I have explained, Adorno translates as Heidegger's establishing the Ontology as an egocentric

project in which the meaning of Dasein is reduced to that of ideal consciousness. As we look to

Jargon of Authenticity, which comprises Adorno's most stringent denunciations of existential

phenomenological and especially Heidegger's language for reinforcing institutionalized,

ideological discourse, we find Adorno to translate this claim further as Heidegger's

"[transforming] a bad empirical reality into transcendence."[754] Heidegger, albeit perhaps

unwittingly, Adorno argues, idealizes the upshot of modal authenticity as appropriating

indifference to one's milieu - as assuming, and valuing, irresponsibility for critiquing in concrete,

publicly relevant terms the historical and material dynamics that manipulate and harden in our

social psyches a propensity to accept exploitation and dehumanization as inexorable norms. This

negligence is conditioned by Heidegger's reifying the subjective and objective spheres in the one

---

[751] However, as authentically resolute, Dasein is engaged in authentic historicizing, and this means that it understands that "its historicizing is a co-historizing"; if not only by virtue of its being Dasein, Dasein, historicizing, is concerned with the historical conditions of the possibilities for social communities (Heidegger 2008a: 436).
[752] Heidegger 2008a: 415.
[753] Ibid: 62.
[754] Adorno 2003: 95.

fell swoop of misinterpreting the significance between immanence and transcendence (a movement of which Adorno deems all existential phenomenology to be more or less guilty).

> Blinded to the moment of synthesis in the substrate, he ignores the fact that the mind - which in Heidegger's adored Eleatic philosophy of Being confessed to identity with Being - is already implied in the meaning of what presents as the pure selfhood it would be confronting. . . This critique tacitly ignores the subjective mind and thus necessarily the material, the factuality which any synthesis acts upon. Instead of recognizing human conditions in the concepts, Heidegger's critique confuses the conditions with the *mundus sensibilis*.[755]

Adorno reasons that Heidegger's reliance on investigating immediate experience - a task still undoubtedly encompassed by the starting point of immanent critique[756] - turns out really to originate in Heidegger's fidelity to evading earnest contemplation on his (and others') own mediating role(s) in the production or sustaining of meanings for objects and, more generally, in modern history's concealing subject-object mediation as real, socio-material processes. First presenting this problem in Chapter One, I explained that, for Adorno, this evasion pertains to Heidegger's mistakenly taking "immanence" to signal Dasein's discovery of the conditions and meanings of an object as it is sensibly experienced in a present moment without also to signal Dasein's considerations of how it might rationally critique that object by constructing constellations that indicate "the contradictory nature of the concept" to which it corresponds.[757] This problem goes hand-in-hand with that of Heidegger's (as Adorno, citing the words of Fritz Heinemann, claims is also Sartre's) presupposing that the so-called "worldly" object is "external to consciousness; i.e. transcendent; the image ceases to be a *content* of consciousness. . . this transcendence henceforth means something like 'being outside.'"[758] "The schools of thought grouped around the concept of existence," Adorno insists, "are incapable of the act of exteriorization for which they yearn in their recourse to the existence of the individual human

---

[755] Adorno 1990: 84.
[756] "[I]mmediacy," Adorno contends in *History and Freedom*, "is itself mediated … but the concept of the immediate must still be retained" (Adorno 2006: 21).
[757] Adorno 2008: 7.
[758] Ibid: 254*n* (Fritz Heinemann, *Existenzphilosophie - lebendig oder tot*, Stuttgart, 1954, p. 116f.)

being as against the transcendental subject."[759] Heidegger's misinterpretion of the significance of

attending to immanence naturally guides him to misinterpret the significance of transcendence,

which, as a critical act whereby the subject would be able to grant conceptuality its mediating

role, would gesture her equally and at the same time toward granting the mediating role of

material objectivity. This culminates in what Adorno claims is Heidegger's unyielding

distinction between immanence and transcendence, where Heidegger understands the latter in

terms not of gathering "outside knowledge," or knowledge cultivated by constellation-making

that exceeds the immanent, subjective thinking of a given moment, but of attempting to outstrip

the very finiteness of the concept itself.[760] Heidegger describes authentic Dasein to transcend in a

way that fictionalizes and refuses the immutable reality of the limit-concept. Even from within

its experienced "exteriority," Dasein continues to abide the priority of the (absolute) concept, "as

though critical thought had no objective foundation but was a subjective deviation."[761] This

aspect of his polemic against Heidegger helps Adorno to infer that there is a "transcendental

attack on culture." Typically construing the term "culture" to signify the industrialization of life

as a whole (as a way of being),[762] Adorno also means it here as interest in cultural criticism - in

garnering "insight into the negativity of culture."[763] Transcendental forms of critique "attack"

culture by failing to grapple with what is philosophy's overarching problem of deciphering, via

negative dialectical thinking itself, the negative dialectics at play in the continuation of "the

culture industry."[764] (That said, Adorno, as we know, censures existential phenomenology more

---

[759] Ibid: 174.
[760] See, for example, Adorno 1990: 182.
[761] Adorno 2003: 2.
[762] Here I very briefly allude to one of the concluding passages of this dissertation, in which I will propose more directly that, ultimately, Adorno is just as much interested in the problem of existential modality as he is in the problem of social critique.
[763] Adorno 2000b: 208.
[764] Adorno explains the problem further: "The blanket rejection of culture becomes a pretext for promoting what is crudest, 'healthiest,' even repressive; above all, the perennial conflict between individual and society, both drawn in

widely on the still more fundamental grounds that it ignores "facticity" simpliciter. His position

is shaped in large part by his reading of Sartre, whose description of freedom as existing in "the

nihilation of facticity"[765] and whose proclamation that "[o]ne can choose anything" Adorno

seems to hyperbolize - he inaccurately interprets "nihilation of facticity" as a willing

renunciation of social embodiment that results in categorical, moral nihilism - and to conflate

this interpretation with the meaning of "nihilation" - which is not unbounded consciousness, but

hermeneutic negation - for Heidegger. While I will continue to flesh out these meanings as they

pertain to the issues of objectivity and mediation in Heidegger, toward the end of this section,

and then more extensively in section four, I will consider them against a more focused question

of morality in existential phenomenology.)

In his criticism of authenticity, Adorno seems to confuse the terms "immanence" and

"immediacy" as they are taken up by Heidegger. If for Adorno the term "immanence" indicates

the subject's remaining within the conceptual framework of the theory, entity, or society that is

under consideration, where she remains not in order to irrationally reinforce the meanings of

what she finds to be immediately given, but to critically detect how immediately given meanings

stand in relations of contradiction with the meanings of things as they are understood from

within a progressively "objective" or "transcendent" frame of reference, then (and for now I put

the personal and political overtones of Adorno's criticisms to one side) I find it difficult to grasp

why he deems Heidegger's existential analytic to conflict so exceedingly with the project of

immanent, negative, social criticism. This difficulty is aided by two more of Adorno's objections

against the idea of authenticity, however tightly related they all still may be. A thick thread

---

like manner, which is obstinately resolved in favour of society according to the criteria of the administrators who
have appropriated it. From there is only a step to the official reinstatement of culture" (ibid).
[765] Sartre 1992: 573.

holding his polemic together is the objection that authentic Dasein not only fails to awaken itself

from but reinforces false consciousness. Where consciousness is false, there is an

> objective contradiction between the experience which consciousness has of itself and its
> relation to totality. The individual feels free in so far as he has opposed himself to society and can
> do something - through incomparably less than he believes - against society and other
> individuals.[766]

Guilty of being in this state himself, Heidegger, Adorno argues, encourages others to strive for it

as they strive to embody the spurious and dangerous idea of authentic Being. Impervious to

subject-object mediation and drawn (unknowingly, I read Adorno to say) out of need for

"spiritual security"[767] against the tenuousness of a renewed state of disarray in disciplinary

philosophy and of anxieties endemic to late capitalist culture (and hence not just to existential

abandonment),[768] Heidegger's "doctrine of Being turns ideological as it imperceptibly

spiritualizes the materialist moment in thought by transposing it into pure functionality beyond

all entity—as it removes by magic what critique of a false consciousness resides in the

materialist concept of Being."[769] Heidegger misplaces the source of anxiety; the latter should not

be thought of primarily as an existential, for feelings of "homelessness" are socially relative and,

today, they are provoked specifically by contradictions between objective ideals of freedom and

the real social orders that constrain human agency. Stephen Hemling crisply summarizes the

issue as "[Adorno's conceding] that the Spirit in our age has a legitimate 'ontological need,' to

which Heidegger offers false consolation," whereas "Adorno's 'immanent critique' means to

interpret the genuine (symptomatic) need or problem as well as to expose the ideological

mystification of the proposed 'imaginary solution.'"[770] Adorno's polemic, as immanent critique,

---

[766] Adorno 1990: 261.

[767] A variant on theological models, the issue becomes more pronounced when interpreting it retroactively via readings of the later Heidegger's ontotheological work.

[768] For example, see Adorno 1984: 15; Adorno 2003: 27.

[769] Ibid: 200.

[770] Helmling 2011: 118 - my brackets.

proceeds by interpreting these contradictions, attempting to critique within the conceptual and valuative framework of Fundamental Ontology in itself. Through it, he deems Heidegger to be negligent of the social conditions that agitate such psychical unease - and which, accordingly, create the need for devising a "god-like" idea of Being - as well as of the (alleged) truth that Heidegger's idea of Being, an understanding of which cannot incorporate an understanding of these conditions, exacerbates one of the central problems it seeks, however obliquely, to address; namely, the reification of what is at once historical and projective consciousness.[771]

Unaware of having positioned Being in a transcendent, (here meaning) mystical realm to "[calm] the constantly festering suspicion of uprootedness,"[772] Heidegger is as much naïve for developing a theory of freedom that makes invisible the conditions of suffering, and which "trains the public" to believe that suffering is to be accepted, "not to be changed," Adorno contends.[773] "[I]mmediacy comes too quickly to terms with suffering," he writes in *Minima Moralia*, alluding to uncritical perception as a social norm and with "philosophies of immanence" as his target.[774] This issue of Heidegger's promoting, by way of denying, suffering, especially forms of suffering that can be identified as structured by institutionalized identity

---

[771] To remind, I agree with Adorno's interpretation of Heidegger's attempt to "overcome" metaphysics as an attempt to expose and correct in the philosophical canon the deep-seated, subliminal tendency to reify its objects of inquiry before inquiry begins. However, I interpret this more specifically as Heidegger's (at least implicitly) understanding the problem of Being's forgottenness as co-determined by the problem of reification more widely, viz., of a historical forgetfulness that concepts are non-identical to objects or "objective" social experience. Adorno appears most often to identify the target of Heidegger's critique just as the realm of disciplinary philosophy, not society at large (in very rare moments, he directly acknowledges Heidegger's intent as to exegetically disclose concept-object contradictions, and Heidegger's thinking as to stretch along the periphery of dialectics). As I intimated in Chapters One and Two and specifically addressed in Chapter Three, although the earlier Heidegger does not explicitly state that his hermeneutic ontology is directed toward social and societal concerns, as we see throughout *Being and Time* and in several of his contemporaneous essays, the latter are tacitly presupposed by concerns of the ontological; hence Heidegger's foregrounding analyses of the They, equipmentality, and mundane being-with as largely defined by its instrumental character. Moreover, and as I will continue to suggest, even though Heidegger, while showing concern for the social/societal, does not prioritize more concrete concerns that would make immanent social critique, via the analytic, most successful (i.e., concerns for the precise historical and material conditions of the They), this fact does not conflict with my claim that Heidegger's analytic can be as much a heuristic for social critique as it is for a (what is by comparison) more abstract critique of the ontological.
[772] Adorno 2003: 13.
[773] Ibid: 38-39.
[774] Adorno 2005: 74.

thinking (if not all forms can be), is mutually informed by what I have explained in Chapter

Three is Adorno's further contending that Heidegger reifies today's public character of

instrumentality; that "Heidegger's sketch of the They comes closest to what it is, the exchange

relationship, when he is treating averageness."[775]

Adorno's critique of freedom in Heidegger, leveled equally as it is among considerations

for the epistemic, material, and ethical, still and in fact for that reason should always be traced

back to his primary objection against an absence of attention to subject-object mediation that is

culpable for the Ontology's successive emulation of false social consciousness (for the presence

of such attention subsequently determines whether questions of knowledge, society, and morality

are approached in the right, negative dialectical way).[776] The "jargon" of authenticity breaks off

the "dialectic between word and thing,"[777] rendering it not just intellectually incoherent, but

responsible for promoting the subject's being robbed and robbing itself of social power; it is a

masked glorification of nihilism. "This powerlessness and nothingness of man is coming close to

its realization in present society," Adorno laments. "Such a historical state of affairs is then

transposed [by Heidegger] into the pure essence of Man," aiding to dispossess one of what little

agency one may actually have when disillusioned of the feined possibility of achieving

unconditional, self-directed freedom.[778]

As immanent critique, Adorno's opposition to the idea of authenticity is then additionally

comprised of evaluating the moral principles that Fundamental Ontology presupposes, which,

insofar as authenticity is determined by experiences of anxiety over being-towards-death, the

---

[775] Adorno 2003: 84.
[776] In *Minima Moralia's Dedication*, Adorno laments the state of philosophy more widely, as it waits in the wake of Kant and Hegel, passing over itself in its foremost importance - "the teaching of the good life" that requires truth to violence, to material mediation, to "the renunciation of explicit theoretical cohesion" - and critical theory too, he confesses, withdraws "part of the social force of liberation. . . to the individual sphere" (Adorno 2005: 15-18).
[777] Adorno 2003: 8.
[778] Ibid: 52 - my brackets.

chief among must be "nothing." In *Being and Time*, "nothing is related to value," Tom

Rockmore emphasizes, "as values that can be realized in authentic comportment, that can fail to

be realized in inauthenticity, and that can be definitively lost in death."[779] There Rockmore

insinuates by his own lights one of Adorno's sub-objections that serves as a significant factor in

the critique of authenticity; i.e., that Heidegger reifies the anxiety he describes to be for modal

authenticity a primary condition. Adorno writes:

> Angst, busily distinguished from innerworldly, empirical fear, need by no means be an existential
> value. Since it is historical, it appears in fact that those who are yoked into a society which is
> societalized, but contradictory to the deepest core, constantly feel threatened by what sustains
> them.[780]

What Heidegger identifies as sheer existential anxiety, which he then turns into an ahistorical,

permanent phenomenon, Adorno claims, must be interpreted instead as, or (I hope Adorno would

agree) as at least confounded with, a historically contingent experience of anxiety over being

socially alienated, expendable, or at constant risk of (whether metaphorical or literal)

"annihilation." Identifying Being with death, and exalting anxiety as the basis of freedom,

Heidegger actually exalts the very conditions of unfreedom, Adorno holds. We thus see from yet

another angle how Adorno finds his conclusion that Heidegger expresses and promotes false

social consciousness.[781] Heidegger positions death, anxiety's mainspring, as something

"artificially beyond the existent," which, as "absolutely alien to the subject," becomes "the

model of all reification."[782] Where anxiety and death are made into ideal concepts, so too is

freedom, and their relation becomes one of positive identity. For, reification, as it hinges on

identity thinking, is a way of psychologically escaping the very natural apprehension about

---

[779] Rockmore 1997: 164.
[780] Adorno 2003: 27.
[781] "It is. . . untrue, that, through Heidegger's admonitions about 'the They,' that social state of affairs whose
symptoms he reprimands grows betters" (ibid: 90).
[782] Ibid: 125.

losing the concept's control over its object; "[h]umans believe themselves free of fear when there is no longer anything unknown."[783] Ultimately driving Dasein's false belief that it is authentically free is its imagining itself to be cured of fear of death and all else which, inevitably, cannot be unconditionally known.

Universalizing anxiety over death as the cause of the need for freedom (as modal authenticity), Heidegger then responds to it by pre-establishing a universal line of action for attaining freedom itself, so Adorno argues.[784] "The jargon [of authenticity] supplies patterns for being human," patterns which demand that Dasein relate positively, irrationally, to its own exploited state.[785] Fixated on dwelling exclusively within what it takes to be its "existentially" anxious moods (wherein anxiety is essentially object-less), authentically resolute Dasein remains oblivious to its need for engaging in immanent critique, presuming that gaining mastery over anxiety, and therefore over death, is the meaning, or the end, of freedom. This results in Heidegger's failure to designate alienation as a social relation, "even if it is the relationship to [actual] death."[786]Authentically anxious Dasein, "[acknowledging] a 'higher' certainty than one which is only empirical," is false consciousness of death; it turns lived experience toward death into a purely positive means of insubstantial forms of critique and freedom.[787]

In what I suggest is but only ostensible contrast, Adorno (to no surprise) defines freedom in negative terms: "Freedom can be defined in negation only, corresponding to the concrete form of a specific unfreedom. Positively it becomes an 'as-if.'"[788] Non-existent "in a succinct form," it is an act of "escaping from the spell or working our way out of the spell" of knowledge systems

---

[783] Horkheimer and Adorno 2007: 11.
[784] Adorno 2003: 125.
[785] Ibid: 12 - my brackets.
[786] Ibid: 126 - my brackets to clarify that, here, Adorno is contrasting his use of the term "death" with that of Heidegger's.
[787] Ibid: 128.
[788] Ibid: 231 - my brackets.

that otherwise posit freedom as a "positive determination" achieved once and for all by adhering to categorical social maxims and doctrinaire philosophy.[789] "The subject would be liberated," he clarifies, "only as an I reconciled with the not-I, and thus it would be also *above* freedom insofar as freedom is leagued with its counterpart, repression."[790] Effectively, and here we can appreciate some resonance of Adorno with Sartre, "freedom is something that has to be created or creates itself," and this is both because and despite the fact that it "is something that cannot be found in the realm of factual reality."[791] Putting this together, for Adorno the name "freedom" would have no logical function in a world where non-identity is the norm, for what he appeals subjects to become free *from* - institutional domination and false consciousness - would no longer be the condition that specifies freedom's need. All the same, the development of individual agency, or the possibility of social liberation, in the very real context of late capitalist society, requires *moments of transcendence* in efforts of immanent critique. "The question of freedom does not call for a Yes or No," he contends; "it calls for theory to rise above the individuality that exists as well as above the society that exists."[792] It is striking how deeply his words here, describing the potential provision of freedom as transcendence, echo those that he likewise relies on to object to the idea of transcendence and freedom in Heidegger. For both thinkers, efforting towards freedom is neither an utterly positive nor utterly negative act. Rather, and this I will unpack in the next two sections, freedom, as an act of immanent transcendence, requires simultaneous criticism and creation. The subject must condemn or negate her own identity by critiquing the "totality" and her affectivity by it (issuing her "second nature"), while also (re)cultivating her affectivity by the non-identical, the innate root of her agency.

---

[789] Adorno 1990: 283.
[790] Ibid: 283 - my italics.
[791] Adorno 2006: 177.
[792] Adorno 1990: 283.

Building on this section, the central claims to be addressed in more detail in the subsequent section are that (1) Heidegger misconstrues the meanings of and relations between immanence and transcendence as they pertain to philosophical critique, a difficulty that demonstrates (2) his broader negligence of socio-historical and material mediation. These problems contribute to and are contributed by 3) Heidegger's universalizing and idealizing experiences of anxiety and anticipating death, which culminates in Adorno's conclusion that 4) the concept of modal authenticity is self-contradictory as it contradicts the possibility of freedom or agency, so long as agency is taken not as a mere notion, but would palpably manifest as resistance to identity thinking and from suffering of the false consciousness that a) the interests of bureaucratic institutions and individual agents are mutually compatible and b) as a perceived "totality," socio-institutional domination is an incontrovertible reality. In the final section, I will return to the issues of anxiety and death as I consider the significance of authentic resoluteness (as authentic being-toward-death) for cultivating relations with the world that are structured by care.

III. Disillusionment and agency: authentic historizing as a structure of immanent critique

Towards challenging Adorno's claim that authenticity is a variation on metaphysical theories of a voluntaristic will, I have considered his grievance against Heidegger's notion of authentic freedom in a number of ways. For the most part, however, I have left to one side more specific considerations of how socio-historical and material mediation figures into that notion and the existential analytic that encourages it, focusing instead on the significance of temporality in especially Heidegger's, but also Adorno's, idea of conceptual negativity or negative identity as a basic structure of experience. Attending to Adorno's own (albeit often implicit) understanding of temporality, as it is centralized in his understanding of the meaning of resisting identity thinking and reification via immanent critique,[793] has remained a main path for analyzing his objection that Fundamental Ontology is an expression of identity thinking, as well as for exploring more greatly what commonalities existential phenomenology and first generation critical theory might hold in regard to how meaning is produced and agency engendered. To recall, it is recovering the priority of potentiality over actuality that is fundamentally responsible

---

[793] Adorno's remarks on the significance of temporality are comparatively sparse in those of his works concerned explicitly with interconnections among knowledge, ethics, and society. Among these works, the tenth *History and Freedom* lecture is very useful for understanding his thinking about time and its relation to non-identity. This relation is centralized, however, in areas of Adorno's aesthetics, with his work on music in particular, such as *In Search of Wagner*. Echoing his commitment in *Negative Dialectics* to the idea that moments of non-identity subvert institutionally arranged thinking, there he writes: "Every repetition of gestures evades the necessity to create musical time; they merely order themselves, as it were, in time and detach themselves from the temporal continuum that they seemingly constituted" (Adorno 1981: 27). In that passage, Adorno points to a positive correlation between how temporality is understood and experienced, and what individuals pursue and how they create. Robert Witkin helps to get to the core of Adorno's thinking on the significance of temporality in music, taking care to explain that Adorno regards this significance as a model example for relations between experiences of time, society, and oneself as an individual agency. Temporality "is inseparable from [Adorno's] notion of what is 'social' and what is 'creative'"; a composition is an interdependent whole, a developing process, a becoming," he writes after interpreting "this temporal unfolding in music also [to be] intrinsic to [Adorno's] view of sociality and of the individuation that it constructs" (Witkin 1998: 182, 83 - my brackets). More precisely, Witkin contends, "[i]n self-self relations there is nothing to develop from or to develop towards. It is only in self-other relations that the subject can undergo real change, and such change is the prerequisite for the construction of temporality in Adorno's analysis" (ibid: 83).
In this section, I will further consider Adorno's understanding of the relation between temporality, identity, society, critique, as well as history.

for the possibility of breaking through the false appearance of "totalized" identity thinking or, for Heidegger, of breaking through the "illusion" of the They.[794] For both Adorno and Heidegger, it is not simply coming to be disillusioned with the governing nature of social systems, but deeper recognition of the problem of communally "forgetting" that totalities, as they appear, contradict the reality of their own structures and purported principles, which co-conditions the adoption of norms of thought and action that are rooted in concern for the priority and value of potentiality. Embracing and embodying this concern is the essential condition of understanding the nature of Being as constituted by non-being, or of experience and knowledge as constituted by non-identity. In turn, this understanding is the condition of the possibility for attaining a robust sense of agency, one that is genuinely capable of detecting distinctions and contradictions between what or how a thing really "is" in light of critical, socio-historical contextualization and how it presents itself to unreflective, immediate consciousness. As I have indicated throughout this dissertation, each Adorno's and Heidegger's ultimate vision is the normalization of a form of rational consciousness that is negatively critical *within* its immediacy; a form for which, by habit, experience unfolds as negative, interpretative moments of subject-object interaction, and, within which the subject always harbors tacit knowledge that experiencing the world in this way is primordial to being human.[795] It is a form of consciousness through which one becomes empowered to play with the limits of one's agency by practicing immanent critique.

---

[794] Also to recall, this claim, and the implications that I continue to articulate for it, were initially motivated by Iain MacDonald's interpretation of Adorno and Heidegger as each "[attempting] to defend a version of absolute potentiality as available within our own, human experience of what is" MacDonald 2011: 3.

[795] To express non-identity thinking as being "primordial to the human condition," as I have done here, is to gesture that, for Adorno, non-identity is a mode of thinking to which one would return as opposed to a mode which one would, strictly speaking, discover. It is a contentious topic as to whether Adorno considers non-identity thinking to be an socio-ontological structure of human experience, one which I already have indicated in Chapter Two. There, I tentatively answered this question in the affirmative. While in Adorno I still find far more reasons than not to believe that this is his position, I am not entirely committed to the interpretation. Whichever way Adorno truly leans, the issue does not directly impact my thesis.

One of two main problems left to be addressed, however, is whether immanent critique is practicable in Heidegger's universe given Adorno's objection that negative moments of mediation that take shape in the particularity and primacy of the object are (allegedly) unaccounted for within it. The essence of this problem for Adorno lies in how Heidegger depicts Dasein's "historicality" and acts of "authentic historizing," including what he determines are the kinds of possibilities that can ensue from the latter. To help frame an account of what history, historicality, and historizing mean for Heidegger, and of also what I find are compelling reasons to dispute this important feature of Adorno's critique, I will first further consider Adorno's objection to (his interpretation of) the meanings of transcendence and immanence in Fundamental Ontology.

I explained in the previous section that this objection, while more generally informing Adorno's conclusion that Fundamental Ontology is idealism, also serves particularly to highlight the alleged inadequacy of Heidegger's notion of historizing for reckoning with the primary conditions of immanent critique. Speaking to it, then, serves as an entryway into analyzing this second problem. The particular questions continuing to motivate both tasks are: How is authentic freedom animated specifically by Dasein's analyses of "its own mind's involvement" in historical and material mediation? And how, precisely, is the existential analytic, as a heuristic for modal authenticity, also and for that reason a heuristic for immanent critique, toward de-reifying subject-object relations within mundane experience?

Let us interpret Heidegger's aforementioned remark that "*Dasein must transcend* the entities themselves." Continuing, he clarifies that, through existential analysis, "[t]ranscendence does not consist in Objectifying, but is presupposed by it."[796] In that passage, Heidegger not only

---

[796] Heidegger 2008a: 415.

signals a shared conditionality of transcendence and objectification (an idea to which I will return in a moment), but he softly alludes to the idea that modal authenticity is ultimately shaped in response to Dasein's resoluteness for discerning the "total," reifying character of its society and how that character manifests itself in Dasein's particular ways of relating to entities. When authentically resolute, Dasein, responding to its incipient "sight" for reification, *attempts to disengage, for a moment, from its mundane relationality*, and this is possible first and foremost because its existence is grounded in ecstatic temporality, the most essential condition of potentiality-for-Being and, similarly, of non-identity thinking. "[T]his transcendence in turn provides the support for concernful Being alongside entities within-the-world, whether this Being is theoretical or practical"; it livens Dasein's care for critically examining its beliefs and actions, especially in relation to the They.[797] When care for such examinations is integrated into its routinized life, Dasein meets one of two basic conditions for *being as* authentic care.[798]

Receptive to its primordially lived temporality, or its temporality that transcends "public time," Dasein is brought nearer, not farther, from immanently critical considerations of socio-historical and material dynamics, considerations that have very much to do with its "very own mind's involvement" within those dynamics. They have to do, for example, with how Dasein's relations with entities assist in sustaining commodity fetishism, a kind of concern that Heidegger insinuates in his descriptions of the adaptability of Dasein's mode of relating to things that it otherwise and ordinarily perceives to be meaningful as merely equipment. They have to do, as MacDonald mentions, with "things [showing] themselves to be the things they are when we concern ourselves with what they might be beyond pre-existing notions, known effects and

---

[797] Ibid - my italics for emphasis.
[798] In section four, I will address the second condition, namely, that Dasein employs its critical abilities toward identifying and nurturing ways of relating empathically with others in their particularities.

instrumental utility."[799] Authentic experiences of time are the fundamental provisions for

Dasein's ability and inclination to reveal reciprocal connections between its ordinary mode of

relationality as equipmentality and the habits of discourse and praxis that typify the publicness of

its "today." In *Ontology - Hermeneutics of Facticity*, where Heidegger also gives the idea of the

They in relatively more concrete terms (of the way I am interpreting it here), he describes how

these sorts of revelations can come to occur:

> The initial public givens of being-interpreted which are closest to us in the today will be seized
> upon in such a manner that by stepping back from this starting point and interpretively
> explicating it a characteristic of the being of facticity is able to come into our grasp. Having been
> grasped in this manner, this characteristic of being then needs to be developed into a concept, i.e.,
> made transparent as an existential, so that a preliminary ontological access to facticity can thereby
> be worked out."[800]

As hermeneutic critique, ontological or, especially given the predominance of his concern with

the They and equipmentality in *Being and Time*, what I prefer to put for Heidegger as socio-

ontological critique consists of sustained interchanges between assuming an immediate (ontic or

pre-predicative) and transcendent (ontological or thematic) standpoint toward facticity (one's

concretely real experience of being in the social, material world).[801] I explained a simpler version

of this hermeneutic in Chapter Two, and I return to it, this time, specifically to reason that, so

long as Adorno's critique of authenticity is grounded foremost in how he interprets Heidegger's

onto-phenomenology to be unconcerned with the "what" and the "how" of meaning formation

from a standpoint that transcends immediacy (in the right way, as conceptual or even practical

bodily negation), then the succeeding verdict of that critique - i.e., that existential analysis

counteracts social criticism and the notion of modal authenticity inevitably mirrors and

---

[799] MacDonald 2011: 22-23 - my brackets.

[800] Heidegger 1999: 28.

[801] Moreover, "[a] modification of our understanding of Being does not seem to be necessarily constitutive for the genesis of the theoretical attitude 'towards Things,'" Heidegger explains. "The ready-to-hand," for example, "can become the 'Object' of a science [i.e., existential analysis] without having to lose its character as equipment. (Heidegger 2008a: 413 - my brackets).

reinforces false consciousness - seems quite indefensible. Once the authentic critic has made the choice to bring into focus how her surrounding world appears immediately in relation to her mundane patterns of projection, she then transcends a particular relation - not, as Adorno reads it, relationality and thus societality as a whole - "primarily" to determine what that relation tells about the meaning of Dasein, and "secondarily" to compare what it tells about the meaning of another entity as it appears within, versus when it is withdrawn from, its everyday context. For, that "which shows itself only '*in disguise*,' is not just this entity or that, but rather the *Being*," or what is itself both the necessary and contingent, driving character "of entities."[802] And, the character of entities is the character of Dasein, and the character of Dasein is the character of a social world.[803]

The character of "today's" social world, of course, is represented by the structure of commodity exchange. In general, to analyze that character in a way that integrates Adorno's and Heidegger's approaches is to disclose the appearing "totality" of commodified culture as it subsists on its masking the fact that it coerces self-moderation of the range of individual possibilities for knowledge and projection, and on its falsely appearing as a historically permanent structure of existence per se. What can still be more psychically violent than being "thrown" into situations of exploitation and alienation is being "handed down" possibilities that are limited by false consciousness. If it is right that the primordial meaning of Being, as authentic temporality, projection, and care, is ultimately non-identity, then working one's way out of false consciousness demands critical, existential analysis of the contradictions between that meaning and how one, as a person living within late capitalist society, understands oneself, others, and the forces that give this society its instrumental character. For Heidegger, such analysis involves

---

[802] Heidegger 2008a: 59.
[803] To be perfectly sure, this "'world' belongs to everyday trade and traffic as the soil from which they grow and the arena where they are displayed" (Ibid: 439).

distinguishing a particular object, where is required this temporary transcendence of immediacy, to then examine the meaning of that object from within the everyday environment in which it is encountered; i.e., to examine it in light of the very same concepts and standards that characterize that environment (where this is, generally speaking, what is "immanent" about immanent critique). When Being, and therefore any particular object, is "covered up so extensively that it becomes *forgotten* and no question arises about it or about its meaning," that object "demands that it become a phenomenon," and it "demands this in a distinctive sense and in terms of its ownmost content as a thing."[804] The job of the phenomenologist is to grasp that object thematically, toward grasping Being, in its both necessary and contingent character, as a whole. So long as Being is the "totality" of "what is" and objects are the "particularities" that mutually shape its meaning, it seems that what Heidegger is describing is also the job of the Adornian social critic. We would simply need to deal explicitly with more socially concrete content for this form of phenomenological consideration in order to do immanent critique.

We would also, of course, need to accept that the particularity and primacy of the object are recognized and valued in Heidegger's existential analytic and by modally authentic Dasein. Although I have suggested a few ways in which to understand why modal authenticity is obliged by recognizing and valuing the particularity and primacy of the object, in order to tighten this understanding it is useful, here, to bring to mind two of Adorno's stipulations in this regard. First, heeding the particularity of the object "depends on the tempo, the patience and perseverance of lingering with [it]."[805] There Adorno signals the significance of living as or through a sense of temporality that contradicts the homogeneous time of instrumental reason. This sense entails in the subject a certain passive sensibility that in turn depends on

---

[804] Ibid: 59.
[805] Adorno 2005: 77.

acknowledging the limit concept. When the subject transcends time as the clock of commodified

labor - which we can put similarly with Heidegger as "publicly dated" time, or time that is lived

and understood for the most part in relation to a "for-the-sake-of-which" - the subject transcends

positive identity.[806] Through this, she enables herself "to make progressive qualitative

distinctions between things which in themselves are indirect," or to attend to things in their

moment-to-moment particularities, and to construct constellations among their meanings, toward

de-reifying them and the totalities they constitute.[807] This ability is co-conditioned by the

subject's self-nurturing a passive, which by Adorno's explication is the opposite of an impassive,

form of experience that is specified by the subject's willingness to relinquish desire for

conceptual control - a criterion for immanent critique. Experiencing moments of de-reified time

as she "lets-herself-be-encountered-*by*" the world, the subject grants priority to the object.[808]

Adorno's second stipulation is that, to experience the object as taking priority in the subject-

object relation is basically to experience it as repelling the concept's dominion and as responsible

for giving to relations their non-conceptual qualities. Within such experience, moreover, the

subject comes to understand herself as an object, not an object as a reified thing, but as an entity

that, like all other entities, must be recognized in her particularity and in the particular ways she

participates in knowledge production. For, owed to this experience is the subject's discerning

chances to realize a stronger sense of subjectivity - to realize herself, though not as an

autonomous agent, as an agent who, by distinguishing her individual intuitions, desires,

---

[806] Heidegger 2008a: 466-467. This time "has by its very nature the character of 'the time for something' or 'the wrong time for something," Heidegger continues.

[807] Adorno 2005: 184.

[808] Although Adorno certainly rejects Hegel's idealizing "totality" as society's "collapse" with the "unitary will" of rational consciousness (Hegel 1977: 567), as still remaining within the Hegelian tradition, I would imagine that he was influenced by Hegel's understanding "time" to be pierced through with conceptual alterity, an understanding which Hegel associates with "freedom": "Only the totality of Spirit is in Time, and the 'shapes', which are 'shapes' of the totality of Spirit, display themselves in a temporal succession; for only the whole has true actuality and therefore the form of pure freedom in face of an 'other', a form which expresses itself as Time" (ibid: 413).

capabilities, and needs (and those of whom she cares for), and putting her potential for critique into practice, is at least "free" to negate instrumental reason and instances of socio-institutional domination.[809]

The term "free" deserves quotations in these contexts because, as I have intimated, Adorno is confident that the idea of freedom cannot be realized today. After Auschwitz, the idea of freedom must more than ever not be thought of "as something purely individual." Instead, it "remains imperfect and incomplete ... as long as and to the extent that it presupposes the unfreedom of other human beings" ("No one is free until we are all free," Martin Luther King Jr. professed).[810] Since the commodity structure defines the public character of today's society and, consequently, since exploitation and atomization prevail as social norms, freedom "cannot be found in the realm of factual reality."[811] As an idea, however, freedom must not be abandoned of hope, not only because "without [it] we cannot conceive of a situation in which human beings can live together … in peace,"[812] but because the ability to speak meaningfully about freedom already points to there being "concrete possibilities" for its realization.[813] I have noted that, for Adorno, freedom today can only be measured in negative terms; that efforts toward it are only relevant when their aim is to "break the spell" of ideological thinking. This is Adorno's first condition for understanding the true meaning of freedom. A second and very related condition, to which Adorno explicitly speaks far less often, is that "[f]reedom is something that has to be created or that creates itself."[814] Partly because capitalist institutions will not give freedom to individuals voluntarily, freedom can only be created because, even more importantly, freedom is

---

[809] "By the primacy of the object is meant that the subject, for its part an object in a qualitatively different sense, in a sense more radical than the object, which is not known otherwise than through consciousness, is as an object also a subject" (Adorno 2000b: 142).
[810] Adorno 2006: 178.
[811] Ibid: 177.
[812] Ibid.
[813] Ibid: 181.
[814] Ibid: 177.

an act, not a substance. Freedom originates, at least for today, in acts of determinate negation, and such acts can only occur for individuals who, under circumstances of acknowledging non-identity and its practical implications, "choose to make the choice" (to borrow Heidegger's words) of pursuing immanent critique, including and perhaps especially critique that is targeted toward ideologies of freedom themselves, whether those ideologies are to be found in disciplinary philosophy (as is, for Adorno, the case with Heidegger and company) or the broader socio-institutional sphere.[815]

> [I]f we are to update the concept [of freedom], the biggest mistake we could possibly make would be to issue appeals to freedom, to popularize the idea of freedom as a slogan or to appeal to people's autonomy. The better approach would be to take the question of what has become of freedom and what threatens to become of it in the future and to treat such questions as the precondition of any serious reflection on freedom - whereas every other attitude, such as taking freedom as a given, is to reduce it to the level of a cliche.[816]

The path toward realizing even the possibility of freedom, Adorno contends, is that of critiquing ideologies of freedom as they are historically constituted, and doing so "within the scope of historical consciousness," to reveal contradictions between what freedom has idealistically been purported to mean and what it actually means (how its possibilities and purported realizations appear) within lived, modern reality.[817] If immanent critique in general demands recognition of the particularity and priority of the object, then Heidegger's notion of historizing, as I see it, is a proficient tool with which we can work toward realizing freedom in Adorno's (fairly loose) sense of it as identity negation in *action*. (After all, authenticity, as a modality, too is manner of acting, not an unmitigated ideal or choice. This is reflected in Heidegger's preferring to refer to modally authentic Dasein as "authentically resolute Dasein" whenever possible, as this term resonates with the notion of authenticity as a movement of self-knowledge punctuated by non-

---

[815] Heidegger 2008a: 313.
[816] Adorno 2006: 201.
[817] Ibid.

being.) The Adornian subject's heeding the particularity and priority of the object is indicated by authentic acts of transcendence, through which the subject deconstructs its ordinary interpretations of being-in while it is modally inauthentic, and where these inauthentic interpretations are distinguished by identity thinking. For both thinkers, freedom is transcendence as an act of institutional transgression.

Adorno advises that "[t]he concrete possibilities of making freedom a reality are to be sought … in the way in which we define the locus of freedom, namely, in the forces of," rather than in merely "the relations of," production.[818] Therefore, immanent critique aims its examinations more on the historical means by which commodification and reification have become a society's basic structure (the They), and less on exchange-based relationships.[819] Heidegger's notion of historizing, I suggest, indicates the readiness of existential analyses for critiquing ideological thinking generally and the exchange structure specifically. Since these acts of critique lie at the heart of Adorno's meaning of freedom, acts of historizing can themselves be supportive of goals to realize freedom in its sense as a lived, practical endeavor in thinking non-identically, rather than as an absolute, ideal "thing" that can belong only to concepts of identity. Authentically historizing the historical "fates" of institutions and other phenomena characterized by equipmental relationality, Dasein engages in a form of onto-existential critique that encourages negative dialectical thinking, and it prepares itself for immanent critique. And, so long as historizing is a condition of the possibility for modal authenticity, and modal authenticity

---

[818] Ibid: 182.
[819] While Adorno, at least in the passages I cite above, does not reason much further for why, within critique, we should prioritize analyses of the forces of production, one main reason, I imagine, is that focusing on the relations of production bears greater risk of reverting to and reinforcing ideological thinking. More precisely, it may be connected to his call for transcending "totalities," where what would be transcended here is the "total" sum of exchanged-based relationships.

is co-conditional with non-identity thinking, it is an effective entryway into attempting to achieve

Adorno's understanding of freedom.

This is apparent, first, in how Heidegger, drawing heavily on Dilthey,[820] interprets the

concept of history, especially as we think of this in light of Adorno's concern for recognizing the

object's particularity and priority in knowledge mediation. For Heidegger, history is not a project

of chronicling a linear series of empirical facts, but instead "pertain[s] to the way subject and

Object are 'linked together,'" in the "happening" of time.[821] From the standpoint of ontological

hermeneutics, to be concerned with history is to be concerned with the connectedness of

(ecstatically lived) time and, for that reason, with the unity of Dasein's understanding of

Being.[822] This latter concern involves concern for critiquing the assumption that the meanings of

entities are shaped in isolation of historically subjective and societal influence. For, again,

questions of Dasein's experience of time, and questions of meaning (how meaning appears, how

it is formed), must always coincide with one another, just as are the questions of Being per se

and of the being of entities. Therefore, to historize existence, in relation to matters of the

"connectedness" of existence throughout time, is primarily to investigate Dasein's "determining

character" of historicality, or *how* Dasein has been-in-the-world (how it has been particularly

thrown, and what possibilities have been disclosed to it) in the history of its being, and to do so

(to repeat Adorno's words) from "within the scope of historical consciousness."[823] After all, "the

thinking that thinks into the truth of Being is, as thinking, historical. There is not a 'systematic'

---

[820] Heidegger gives his reception of Dilthey in section 77 of *Being and Time*. As Charles Bambach summarizes, "Heidegger found in Dilthey a way of historicizing the lifeless, worldless sphere of transcendental subjectivity and making historicity itself the transcendental condition for the possibility of human understanding" (Bambach 1995: 233).

[821] Heidegger 2008a: 440; 30 *fn* 1. Heidegger designates this ordinary conception of history as "Historie," and this robust sense of it, as a hermeneutic event, he designates as "Geschichte."

[822] This true sense of history derives from the movement of historizing itself (ibid: 427-428). Thus, historizing and understanding history are originally co-conditional.

[823] Ibid: 41.

thinking and next to it an illustrative history of past opinions," and this fact holds equally true for

Dasein when it is not explicitly concerned with ontological truth.[824] If Dasein "always and

already" tacitly harbors self-understanding of its being in terms of ecstatic temporality, then

included in that understanding is that, because it is ecstatically temporal, Dasein is always

historical. Simply put, historicality is an essential structure of Dasein - it is "rooted in care" -

whether Dasein exists authentically or not.[825]

To historize is, secondarily, to interpret "historical entities as regards their historicality,"

or to interpret the historical "connectedness" of their meanings as these form within an unfolding

history of hermeneutic existence.[826] Just as we have seen in the earlier chapters of this

dissertation, that Dasein's *primary* concern, when questioning the meaning of Being, is always

Dasein itself, does not at all indicate that Heidegger envisions Dasein, or the existential analytic,

in idealist terms. In fact, Dasein cannot truly remain with this primary concern alone because, as

a relational, historically factical being, its ontological examinations straightaway lead it to

consider other entities.[827] Historizing is *inauthentic* when Dasein fails to acknowledge this, and

such failure is mutually conditioned by Dasein's denying its historicality while it lives as the

---

[824] Ibid: 238.
[825] Ibid: 428.
[826] Ibid: 31.
[827] It is crucial to maintain the primacy of this concern because, first it safeguards against the risk of reverting to an "objectifying," reifying framework of ontological understanding. We simply cannot challenge identity thinking, and we cannot open ourselves to authentic modality, if we falsely consider ourselves to have separated first-hand experience from metaphysical questions (or vice versa). This is essentially why Heidegger rebuffs the label "metaphysics." Though ontology is, by definition, the question of *human* being, this definition, especially in Heidegger's case, demands to be contextualized by the form of temporal relationality that characters being human. Second, the concern must maintain primacy because, although it is true that Dasein is always considering other entities as it engages the question of Being, the real upshot of engaging with the question is coming to determine what are Dasein's particular possibilities. This still does not mean that existential analysis is merely a self-seeking project, however, for (and here I anticipate the next section of this chapter), the implications of determining one's possibilities, and thus of strengthening one's agency and reinforcing one's practice of authentic care, readily bears on the wellbeing of other individuals (and in some cases, non-human animals and the natural world).

They.[828] "If this historicality remains hidden from Dasein, and as long as it so remains, Dasein is also denied the possibility of historiological inquiry or the discovery of history"; it cannot become a truly historical being.[829] What is more, so long as history, as "truly historical being," is distinguished by Dasein's interest in the hermeneutics of subject-object relations, modal inauthenticity cannot accommodate its discovery, and, put the other way around, modal authenticity demands historizing.[830] *Authentic* historizing occurs, then, when Dasein recognizes itself as ecstatically temporal and historical (this means, as originally grounded in care), and, as a result, when it realizes opportunities for exploring the ways in which the meaning it finds in its everyday world materializes from out historically, objectively, and negatively mediated interactions. The upshot of authentic historizing is Dasein's disclosing possibilities to negate identity thinking, to de-reify its socio-historical world (particularly, the world as it is characterized by commodity exchange), and to advance its "sight" for a form of freedom that is akin to the form I have described for Adorno: freedom for the act of identity negation.[831]

As it historizes, authentically resolute Dasein is ultimately (and ineluctably) concerned with understanding its "heritage," or its historical possibilities that no longer exist but continue to inform its facticity, including its present and future possibilities, possibilities that Dasein cares

---

[828] Heidegger's description of inauthentic Dasein's sightlessness for the fact that the They promotes a false ideal of freedom, and thus of Dasein's disregard for detecting variances between that ideal and freedom's meaning as modal authenticity, resonates with Adorno's claim that the "semblance of freedom makes reflection upon one's own unfreedom incomparably more difficult than formerly when such reflection stood in contradiction to manifest unfreedom, thus strengthening dependence" (Adorno 2000b: 198).

[829] Ibid: 42.

[830] "The existential-ontological constitution of historicality has been covered up by the way Dasein's history is ordinarily interpreted; we must get hold of it *in spite of* all this" (Ibid: 428).

[831] To emphasize, the possibility of such freedom, for Adorno and Heidegger both, is conditioned by how one conceives of and experiences time and, alongside it, history. In support of Benjamin's "On the Concept of History," Adorno concurs that "contrary to what traditional philosophy believed, facts do not simply disperse in the course of time, unlike immutable, eternal ideas. The truth is that, while the traditional view inserts facts into the flow of time, they really possess a nucleus of time in themselves, they crystallize time in themselves. What we can legitimately call ideas is this nucleus of time within the individual crystallized phenomena, something that can only be decoded by interpretation. In accordance with this, we might say that history is discontinuous in the sense that it represents life perennially disrupted. At the same time, history detects in these fragments the trace of possible developments, of something hopeful that stands in precise opposition to what the totality appears to show (Adorno 2006: 91).

for as it cares for its "destiny" or "fate." Efforting to grasp the historical "connectedness" of its existence - to "pull itself together from the dispersion and the disconnectedness of the very things that have 'come to pass'" - toward understanding its heritage and fate hermeneutically, Dasein engages in acts of "repetition."[832] This is the crux of historizing.[833]

Understanding history "as the 'recurrence' of the possible," and "that a possibility will recur only if existence is open for it fatefully, in a moment of vision, in resolute repetition,"[834] Dasein examines the origins of the possibilities that have been "handed down" to it, and it does so in anticipation of making those possibilities "its own."[835] (By contrast, inauthentic Dasein, lacking critical imagination, is "blind for possibilities"; it "cannot repeat what has been, but only retains and receives the 'actual' that is left over"; "in awaiting the next new thing, it has already **forgotten** the old one."[836]) While in some cases this could mean retrieving lost possibilities that Dasein is intent on finally fulfilling, in general it means illuminating the possibilities into which it has been thrown for the sake of deciphering how its present and future possibilities might appear to be different; that is, how Dasein might negate (but not desert) the socio-historically contingent "facts" of its existence that contradict its agency, and identify alternative ways of being-in-the-world. As it "makes a *reciprocal rejoinder* to the possibility of that existence which has-been-there," repetition is at the heart of the means by which authentically resolute Dasein puts its capabilities for determinate negation into practice.[837] This is ultimately why Marcuse, in

---

[832] Ibid: 441-442.
[833] The concept of "repetition" also represents the apex of Heidegger's influence by Nietzsche. See Niels Nymann Eriksen's comments on this influence, particularly its evidence in Heidegger's "repeatedly" quoting Nietzsche's following remark: 'To *impress* upon becoming the character of being - that is the *supreme will to power* … That everything recurs is the closest *approximation of a world becoming to a world of being - the high point of the meditation* [*Betrachtung*]'" (Erikson 2000: 143).
[834] Ibid: 444 - my brackets.
[835] Ibid: 442. In comparison, "[inauthentic] Dasein no longer understands the most elementary conditions which would alone enable it to go back to the past in a positive manner and make it productively its own" (ibid: 43).
[836] Ibid: 443 - original bolding. (I reject the ableist and condescending language here.)
[837] Ibid: 438.

his late 1960s writings on "existential Marxism," calls historizing "a revolutionary act." It "[takes] the form of a 'negation of the status quo'" ("when taken in conjunction with the Marxian breakthrough to political concretion," he quickly adds).[838] "From this foundation" of Dasein's historical movement, proposes Marcuse, "all philosophical problems can now be approached in an effort to rethink them in their genuine relation to *Dasein* and to explore the degree to which they point to truths, lies, or masks of being-in-the-world."[839]

We should be mindful, however, that the "foundation" of the possibility for determinate negation is not the act of historizing exactly, and rather Dasein's self-understanding as ecstatically temporal that marks Dasein's anticipatory resoluteness, where the latter both precedes and accompanies the former. To that point, Marcuse's argument could be strengthened by emphasizing how Dasein's registering the priority of potentiality over actuality comes front and center in authentic historizing. (For, historizing is essentially an approach to understanding Dasein's finite temporality yet more carefully. Dasein expands on the content and deepens the form of its analysis.) As Dasein progressively grasps the "connectedness" of its existence (its historicality), it comes to understand how its existence could be *otherwise*, and this understanding is specifically owed to its being "*essentially **futural**, so that it is free for its death and can let itself be thrown back upon its factical 'there*.'"[840] Coming to terms with itself as potentiality-for-Being and with the concept as the limit concept, Dasein increasingly motions

---

[838] Marcuse 2005: 18-19 - my brackets.
[839] Ibid: 14. Marcuse's reception of (both the earlier and later) Heidegger shifts significantly, particularly on the grounds that Fundamental Ontology fails to take explicit interest in the *real* damages of ideological thinking on socio-historical consciousness. He makes his position clear in a later interview with Frederick Olafson: "If there is an ontology which, in spite of its stress of historicity, neglects history, throws out history, and returns to static transcendental concepts, I would say this philosophy cannot provide a conceptual basis for social and political theory … To be sure, Dasein is constituted in historicity but Heidegger focuses on individuals purged of the hidden and not so hidden injuries of their class, their work, their recreation, purged of the injuries they suffer from their society. There is no trace of the daily rebellion, of the striving for liberation. The Man (the anonymous anyone) is no substitute for the social reality" (ibid: 168-169).
[840] Heidegger 2008a: 437 - original italics and bold.

toward liberating itself from the identity thinking of the They. In this sense, it de-reifies its

historical consciousness of its own historical being, and it opens itself up to embodying its fate -

fate not as a mere idea, but as a mode of authentically caring for *what Dasein does* with its

situation.[841] This does not mean, however, that historizing, as historical self-interpreting, is only a

matter of understanding the "connectedness" of one's personal existence. For, when Dasein is

authentically caring, authentic care becomes characteristic of Dasein; such modification means

that Dasein cares for whatever or whomever occupies its (temporally "stretched") attention,

Heidegger alleges. We will see this in section four's discussion of authentic social relations, and

here we see it initially in how historizing, like all moments of Heidegger's existential analytic,

begins by attending to the entities with which Dasein is most familiar in its usual

environment(s).[842] If conscientiousness of the need, possibility, and pursuit of socio-structural

critique is imperative to *being as* authentic care, then it comes as no surprise that Heidegger

chooses equipment and work as near-exclusive examples for what Dasein tends to be

immediately concerned about as it historizes. As we recall Adorno's objection that Heidegger

reifies the They, we find Heidegger to ask rhetorically: "Do not equipment and work and

everything which Dasein dwells alongside, belong to 'history' too?"[843] Indeed, for him, they are

among that which foremost distinguishes Being's "world-historical" character.

So long as, for primordial time, "higher than actuality stands possibility," and historizing

is authentic when it examines historical consciousness from within primordial time, then

---

[841] "Only if death, guilt, conscience, freedom, and finitude reside together equiprimordially in the Being of an entity as they do in [authentic] care, can that entity exist in the mode of fate; that is to say, only then can it be historical in the very depths of its existence" (ibid - my brackets for clarity).

[842] Adorno, with Horkheimer, frequently affirms the importance and inevitability of critiquing entities within the subject's immediate presence, toward grasping the mediatory nature of knowledge, and the nature of knowledge as *determinate* negation when it is rooted in authentic non-identity thinking: "Knowledge does not consist in mere perception, classification, and calculation, but precisely in the determining negation of whatever is directly at hand" (Horkheimer and Adorno 2007: 20).

[843] Ibid: 440.

Dasein's concern with historizing entities transpires alongside its understanding that "entities within-the-world become accessible as 'being in time.'"[844] Additionally, so long as reification fundamentally depends on being-in-the-world according to the "world-time" of the exchange structure and culture industry, and reification, as grounded in identity thinking, cannot coincide with authentic historizing, then Dasein's determination to experience entities "in (primordial) time" is a necessary first step toward de-fetishizing them and de-reifying historical consciousness more generally. This is reflected in Heidegger's claim that, for inauthentic Dasein, "there is no need of connectedness"; "lost in the making present of the 'today,' it understands the 'past' in terms of the 'Present.'"[845] By contrast, authentically historical Dasein, having self-interpreted as being-toward-death and thus having recovered the priority of potentiality, understands the past in terms of the future, or in terms of juxtaposing the possibility of its openness to "what could be" with the possibilities that it has previously identified for subject-object relations. "[T]he temporality of authentic historicality, as the moment of vision of anticipatory repetition, *deprives* the 'today' of its character *as present*, and weans one from the conventionalities of the 'they.'"[846] Resisting its habit of understanding the past in terms of the *present*, that is, of treating historical objects as present-at-hand, Dasein resists reifying consciousness.

Critically experiencing the phenomena of equipment and work "in time," Dasein is accordingly interested in how they historically "connect" with its historicality (its ecstatic unity of onto-existential understanding; its historical truth of Being). Of course, this involves negating the falsely appearing ubiquity and permanence of the cultural "tradition" of the They, which "makes us forget" that the meanings of phenomena have historical origins, and "makes us suppose that the necessity of going back to these sources is something which we need not even

---

[844] Ibid: 382.
[845] Ibid: 442-443.
[846] Ibid: 444.

understand."[847] As we might expect, Heidegger does not move on to describe, within any

concrete, socio-historical context, the origins of those or any other phenomena. To take a short

detour into addressing this dilemma before suggesting that historizing equipment and work

primes Dasein for moments of de-reifying its situation, I draw on Dreyfus and Rabinow's

interpretation of this dilemma as demonstrating not a disinterest in or incapacity for critical

social analysis (they do not speak to this issue here), but a necessary outcome of presupposing

the hermeneutic nature of Being. "The attempt to pinpoint those practices which begin our

history, rather than enabling us to get clear about the sources of our culture," they write, "finds

those practices retreating further and further into the distant past until they become what

Heidegger calls 'the essential mystery.'"[848] Perhaps vindicating, to some extent, Adorno's

objection that negative, historical critique has no place in Heidegger's universe, Dreyfus and

Rabinow suggest that Heidegger's reticence about the sources of socio-cultural traditions is both

purposive and unavoidable, for it demonstrates his wider position "that man is condemned to the

fruitless project of attempting to get clear about the origin, which in this case amounts to trying

to name being and thus drag the clearing into the open."[849] Indeed, Heidegger affirms in "On the

Essence of Truth" that Being's ceaseless self-concealing proves itself in the "inordinate

forgetfulness of humanity," and that "the mystery leaves historical man in the sphere of what is

readily available to him, leaves him to his own resources."[850] Echoing this sentiment in section

75 of *Being and Time*, he tells us (somewhat to this reader's exasperation) that the real point of

historizing is to reveal that "the movement of historizing in general" is "the ontological enigma,"

---

[847] Ibid: 43.
[848] Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982: 37.
[849] Ibid.
[850] Heidegger 2008c: 130-132.

before he returns to recount the complexity of primordial time.[851] Since the question of Being

cannot ever be fully worked out, Dreyfus and Rabinow conclude that Heidegger envisions

Dasein to be always and "essentially wandering in distress."[852]

Insofar as the meaning of Being, on the basis of its very own essential structures, will

always elude understanding to varying degrees, it seems right to say that Heidegger has a rather

tragic vision of humanity. This is often apparent in his later works as well, for which the then

interchangeable terms "technology" and "metaphysics" include "all the areas of beings which

equip the whole of beings: objectified nature, the business of culture, manufactured politics, and

the gloss of ideals overlying everything."[853] Nevertheless, it is worthwhile (among this and other

reasons)[854] to emphasize Heidegger's career-long intention to "overcome metaphysics" and thus

the instrumental, reifying, contingent character of Being as it is for us today within the They of

---

[851] Heidegger 2008a: 441.
[852] Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982: 37.
[853] Heidegger 1973: 93.
[854] The claim that Heidegger "holds a rather tragic vision of humanity," draws on his both earlier and later works, including the 1931-1938 volume of the *Black Notebooks*, and must be tempered. In the notebooks, Heidegger alleges that "the technological character … cannot by its very essence be stopped by some sort of 'preventative measures' interposed along the way. Even here something rolls or, better, slinks to its end" (Heidegger 2016: 210). In this tragic vision, Heidegger tragically identifies for Jewish people an "excellency in calculation," and associating this with the paradigm of technology, or metaphysics. Rhetorically and in response to his own question of whether "the West and 'world history'" have not become "ahistorical" (and thus marked by calculation and inauthenticity as rule), he asks whether this ahistoricality is "only the sign of the historical entrance into an era of transition to a new historical day in the West" (ibid: 211). Here the fascist undertones of his notions of "heritage" and "fate" in *Being and Time* become explicit. "Our history will proceed to its end, or is already at its end" he writes, "unless once again those *few* come to power who *know and set into work beyng itself* - solely for the sake of itself - and its *truth* (ibid: 220). We may interpret this "transitioning" as the "overcoming" of metaphysics, through which "the Germanic people," whom in this context we may interpret as authentic Dasein, "reclaim" a "supreme power" (this is "fate") through analyzing historical consciousness (i.e., historizing to identify "heritage") (ibid: 366). Despite the fact that these undertones are now increasingly becoming overtones in my reading of *Being and Time*, I find it somewhat difficult to abandon the other interpretation of Heidegger's "overcoming metaphysics" that I have been offering; namely, that with a broad vision of disillusioning ideological thinking and its detriment to critique, agency, and happiness, "overcoming metaphysics" is an endeavor in reclaiming non-identity and breaking through false consciousness on Adorno's terms. While I will not pretend that I believe my interpretation coincides with Heidegger's intentions (especially at this juncture in the dissertation, as I turn the pages of the *Black Notebooks* more frequently), I do still believe that juxtaposing this interpretation with Adorno's critique is advantageous for exploring how the approaches of existentialism and phenomenology on the one hand, and of critical social theory on the other, can be integrated toward refining understandings of the conditions and possibilities for effective social critique. With that, I hope it needs no reminding that this dissertation is not a defense of Heidegger as a philosopher or as a person - it is not even an outright defense of Heidegger's ontology - nor has it set out with concern for the Adorno-Heidegger debate exclusively. See section four of this chapter for clarification.

"the administered world." In not only this regard, the general framework that Heidegger gives us evidences the potentiality of existential analysis for negative social critique. Perhaps still more telling is how quickly he ends his discussion of historical origins and returns just two sections later (the interim section detours into Dilthey's work on history) to discuss the concept of ecstatic temporality again and exclusively. There we are, for all intents and purposes, brought back to the very first page of *Being and Time*, which sets "our provisional aim" as one of interpreting "time as the possible horizon for any understanding whatsoever of Being."[855] If experiencing non-reified time is the essential condition of thinking Being "originarily" as non-being, and is likewise an essential condition of thinking non-identically, then continuing to keep this "horizon" as the backdrop of consciousness will be most supportive of efforts for immanent social critique. Coupled with this claim, while it is true that we cannot ever "name" Being, surely in practices of historizing we can begin to identify, put into relation, and critique many of the sources that are historically responsible for the "forgottenness" of it, and with this, the "forgottenness" of the problem of identity thinking, even if doing so would come in the simple, preliminary form of acknowledging patterns of historical "connectedness" that reflect the exchange structure's global ascendency, for instance. Heidegger *does* identify equipment and work to connect them with the historicality of Dasein, and shows that these phenomena blur the traditional subject-object dichotomy - i.e., that neither they nor Dasein are merely object and subject, respectively, but that, as historical objects, equipment and work are also historical subjects given their meanings are conditioned by the They, and that, similarly, Dasein, as a historical subject, is also an object for its identity's profound affectivity by its socio-material environment(s). However, Heidegger's phenomenology in this regard, while it is not "abstract" -

---

[855] Heidegger 2008a: 1.

it is "concrete philosophy" inasmuch as it "seeks out Dasein in the sphere in which its existence is based: as it *acts* in its world in accordance with its historical situation," Marcuse proposes[856] - it of course does not deal with particular social objects in any sufficient capacity against the standards of historical materialism and negative dialectics.

Indeed, then, Heidegger for the most part lays but only the ontological groundwork for critiquing the cultural origins of, within the immanent contexts of, late capitalist society. I will briefly make two related points in this regard. First, when Dasein examines the history of its experiences with equipment and work, it quickly discovers that the latter's particular manifestations as being ready-to-hand exist only for those times in which Dasein has experienced them immediately and from within a particular relational framework of having been irresolute. Insofar as an entity's state of being ready-to-hand is undifferentiated from (irresolute) Dasein's tendency to experience that entity unwittingly as a representation of itself or to give it absolute identity with a concept, that state, strictly speaking, can only be said to exist *at the moment(s) when* Dasein treats that entity solely as equipment (I will qualify and further unpack this point in a moment). The other side of the coin and my second point is that, because its temporal constitution as being ecstatically "stretched along" means that Dasein's relations with entities are "primarily and for the most part" *as* ready-to-hand, "the movement [Bewegheit] of existence is *not* the motion [Bewegung] of something present-at-hand."[857] Because to experience an entity as present-at-hand is ultimately to reify it, we see that authentically historizing Dasein is concerned with de-reifying its historical consciousness (even though it must "objectify" consciousness and entities in intentional acts of historizing). When this concern is present, so too is Dasein's concern for de-fetishizing other entities. To be sure, this does not entail that Dasein

---

[856] Marcuse 2005: 47.
[857] Ibid: 427 - my italics.

aims to or can eliminate readiness-to-hand as its ordinary mode of relationality, for, as authentic, it understands that readiness-to-hand is a necessary structure of Being; as beings whose frames of reference are not usually thematic, readiness-to-hand is our usual mode of ontic relationality. "*With the existence of historical Being-in-the-world, what is ready-to-hand and what is present-at-hand have already, in every case, been incorporated into the history of the world*."[858] Also because it is authentic, however, Dasein understands the contingency of the particular form in which readiness-to-hand appears in regard to the determining character of its society, a form and character which are, here, equipmentality or instrumentality. Together, these points suggest that a significant implication of authentic historizing is Dasein's ability to de-reify its past experiences with entities in the particular ways they manifest as ready-to-hand, freeing Dasein to identify other manners of relating to them. Entities, while they still must typically be experienced as ready-to-hand to the extent that Dasein cannot continuously remain within its thematic purview, need not necessarily be related to as entities that are ready-to-hand *merely* as commodities. For, again, equipmentality, while it corresponds to Being's necessary structure of readiness-to-hand, also corresponds contingently to a society's character, which Heidegger makes clear by associating equipmentality with the "public time" of the They and hence with modal inauthenticity, and, in turn, by accentuating the "modifiable" nature of existential modality.[859]

With that said, Dasein's habit of fetishizing entities, because it belongs to the fundamental, cultural character of structural exchange, cannot be modified completely or in any modest timeframe, a point on which, employing different terms, Adorno would agree. What can

---

[858] Ibid: 440 - original italics.

[859] A primary way in which inauthentic Dasein's unawareness of the meaning of Being manifests is in its insensibility to the *how* of its everyday relations that are projected toward equipment and work: "A specific kind of *forgetting* is essential for the temporality that is constitutive for letting something be involved. The Self must forget itself, lost in the world of equipment, it is to be able 'actually' to go to work and manipulate something." Heidegger contrasts this forgetting that is inherent to public time with authentic Dasein's resoluteness to be rooted in primordial time: "But all the same, inasmuch as an *awaiting* always leads the way in the unity of the temporalizing of concern, concernful Dasein's own potentiality-for-Being has, as we shall show, been given a position in care" (ibid: 405).

be possible for an individual living in late capitalist society, however, is (1) to attempt to lessen the instances in which she uses entities merely as tools (this might involve a kind of Honnethian recognition of the non-human other, for example); (2) to practice mindfulness, when she must use entities as tools, of the historical conditions and present and future consequences of those relations (to put this in a broad case, she may practice mindfulness of how the "totality" of commodity culture limits her options and the options of others for securing employment and basic resources, and of how her work might, directly or indirectly, exploit or otherwise oppress others); and (3) to determine to use tools, whenever able, "in order to" fulfill projects pertaining to negative social critique (for an arguable example, by using social media in attempts to galvanize collective subversions of institutional power).[860] Of course, which precise possibilities would be viable for an individual in this regard would vary according to the precise conditions of that individual's situation(s), desires, and needs. The meanings of all three possibilities are, in part, alluded to in Heidegger's claim that "[a]s fate, resoluteness is freedom to give up some definite resolution, and to give it up in accordance with the demands of some possible Situation or other."[861] Such freedom is a co-possibility of Dasein's instinctually facing its existence in primordial time, whereby it enables itself to conceive other "possible ways in which [it] assigns itself time," and, on that basis, to resolve itself to conscientiously examine and choose - as a mundane value and habit - *how* it will "concern itself environmentally."[862]

The relevance of authentic historizing for determinate negation, then, is first demonstrated by Dasein's resoluteness to critically contrast its previous possibilities for relating to (inanimate or sentient non-human) entities as equipment with its present and future

---

[860]Adorno's rejoinder would probably be that the subject in this example suffers from false consciousness, and I wouldn't necessarily disagree in full. The topic, however, is far too extensive and thorny to substantially introduce here.
[861] Ibid: 443.
[862] Ibid: 462-463.

possibilities for relating to them differently, whether by being conscientious of when and how it treats them as equipment, or by not treating them as equipment at all. This involves Dasein's reflecting on and attempting to modify its previous habits and values, and doing so specifically by recognizing how those have been impressed by a "world" defined by commodity exchange. In such moments, Dasein distinguishes the need of thinking non-identically and works to help to satisfy that need in praxis, where the possibilities of both tasks are already conditioned by the meaning of Being itself. "Equipment and work … have their 'fates,'" Heidegger tells us.[863] Regardless of his intentions in that passage, we can see how, when looking to the overall framework and intentions of the existential analytic, it may be interpreted as indicating that, when Dasein modifies its ordinary way of being-in-the-world, so too are modified the possibilities that Dasein perceives for its relations with equipment and work, where, together, these latter terms refer generally to Dasein's everyday projects. Continuing that passage, Heidegger specifies "buildings and institutions" as having their "histories." There we may read him as pointing specifically to the idea that Dasein's re-envisioning the "fate" of *what* Dasein does with equipment and work - and thus of how Dasein chooses to project itself given that it cannot *idealistically* transcend its situation - is mutually directed by its critically negating the historically social and, importantly, *material* conditions that mediate its self-identity. Although there is not space and time here to consider in any further detail how authentic historizing can potentially guide Dasein to analyze its "own mind's role," in relation to the (prioritized) role of the object, in having historically denied and perpetuated the forces of production, it is at least clear, I hope, that existential analysis, as the groundwork and as an ongoing, supportive approach for immanent critique, can help Dasein to realize its inherent potential for historically examining

---

[863] Heidegger 2008a: 440.

the material conditions that have given equipment and work their past and present meanings, toward negating the identity of the forces of production. Engaging in acts of repetition is, to these ends, the most crucial function of Heidegger's existential analytic. As it refuses to dissociate questions of history from questions of time, the analytic quite literally opens up space and time for pursuing the basic agenda of historical materialism: "to view the present historically and hence scientifically so that we can penetrate beneath the surface and perceive the profounder historical forces which in reality control events."[864]

I conclude this section with a few remarks on Adorno's objection that Heidegger "reifies anxiety and death," before moving onto the final section in which this issue will reappear within reflections on the conditions and possibilities of authentic, intersubjective care. As we recall, the main premise underlying Adorno's criticism of Heidegger's naming being-toward-death as the key to ontological understanding is that, "Insofar as death is absolutely alien to the subject, it is the model of all reification. Only ideology praises it as a cure for exchange."[865] This premise is complemented by Adorno's interpreting Heidegger to conflate anxiety caused by real suffering of socio-institutional domination, with "an existential value."[866] That anxiety is *historical*, "that those who are yoked into a society which is societalized, but contradictory to the deepest core, constantly feel threatened by what sustains them," undermines the coherence of this alleged conflation.[867] For, anxiety, "that supposed 'existential,'" is really "the claustrophobia of a systematized society."[868] Accordingly, Dasein's sense that its existence is meaninglessness and always in peril (as Adorno takes it) should be reconceived as the contemporary subject's

---

[864] Lukács 1972: 224.
[865] Adorno 2003: 125.
[866] With this, Marcuse, having renunciated his earlier, supportive interpretations of Heidegger's Ontology, agrees: "The Frage nach dem Sein remains the every unanswered but ever repeated question; the distinction between fear and anxiety tends to transform very real fear into pervasive and vague anxiety." This inevitably follows from Heidegger's naming death to be an "insurpassable possibility" (Marcuse 2005: 167).
[867] Adorno 2003: 27.
[868] Adorno 1990: 24.

experience of alienation.[869] Instead transfiguring anxiety into an *a priori* structure of Being,

Heidegger "celebrates" the social conditions of anxiety and death, as well as Dasein's denial of

those conditions, Adorno claims. Ontologically and thus also epistemologically prioritizing

being-toward-death is yet another primary way in which he divests the subject of understanding

and realizing her capabilities for negative social critique. Overall, Adorno argues that

Heidegger's articulation of being-toward-death replicates identity thinking.

While Adorno is right to accentuate Heidegger's negligence to identify and critique at

least the general conditions of anxiety that continue to be precipitated by the ideals and impacts

of Enlightenment "progress" (alienation and exploitation, wrapped up in institutional

dependency), his equating anxiety in Heidegger merely with an "abstract," absolute structure of

Being is misguided, and, as a result, he underestimates the potential of self-interpreting as being-

toward-death as a preparatory condition of immanent critique. Turning to Tillich's rather unique

position on the ontological status of anxiety is helpful for advancing these suggestions. Although

Tillich does not engage Adorno or Heidegger explicitly on this issue, we see him finding his

way, first, to agree with Adorno's objection, before, second, striking a balance between the ideas

that anxiety is an existential value, and that it must be considered from within discrete social

contexts. Tillich distinguishes experiences of the "totality's" both really and falsely appearing as

an absolutist synthesis of power to be primary sources of anxiety: "It is the conflict between the

appearance of independent tendencies in all groups of society, on the one hand, and the rise of an

absolutist concentration of power on the other that is largely responsible for the predominance of

the anxiety and guilt."[870] In this way, anxiety is socially contingent in both degree and form.

"The victory of humanism and Enlightenment," as the socio-cultural (and, for Tillich, religious)

---

[869] "Socially, the feeling of meaninglessness is a reaction to the wide-reaching freeing from work which takes place under conditions of continuing social unfreedom" (Adorno 2003: 28). Also see ibid: 126.

[870] Tillich 2014: 61.

foundation of Western society, has precipitated an eruption of "anxiety about non-being."[871] Such anxiety correlates positively with increasing atomization and, accordingly, with loss of a "spiritual center." However, Tillich also mitigates these claims, contending that the "threat" of emptiness, loss of meaning, and ultimately death, while "actualized by man's estrangement," is equally "implied in man's finitude."[872] In other words, anxiety is simultaneously a necessary, universal structure of existence, and provoked by real, social risks. Interestingly, he surmises that one will not find solace in the "sphere of culture." Recovering one's "spiritual center" - a center of "freedom" from which one is steadily able to make meaning of life both because and in spite of the fact that life is finite - will not truly happen by turning to society.[873] Doing so "only produces deeper anxiety," for one then, to interpret this with each Heidegger and Adorno, "falls" back into the comfort of denying non-being, which the They provides as it coerces one to sublimate anxiety over death and therefore also to suppress one's singularization by non-identity thinking. Tillich puts this as one's renouncing one's faculty to *doubt*, by which he is calling us not to adopt a paradigm of Cartesian skepticism, but to retain an amount of "separation from the whole of reality" in which the possibility of sincere self-relatedness can be preserved.[874] Considering this from Adorno's purview, turning to society in attempt to assuage anxiety is to risk reverting to the deception that subject and object are identical; viz., to the most basic ideology that is responsible for (societally engendered) anxiety in the first place. Comparatively, from within the purview of Fundamental Ontology the risk is that of self-identifying with a social character for which there is no interest in and hence no doubt about the meaning of Being.

---

[871] Ibid: 60.
[872] Ibid: 48.
[873] "Man is essentially 'finite freedom'; freedom not in the sense of indeterminancy but in the sense of being able to determine himself through decisions in the center of his being" (ibid: 52)
[874] Ibid: 49. We might think of this in part along Kierkegaardian lines: "Despair itself is a negativity, unconsciousness of it is a new negativity. But to reach truth one must pierce through every negativity" (Kierkegaard 2004: 177).

We might articulate Tillich's "doubt" as authentically resolute Dasein's understanding the very nature of existence as a movement of hermeneutic negation, and modal inauthenticity as a reflection of living according to artificial time.

We have explored the question of how, or where, for Adorno and Heidegger, the subject can recover her potentiality for freedom - for locating a kind of "spiritual center" on which she can rely to summon her resolve for living conscientiously *as* negative identity. Our general answer has been that she must "transcend" her everyday social world in order to return to the latter *in the right way*; namely, with critical awareness that temporality is an "interdependent whole, a developing process, a becoming" (Adorno),[875] and that, because of this, existence is "always and already" potentiality-for-Being (Heidegger). The feasibility of this transcendence and return is co-conditioned by the subject's resoluteness to candidly confront her anxiety, guilt, and death, and this fact hints at one reason for questioning the coherence of Adorno's assertion that Heidegger reifies these experiences.

While it is true that Heidegger locates anxiety and being-toward-death together as a universal structure of Being, we can identify at least three reasons why this does not mean that he thereby reifies being-toward-death and that existential analysis is futile when it comes to dealing with anxiety that is provoked by specific societal contradictions. All three reasons, as we might imagine, are founded on Heidegger's (and although he uses different language for it, Adorno's) differentiating primordial from mundane time. First, anxiety is not some *thing* to which Dasein is tied in perpetual distress, and is rather a "happening" by which Dasein is brought "into the mood for a *possible* resolution," or for the possibility of reconciling its finitude with its responsibility to create meaning in and for its existence.[876] For the simple reason that anxiety is an act of

---

[875] See ftn. 127 of this chapter.
[876] Heidegger 2008a: 394.

anticipation, it cannot be reified. (Besides, reification and generalization are not synonymous issues, and by specifying anxiety as an universal, Heidegger is not generalizing experiences of it anyway.) Moreover, although Adorno correctly interprets Heidegger to distinguish anxiety from "fear," he misinterprets fear to signify all that is "innerwordly" and "empirical."[877] Fear does not signify all forms of apprehension that are caused by "worldly" events (as opposed to events of "sheerly" grappling with being-toward-death); it is not anxiety of some lower form because its object is contingent on societal dynamics. Instead, it signifies Dasein's tendency to "lose itself" irrationally in the object of its concern, whether that object is death itself, or the feeling of alienation, for example. When Dasein is fearful, it simply loses sight of the non-identity of Being and its own potentiality.[878] This is important to note because, second, Heidegger's existential analytic can accommodate critical reflections on anxiety - no matter the object - including reflections on the source(s) of anxiety and on how Dasein may "resolve" itself in the face of it. We have seen this indirectly in the discussions above about historizing and Dasein's historically analyzing its relations with equipment and work in particular. In that particular case, we are pointed to the idea that authentic historizing is possible only insofar as it coincides with Dasein's becoming aware of the historical origins of its anxiety over and its inauthentic resoluteness for rethinking its relation to a specific object that pertains to its experiences with equipment and work; authentically resolute and historical Dasein is capable of putting its anxiety about being an efficient worker into the wider context of capitalist exploitation and the commodification of leisure time, for example. This second point is mutually informed by the third and most crucial: that Dasein's authentically living as being-toward-death, because it is the origin of authentic temporalization, is also the origin of the potential for determinate negation. This is yet another

---

[877] Adorno 2003: 27.
[878] Heidegger 2008a: 394-395.

way of saying that modal authenticity not only does not correspond to, but is a moment of counteracting, reification. To determine the sources of, as well as the available courses of action for coping with (if not also challenging those sources of) one's anxiety at a given moment, authentic temporalization is necessary. If turning to the They results in denying and strengthening anxiety, then "transcendence," or a pattern of moments of singularization, is vital to immanent critique of anxiety, and singularization far from entails that the subject aims or is destined to investigate the sources and creative possibilities of its anxiety without doing so holistically, with reference to real societal dynamics. Simply enough, practicing awareness of the precise causes of anxiety presupposes understanding ecstatic temporality, for it is the latter to which determinate negation, and the subject's willing motivation to make non-identity thinking an everyday norm, is indebted.

IV. *Hermeneutically being-with: meta-critical reflections*

The guiding thesis of this dissertation has pointed to difficult questions concerning the prospective relevance of the idea of modal authenticity for thinking about the conditions of authentically being-with. So long as authentic resoluteness is defined by authentic care, and, as a modality, resoluteness is an endeavor in modifying one's habits and values *comprehensively* – it is a series of comprehensive acts of resolving to reshape *how* one is in the world, or what one does with one's facticity - then naturally it must entail modifications to one's day-to-day relations with others (if not also to how one *is* concerned about others who are beyond one's mundane milieu). This necessity is implied even more plainly by Heidegger's presupposing "Dasein" to refer to *communal being*, which, in Chapter Three, I spelled out towards refuting Adorno's interpretation of it as an ideal ego and modal authenticity as nothing but a false and dangerous claim to an unbounded will to power. Considering these premises together and in light of Adorno's envisioning non-identity thinking as a practical social norm (which is, roughly speaking, his "utopia"),[879] we are well-positioned to ask after the accuracy of his final verdict on Fundamental Ontology, which is that the existential analytic not only cannot nurture, but actively discourages intersubjective relations rooted in genuine care. This is just as we are well-positioned to ask whether a desire or responsibility to help galvanize more caring, loving communities typified by non-identity thinking (which is to say, for Adorno, by true rationality) is inherent to the meaning of authentic Being. Pursuing these questions requires taking into account

---

[879] In his introduction to *Adorno: Disenchantment and Ethics*, Richard Bernstein illuminates the ethical overtones that tie together Adorno's work: "No reading of the works of T.W. Adorno can fail to be struck by the ethical intensity of his writing, sentence by sentence, word by word. Whether he was writing about questions in epistemology, aesthetics, social theory, literature, or music, one senses that these were vehicles for his somber ethical vision of a world grown inhuman in which the primary task of the intellectual had become critical vigilance; all accommodation was exacerbation of the worst" (Bernstein 2001: 1-2). We see this particularly in what Adorno suggests is the ultimate aim of negative thinking and immanent critique; namely, to illuminate the need and possibility of re-socialization, or of radically reforming socialization processes, which naturally are the most powerful political tools as they mold human beings "into the very core of their psyche" (Adorno 2006: 71).

Adorno's specific and related objections that the idea of modal authenticity *inevitably* reinforces social estrangement, dehumanization, domination, and disempowerment, objections which are all overarched by his construing Heidegger (and Dasein) to reify consciousness, entities, and the language of Fundamental Ontology for expressing their connectedness.[880]

These questions are difficult in part because, even if we remain certain that modal shifts are socio-ontologically comprehensive, that "Dasein" means communal being, and that, consequently, modal authenticity always entails modifications to one's being-with,[881] we cannot be certain whether Heidegger sincerely valued these features of the Ontology, embracing them at the very core of himself not just as a disciplinary philosopher, but as a person who has participated in, whose facticity has been grounded in, a whole of civic life. For, if the social meaning of Dasein is as significant to him as it is for us, then why does he spend such comparatively little time exploring the complexities of "being-with," opting to focus instead most broadly on "being-in"? Similarly, given the substantial attention he devotes to articulating authenticity as a mode that mediates Dasein in its full relationality, why does he for the most part utilize only two sections of *Being and Time*'s second division (wherein he gives deeper nuance to the idea of authenticity) to explore the intersubjectivity of authentically resolute Dasein?[882] In those two sections, moreover, why does he largely restrict his concern for being-with to the contexts of Dasein's self-interpreting as being-toward-death and its understanding the "call" of conscience (respectively), where this means that he takes others into account only for purposes of advancing understanding of the universal structures of facticity (even though this "only" task is indeed immense)? Overall, why does Heidegger not decide to explore any of the *concrete*,

---

[880] See Adorno 2003, especially pp. 12-13, 33, 48, 49-53, 66-67, 88, 92-95, 98-100, 109-117, and 125.
[881] On authentic modifications to being-with-others, see, e.g., Heidegger 2008a: 344.
[882] See Section 47: "The possibility of experiencing the death of Others, and the possibility of getting a whole Dasein into our grasp" (pp. 281-285), and Section 58: "Understanding the appeal, and guilt" (pp. 325-335).

intersubjective implications of modal authenticity, as he could do, for example, not only by

identifying in detail how being-with is a condition of Dasein's finding its conscience, but by

demonstrating, in socially explicit terms, how being-with is or can be modified as Dasein

responds to the "call"? Is Adorno right after all and Heidegger's work on the idea of authenticity

is mere jargon, breaking off "the dialectic between word and thing … between individual words

and their relations," making "the mediation *through* the thinking subject disappear under the

varnish" of ideological language?[883]

      While Adorno's accusation is against both the ontological coherence and ethical

implications of the idea of authenticity per se, it is far from lost on us that it is directed at

Heidegger on a personally political level. Claiming that Heidegger obliterates subject-object

mediation by disjoining the idea of authenticity from critical, historical consciousness, and thus

from both the conditions and possibilities of social facticity, Adorno is not thereby proposing

that he writes about the idea disingenuously (as if from on some rung of consciousness

Heidegger suspects that it reflects an idealized view of reality), or in naiveté of the possibility

that authenticity - *as which*, one is said to take "the supreme leap" into "standing firm" in Being

(beyng), or, *as which*, Heidegger writes in the 1931-1938 *Black Notebooks*, "the German" is said

to cease renouncing his uniquely historical "poetic-thinker essence," - implies and encourages a

Weltanschauung epitomized by racist and fascist convictions.[884] It is not even quite right to

interpret Adorno's claim to be fundamentally concerned with the contradiction between, on the

one hand, Heidegger's indicating authentic being-with to be distinguished by artless care for the

well-being of others (a notion that, as Heidegger describes it in a few areas of *Being and Time*,

---

[883] Adorno 2003: 8-9.
[884] These articulations are found in the *Black Notebooks 1931-1938* (Heidegger 2016: 182, 364).

we might otherwise take to be kindred with Buber's "great and loving community"[885]), and on the other hand, his anti-Semitism and fidelity to National Socialism, which leastwise by 1936 he straightforwardly admitted "lays in the essence of his philosophy."[886] Indeed, as Adorno maintains throughout the majority of his critique, this is no contradiction at all. "Heidegger is at one" with the National Socialist maxim that "Sacrifice will make us free," he writes, hinting that, for Heidegger, National Socialism's self-assertion of its presumed "will" is what amounts to modal authenticity.[887] As Heidegger's appallingly remorseless confession itself implies, appealing to authenticity seems to be ultimately for the sake not of vitalizing efforts to make logos, eros, and kairos the character of any and all societies, but of propagandizing the lie of white western supremacy and of ostensibly protecting the solidarity of "the poets" - "the Germans" - against "culture," that "rampant competition and business" that Heidegger, associating it with "the Jewish people," distinguishes from the meaning or "substance" of Being.[888]

> Must not all thinking first be twisted free of those notions of the human being as *animal rationale* - i.e., today, as the living community pursuing culture - if the Germans want to find their essence and thus for the first time save their "substance"?[889]

> Thus far forth must meditation … wonder whether, instead of "culture," beings might not - unexpectedly - come into growth out of beyng. Yet we do not want to calculate but, rather, to wait - on the basis of knowledge of the essence of beyng - or perhaps merely be a sign for those who wait.[890]

---

[885] As it is impossible to fully escape the *I-It* relation (which resembles the character of Heidegger's "the They"), individuals must perpetually work to form communities that normalize relations of the *I-Thou*, where this foremost means of love, solidarity, rationality, values all rooted in recognition of alterity (Buber 1970).

[886] "My Last Meeting with Heidegger in Rome, 1936," Karl Löwith (Wolin 1992: 140-143).

[887] Adorno 2003: 108. "The jargon" echoes and ushers in this sense of sacrifice: "In its second-hand primalness they [its advocates] find something like contact, comparable to the feeling in the fraudulent National Socialist *Volk*-community which led people to believe that all kindred comrades are cared for and none is forgotten: permanent metaphysical subvention. The social basis for this is clear" (ibid: 62 - my brackets).

[888] Heidegger 2016: 364, 370.

[889] Ibid: 364.

[890] Ibid: 365.

Such passages strongly suggest that Heidegger considers the "fate" of authentic Being to belong solely to "the German nation."[891] He appears to consider being-with, a purportedly universal (because ontological) structure, primarily if not only to this extent. This entails that, if the "caller" of conscience is ultimately an individual's community of being-with, then, for Heidegger, Dasein can only be "called" by other "Germans."

> Whenever thinking and the act of meditation fall into the superficiality of the everyday and into the snares of today's measures and standards - the justification of any activity is without prospects. Then recollection must come as *a call* and must bring that excessive demand by which the thoughtful mode of Dasein is withdrawn into the most extreme solitude. The latter, like an unknown abundance, *allows it to happen that only the rare and the few ask about the one*.[892]

We need not ask further *who* the existential analytic, at least in the notebooks, appears to be for. What we can seek clarification on, however, is just *how* Heidegger appears to view the analytic as benefitting the projects of these "rare and few" who and who only, he says, "can in an originarily new way poetize being and say being."[893] Heidegger's 1931-1938 remarks on the meaning of the They, history, resoluteness, and time demand that we call this dissertation's foregoing interpretations of these phenomena into question.[894] I will briefly articulate these problems and, for each, take an initial step in revising the interpretations to which they correspond.[895]

---

[891] Other *Volk* still have their own "fates," he says. The "fate" of "the masses" does not correspond to "*the decision* of the West," the "people [that] experiences itself as needed by 'beyng'" (ibid: 379 - original italics).

[892] Ibid: 184 - my italics for emphasis.

[893] Ibid: 21.

[894] According to Jeff Malpas, the anti-Semitic passages in the *Black Notebooks* published to date were mostly written before 1934, and many of the later passages indicate the beginning of Heidegger's "*Kehre*." After 1934, while Heidegger's "*political* enthusiasm [for National Socialism] vanished," his "revolutionary zeal remained, now transformed into a singularly and resolutely *philosophical* mission" (Malpas 2018: 110 - my brackets). Even if we can confirm it is right that, after 1934, Heidegger began to renounce his allegiance to National Socialism, this does not change that the majority of his anti-Semitic passages were composed quickly after *Being and Time*, nor should Heidegger's later appearing to construe the "spiritual mission" in only philosophical terms assuage worries about his reifying consciousness and entities.

[895] To be sure, I will do this in brief, for, given how the *Black Notebooks* holds us responsible, as Heidegger scholars, to undergo sweeping reinterpretations of the primary concepts of *Being and Time*, more detailed critiques must be left to another project.

Whereas in *Being and Time* Heidegger characterizes the They as something like Adorno's "administered society," in the *Black Notebooks* he refers to it specifically as "a people" who "*no longer* want, *even implicitly*, to be the 'people' of poets and thinkers."[896] There he suggests that we should interpret transcendence as the transcendence of "the Germans," and not from the everydayness of commodified life, but from "the everyday people" whose existence he reduces to a so-called character of calculation.[897] This precisely means that there he, just as Adorno claims, reifies the They, and does so by dehumanizing "the people" whom he identifies with it. This further problematizes, obviously among more things, our supposition (however loosely it has been crafted) that a coherent concept of society is present in *Being and Time*.[898] Johannes Fritsche, whose 1999 text *Historical Destiny and National Socialism in Heidegger's Being and Time* remains one of the most detailed accounts of the embodiment of right-wing fascist politics in Heidegger's philosophy, contextualizes this problem by turning to Scheler's distinction between "community" and "society," and as he does, he parenthetically calls into question how we have here been interpreting Heidegger's notions of historicality and historizing. Against Hegel's *Philosophy of Right*, Scheler proposes that the idea of society or the state as a network of formal rules contradicts how "feeling and willing" come before "matters of civil contract," or, as Fritsche expresses it for him, that "in the realm of values, the whole is prior to its parts and allots each of them its place."[899] Playing up Scheler's influence on Heidegger, and drawing on section 74 of *Being and Time,* where Heidegger designates *co-historizing* as "the historizing of the community, of a people,"[900] Fritsche suggests that the real agenda of historizing

---

[896] Ibid: 364.
[897] Ibid: 138.
[898] That an actual concept of society is lacking in Heidegger is an issue to which Christian Lotz has often pointed me.
[899] Fritsche 1999: 113.
[900] Heidegger 2008a: 436.

is not to critique society toward remodeling its structures, but to "cancel society," and to do so on the basis of aiming for a spiritual awakening of "the West" (which, as I construe it, primarily informs the onto-theological dimension of Heidegger's earlier work).[901] As Derrida phrases it in his book largely dedicated to examining the interdependencies of Heidegger's fascism and philosophical work (*Of Spirit: Heidegger and the Question*), "He spiritualizes National Socialism.… The force to which Heidegger appeals, and again in conclusion when he speaks of the destiny of the West, is thus a 'spiritual force' [*geistige Kraft*]."[902] That Heidegger prioritizes appealing to a spirit of the will over examining a society's material conditions, and, accordingly, that he neither holds nor holds interest in a robust concept of society, is apparent in his own writings and talks shortly after the publication of *Being and Time*. For example, in his 1933 Rectorial Speech Heidegger addressed Freiburg University with the words that Germany, and the German University, is on a "spiritual mission" to be realized only "*through* the Volk to the destiny of the state."[903]

Fritsche's interpretation, which, especially prior to the publication of the *Black Notebooks*), some scholars have regarded as "too radical,"[904] seems right on target. Seemingly, Heidegger purposively does not give any real concept of society because, in his view, what is alone important to consider is both the "heritage" and "fate" of *a* (white western supremacist) community, and analyzing society, the "lower" sphere of human existence, is non-valuable to this end. He also does not offer any substantial remarks on what constitutes a "community," as

---

[901] Fritsche 1999: 124-125.

[902] Derrida 1989: 39. Unfortunately, as Richard Brody points out, in this text Derrida ultimately "defends Heidegger by showing that the underpinnings of his philosophy—his vocabulary and his network of metaphors—were the same as those of the era's ostensibly liberal thinkers" (https://www.newyorker.com/culture/richard-brody/why-does-it-matter-if-heidegger-was-anti-semitic). This issue is addressed more thoroughly in Richard Wolin's Preface to the MIT Edition of *The Heidegger Controversy* (Wolin 1992: viiii-xx).

[903] "The Self-Assertion of the German University" (Wolin 1992: 29-39): 36 - original italics.

[904] For example, Bernhard Radloff considers Fritsche to be "restating this [Heidegger's] position in the most extreme terms." Unsurprisingly, Radloff moves on to claim that "Heidegger's understanding of the Volk community … in no way implicates a policy of racial exclusion" (Radloff 2007: 174).

for him a communal realization of being (by "the Germans") is still in waiting. All he indicates

in *Being and Time* are the conditions (heritage, historicality, historizing) and, to a very lesser

extent, the possibilities of realizing this exclusive sense of community. In the notebooks, he

believes to have justified these choices:

> To remonstrate against *Being and Time* for not taking up or even naming the "people" and "the community of the people" as "cores of meaning" is equivalent to reproaching a fir tree for not attaining the performance of a race car. In the end the fir as fir is capable still of something the race car, as loud and as gigantic as its demeanor may be, will never perform. Thus *Being and Time* is striving for something which, remaining in stillness, reaches far ahead of all idle talk about the "people" in the "pseudophilosophy" suddenly become overzealously "folkish" [*"völkisch"*].[905]

There Heidegger does, however, also equate this "spiritual community" with an idealized nation-

state, one that, facilitating the realization of "the community's mission," would no longer

contradict the historical "bonds" of the *Volksgemeinschaft*, which, while having yet to become

tangible, *is there* "always and already."[906] As he makes clear in the 1933 speech, he believes that,

because this mission is a spiritual one, it is a historical one too. Consequently, he suggests that

authentic historicality is an imperative condition of (to borrow in cursory critique of this

dissertation's keyword) "recovering" a sovereign state of what is believed to be a homogenous

people with a common historical descent and destiny.[907]

> To become historical is the act within these great powers of existence that are placed in the state. Doing this, the people lay claim to the right to possess the state, to know what it is in itself and the great powers of its existence.… It is only through the state that it is possible to raise ourselves to glory.[908]

Catalyzing such a nation-state is, for Heidegger, the necessary means through which this mission

could come to fruition. He envisions it as a cohesive space wherein its members would

---

[905] Heidegger 2016: 213.
[906] On a very related note, in the notebooks Heidegger identifies the meaning of politics not as "a 'mere' reaction to the extrinsic and typifying self-comparison against other possibilities, circumstances, and eras," but as actually "the political will of the young people" (ibid: 44).
[907] Wolin 36-38.
[908] Farias 1991: 144.

strengthen what he identifies as the "three bonds" of National Socialism: this one that binds "to the spiritual mission of the German Volk"; "the one that binds to the ethnic and national community [*Volksgemeinschaft*]"; and "the one that binds to the honor and the destiny of the nation in the midst of the other peoples of the world."[909]

Included in what we must call into question, then, is how we have been interpreting the potentiality of historizing as a preparatory act of or toward determinate negation (in its sense for critical social theory), which would presuppose a dynamic concept of society alongside a vision of socially democratic communities constituted by relations of self-other recognition. It is quite convincing after all that, for Heidegger, in the act of historizing there inheres no intended possibility of critiquing, toward remodeling, exchange society. Acknowledging that already in 1936 Heidegger had divulged, to Löwith, that "his concept of 'historicity' was the basis of his political 'engagement,'" we have sound reasons to believe that, in *Being and Time*, he understands Dasein's historicality to be only the historical consciousness of the Nazi Party.[910] (We are also compelled, with Jean-Luc Nancy, to determine that Heidegger did not even care to reflect seriously on the historical origins of National Socialism: "This thinker who was so adept at tracing provenances, whether those of the Greek language or those of modern (technical, democratic, calculating) devastation, did not ask himself where anti-Semitism could have come from."[911]) As authentic historicality and historizing entail and are entailed by authentic resoluteness, we need also to consider what the latter specifically means for Heidegger in light of the *Black Notebooks*. We recall that, in *Being and Time*, conscience is said to "manifest itself as

[909] Wolin 1992: 35.
[910] Wolin 1992: 140-143.
[911] Nancy 2017: 27.

the call of care."[912] What exactly is Dasein/"the German" called *toward*? "Pride," a term that

Heidegger, in the notebooks, seems to replace for "authentic resoluteness." "Pride" is

> the mature decisiveness of abiding in one's own essential station, the station arising from one's task; it is the certainty of no longer confusing oneself with something else,[913]

and it represents

> *Will and engagement toward the empowerment of powers*. The attuning insertion of Dasein into the thrusting projection and content of the happening of the people.[914]

Dasein's authentic resoluteness, as Heidegger describes it in *Being and Time*, "is traced to

[Dasein's] primordial roots;"[915] historizing discloses it as Dasein's latent, "superior power."[916] In

the notebooks labeling this idea as "pride," he anticipates its need and possibility to manifest in

projects of impelling other individuals of the same potential "community," of the "same"

historical and futural Dasein, to understand their alleged power of transcending, dehumanizing,

and eradicating (at the very least, the cultural influence of) the socially and "racially" "other."

This all offers an alternative perspective for interpreting Heidegger's contention in *Being and

Time* that "entities other than Dasein which are historical by reason of belonging to the world,

are what we call 'world-historical.'"[917] Juxtaposing the above with recollecting that Heidegger

deems acts of historizing the "world-historical" to be *secondary*, or as occurring only

incidentally as one historizes the historical consciousness of Dasein - we are obliged to concede

the acute likelihood that Heidegger is there discriminating between Dasein as the "spirit" of

National Socialism, and "other entities" that are, by (his) association with "society," of worth to

historizing only insofar as they symbolize a kind of being to which Dasein ("who is German")

can point and thereby name what it fundamentally *is not*. For him, Dasein holds promise for

---

[912] Heidegger 2008a: 322 - italics omitted.
[913] Heidegger 2016: 195.
[914] Ibid: 103 - my italics.
[915] Heidegger 2008a: 429.
[916] Ibid: 436.
[917] Ibid: 433.

becoming authentically historical, whereas "the masses" are "without history."[918] (Without *being* historical, one simply does not meet the conditions of Dasein.) In that case, Adorno's interpretation is correct: the power of negation in Fundamental Ontology is largely demonstrated by a false power of negating, toward reifying and fetishizing, things and other beings, and of affirming, toward reifying fascist consciousness, an idealized, malicious will to freedom. Such freedom would present not as a project in contradicting and remodeling the norms and values of "everyday society," but as one of establishing an insular nation-state, the norms and values of which "pridefully" contradict the "denerating mass" of society as such.[919] (In fact, in a passing remark during his 1933 speech, Heidegger outright opposed truth with "mere" negation.[920]) Also in that case, since the intention of existential analysis would be to lead *this* Dasein to an idealized "world" over and against society, we should find ourselves compelled to reconsider the accuracy of a central premise among *Negative Dialectics*, *Against Epistemology, Jargon of Authenticity*, and *History and Freedom*: that Fundamental Ontology pretends to have an "outside" rather than an "immanent" starting point. "In that way," Adorno explains, "such ontology succumbs to cultural mediations all the more; they recur as social aspects of that ontology's own purity."[921] Additionally "in that way," Fundamental Ontology, as it seeks to fortify an echo chamber for the voices of "authentic" National Socialists, betrays its disinterest in understanding and resisting false consciousness.

Furthermore, insofar as authentic historizing and authentic resoluteness are co-conditioned by authentic temporality, we can reasonably conjecture that, for Heidegger, either primordial time belongs to "the Germans" alone, or, what is much more probable, it is only "the

---

[918] See Heidegger 2016: 84.
[919] See, for example, Heidegger 2016: 127.
[920] See Wolin: 34.
[921] Adorno 2003: 81.

Germans" who are capable of recovering primordial time. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger asks

rhetorically: "What does this restraining empowerment [of authentic resoluteness] presuppose

existentielly?" To which he inevitably answers: "First and last: a change in the understanding of

being! Time!"[922] There he is warranting, as we know, a modal shift that depends on resolving to

think and act beyond the confines of "world-time," or what I have been associating with a form

of commodified time that reflects and manages the values of socio-cultural exchange. In doing

so, I have argued that the act of critiquing exchange society depends on acts of resolve to live as

primordial time, ideally toward making this mode of being a benchmark for everyday experience

on a collective scale; and I have assumed that Heidegger envisions the ability for such acts to be

intrinsic to the being of everyone, as well as for these potential efforts to benefit the well-being

of all who are in-the-world of late capitalist culture. These premises are hard-pressed by the

following dictum in the *Black Notebooks:* "The incomparability of the world's current hour, a

chamber in which German philosophy should strike up and resound."[923] With this, and while

contextualizing it within its horizonal themes, we see that Heidegger reinforces his ongoing

concern with distinguishing "worldly" from "primordial" time, but now appears to tag on to it

concern for the question of precisely *whose* "destiny" it is to successfully take on the task of

recovering authentic temporality as a mundane way of being.

Finally, it is important to note how the *Black Notebooks* problematize our earlier

suggestion that the existential analytic, because it appeals for a return to primordial time, also

appeals for recovering authentic moods and impulses, which would be a vital component of

fostering immanent critique. In *History and Freedom*, Adorno contends that what "we refer to in

---

[922] Heidegger 2008a: 103 - my brackets for clarification.

[923] Heidegger 2016: 80. Although Heidegger does not there stipulate what for him "German philosophy" is precisely (presumably he does not want more Hegelian dialectics, or Kantian morality), this lack, I find, itself suggests that he identifies it strictly with the possibility of putting German philosophy to use for advancing the mission of National Socialism, "a mission rooted in the basic attunement and one constantly reaching higher and broader" (ibid: 81).

pre-scientific discourse as spontaneous action" (or impulse) is "integral to the constitution of

what we [critical theorists] call will and freedom." "In the framework of total planning

characteristic of the culture industry," he continues, "[human beings] are no longer capable of

will, impulse, or spontaneity," but are susceptible to "regressive reactions" that contrast with

impulses coinciding with *mimetic rationality*.[924] Pulling on these of Adorno's (and

Horkheimer's) ideas, in Chapter One I fleshed out the meaning of the "original" relation between

impulse and non-identity thinking, and how this relation is necessary to recognize and practice if

mimetic experience is to be cultivated in its true sense as critical rationality. Throughout this

dissertation as a whole, I have periodically gestured that, for Heidegger, modally shifting to

experience primordial time involves determining to shape one's existence according to this sense

of, and urge for, mimetic "play." A telling passage from the *Black Notebooks* puts this

interpretation into question. Lamenting the loss of "anticipatory impulses and attunements" by

the popularization of National Socialism, which he says had become a "gimmick" for the masses,

Heidegger argues that

> one creates for oneself cognitive circumstances from which one can calculate in a superior way
> that indeed National Socialism actually always already was there and has been prepared. And
> thence one is absolved completely of the basic attunement of assuming a quite new and
> unprecedented spiritual mission.[925]

From this and other relevant passages, we can reasonably infer that Heidegger's concern with

repossessing "impulses and attunements" is only or primarily a concern with realizing this said

"spiritual mission" and *not* with revealing the contingent character of and restructuring the They

by way of supporting all who "are there" to embrace their innate agency via socio-existential

critique. Indeed, Heidegger holds that philosophy is "*for* a volition which is thereby prepared to

---

[924] Adorno 2006: 235 - my brackets for clarification.
[925] Heidegger 2016: 103.

strive for its destiny and to do so deliberately as history," and he concludes that "[it] *must* perhaps disappear from the sphere of the ordinary public claims and needs."[926]

. . .

To be clear, in comparison to these (re)interpretations, I have proposed that the analytic is a heuristic for realizing one's potential for determinate negation as immanent critique. As one is "called" by others to understand the non-being of Being, one transcends "everydayness" *in order to* negatively evaluate socio-institutionally managed values and norms, which presupposes coming to terms with primordial time. Regardless of Dasein's modal status, primordial time conditions the possibility of Dasein's resoluteness for thinking non-identically. When Dasein is anticipatorily resolute, it projects itself toward the ecstacy of its existence, and in doing so it negates the They. I have interpreted this not as Dasein's transcending the cultural traditions of its society by way of denial and isolation, but as its critically negating instances of identity thinking, and its having mostly self-interpreted according to the "world-time" on which administered life runs. This possibility of authentic resoluteness (freedom) depends on a recovery of organic, rational impulse. Heidegger's urging for such a recovery, I have suggested, should be considered in terms similar to that of Adorno's urging for resistance against the supplanting of impulse "by human reflex actions" that mimic the cultural behaviors of commodity exchange, and for repossessing "natural" mimesis as a natural way of encountering the world.[927]

While advancing these ideas, I have deliberately reserved for the end of this writing process more substantial engagements with the *Black Notebooks* and other of Heidegger's

---

[926] Ibid: 203.
[927] Adorno 2006: 235. This issue is also central to *Dialectic of Enlightenment:* "The generality of the ideas built by discursive logic, power in the sphere of the concept, is built on the foundation of power in reality.... The self which learned about order and subordination through the subjugation of the world soon equated truth in general with classifying thought, without whose fixed distinctions it cannot exist. Along with mimetic magic, it tabooed the knowing which really apprehends the object" (Horkheimer and Adorno 2007: 10).

politically charged writings, speeches, and letters from the early 1930s to the late 1940s. I did

this not for reasons of deliberate self-pedagogy, as if I had consciously thought to earmark much

of this closing section for reflecting on these texts in any moderate amount of detail. Rather, I did

it in part because, quite frankly, I knew that engaging these texts earlier would have risked my

willingness or ability to move forward with this project, a project that had been decided on as an

opportunity to explore my long-standing interest in the possible intersections of the assumptions

and practices of existential phenomenology and First Generation Critical Theory. As Heidegger

and Adorno have each largely become the public face of their respective sphere of thought, I

found it sensible to pursue this interest by focusing on their principle tomes. Both have simply

generated new paradigms that continue to frame continental philosophy, and even areas of

analytic philosophy, today.[928] Also for that reason, I had assumed (and for the most part, I still

assume) that attempting to gain proficiency in their ways of thinking could serve as a toolkit of

sorts for grappling with some of philosophy's most essential questions (what constitutes identity,

conceptuality, and knowledge; what are among the effective conditions of social critique and

change) in ways that can inform a wide range of modern-day "situations."[929] Additionally,

despite already having been much aware of Heidegger's anti-Semitism and allegiance to

National Socialism, I have continued to be intrigued by *the Heideggerian notion* of authentic

---

[928] Postmodern philosophy would not have become what it is had there not been opportunities for thinking with and critiquing Heidegger, for instance, nor could experimental phenomenology have taken the forms that it has in the last many decades. Adorno's framework maintains its appeal today, especially for new scholars, and the works of Habermas, Honneth, and Pippin (among others), moreover, are heavily framed by their own implicit and explicit critiques of Adorno et al. More generally, the point I am attempting to make here concerns hermeneutic "repetition"; Heidegger's synthesizing hermeneutics, phenomenology, and ontology, and Adorno's remodeling dialectical materialism, have each resulted in an archetypal set of assumptions and practices that scholars have widely "repeated," even if by way of criticizing them.

[929] For instance, moving through *Being and Time* also from within Adorno's own framework has been valuable for efforts to break through what are always more layers of feminist consciousness. Grappling with Heidegger's specific meaning of "spatiality," in conjunction with Adorno's writings on mimesis, and toward reflecting on the body as its own dedicated site of potentiality, or as a site of "playing" with one's factical, material possibilities, has been particularly valuable to this end. These reflections are included in a separate, developing paper influenced especially by Mechtilde Nagel's and Iris Young's feminist interpretations of the earlier Heidegger.

care, a notion that, though taking different forms, has long preceded and outlived Heidegger himself,[930] and by how it can lend excellently to a variety of frameworks for social and philosophical practice - even if demonstrating this ability would entail infidelity to Heidegger per se by thinking beyond his too-abstract universe, or by refining the meanings or reimagining the functionalities of many of the ideas found therein.

This reason signals and hints at an answer to the time-honored question of whether an intellectual work, or, in Heidegger's case, an entire conceptual paradigm, can or should be considered in separation from the personally political beliefs and actions of its author. Accompanying this question is that of whether it is not unethical to take interest in and draw attention to the work of a morally problematic if not also harmful thinker.[931] Conceding to these moral dilemmas is especially important in view of what had originally been my primary intention for this closing section; namely, to explore if or how modal authenticity is an essential condition of building relationships and communities that, because they are piloted by authentic care, are truly dialogical, or that are based on shared recognition of the particularity and primacy of others. Now, after sitting with much of the *Black Notebooks*, I have found myself compelled to invert this plan and allot a majority of room for signaling opportunities to critique several areas of my critique of Adorno's critique (as I have done above), as well as for broaching this paradox

---

[930] The meaning of friendship in Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics* - i.e., friendship as a non-instrumental relation in which one actively cares whether the virtues (rationality, courage, humility, compassion, e.g.) of others are realized - is our most significant historical example. Today, many thinkers continue to apply Heidegger's notion of authentic care to issues in areas such as educational pedagogy, professional learning, and leadership (e.g., Michael Ehrmantraut, Sandra Wilde, Carolin Kreber, Sevket Benhur Oral, Ann Webster-Wright, Leah Thompkins and Peter Simpson), social work (e.g., Siby George, Timo Harrikari, Pirkko-Liisa Rauhala, Jan Pascal), and digital technology and media studies (e.g., Babette Babich and Theodore Kabouridis). The notion has also taken center stage in new and emerging work on healthcare and especially nursing practices.

[931] In Heidegger's case, this question is made all the more complicated by the fact that there has yet to be clear consensus on the related question of how deeply Heidegger's Nazism runs through the course of *Being and Time*. Tom Rockmore, whose book *On Heidegger's Nazism and Philosophy* gives a remarkably detailed account of Heidegger's reception by intellectual communities after his commitment to the Party became more widely known, recounts six popular views, one of which is "Adorno's extreme view that everything that Heidegger ever said and did was Nazi to the core," and one similar that Rockmore endorses, which holds that "Heidegger's philosophical thought and his Nazism are inseparable" (Rockmore 1997: 282-283).

in Heidegger in which his adherence to anti-Semitic fascist ideology instinctively conflicts with interpreting the notion of authentic care, and the existential analytic that kindles its realization, to provide an ontological template for enhancing the ethicality of being-with. After all, if we can assume that Heidegger understood himself to be modally authentic, and if existential modality is truly comprehensive in nature, then Heidegger must have understood National Socialism's "spiritual mission" to be, for both himself and his fellow "Daseins," an expression of, if not the paragon of, authentic care. We should not sever Heidegger's anti-Semitism from Heidegger the person, nor should or *can* we, after reading the *Black Notebooks*, longer interpret the paradigm of Fundamental Ontology in separation from the notebooks' contents. As Peter Gordon reflects in response to their publication, as soon as Heidegger's anti-Semitism becomes boldly visible anywhere, "it almost immediately becomes visible elsewhere, in fact everywhere or almost everywhere. In that case, the carefully constructed edifice based on the supposed distinction between the man and his thought, or, on the contrary, on their supposed unity, begins to crumble."[932]

What should we make of this paradox? Can we acknowledge it while also proposing that latent in Fundamental Ontology is a substructure of ethical thinking, and to do so without jeopardizing rational coherence and our own moral responsibilities? Although more nuanced deliberations on these matters must be deferred to another paper or discussion, here I briefly suggest how we might come to two kinds of initial, affirmative responses by approaching these questions immanently from within Heidegger's own framework. The second response will streamline into concluding remarks on what one might still gain today from the ideas of authentic care and being-with (and thus from Heidegger's form of existential analysis) while

---

[932] "Prolegomena to Any Future Destruction of Metaphysics: Heidegger and the *Schwarze Hefte*." Mitchell and Trawny 2017: 139.

rebuking their fascist connotations. Both responses will moreover suggest that we need not

necessarily regard this critique of *Being and Time* via the *Black Notebooks* to sharply contradict

many or all of the interpretations proposed in the foregoing chapters of this dissertation, so long

as those interpretations have been sure to rest primarily on concern for the meaning of

existential, socio-ontological hermeneutics.

Continuing his reflections above, Gordon tells us that he is "convinced that Heidegger's

philosophy can no longer present itself for appraisal as an integral whole in the manner of the

grand philosophical systems of the past. Nor can we sustain the old idea of the *maître à penser*

that awards to Heidegger an authoritarian and proprietary control over his own thoughts."[933] I

agree, and I also find these lines to get at the nub of why the "philosopher versus person

question" is so uniquely complex when it comes to Heidegger, for it has very much to do with

his extending Dilthey's (historical) hermeneutics and transposing it into the meaning of Being at

large. As I have argued, hermeneutic phenomenology, because it nurtures non-identity thinking,

is supportive of, or a liaison of, immanent critique. We may think of this in terms of Gadamer's

claim (posed in only partial opposition to Hegel) that "dialectic must retrieve itself in

hermeneutics."[934] For Gadamer and Heidegger, although hermeneutics preserves the Hegelian

phenomenology of dialectic, it uproots the idea that dialectic follows the way of "rational"

progress toward synthesized identity, and replaces it with the idea that dialogical experience is

poised within a "fusion of horizons," that meaning is shaped through variable acts of concealing

and unconcealing,[935] or that getting to truth is a messy process of interpretation (being) that can

only "move in a 'circle.'"[936] Adorno's *negative* dialectic comes close to reaching this temporal

---

[933] Ibid: 145 - my brackets.
[934] Gadamer 2008: 99.
[935] Gadamer 2008: 168-169 (on concealment).
[936] Heidegger 2008a: 362.

309

element that is so distinctive of hermeneutic phenomenology. Mirroring how ("truly rational")

experience unfolds mimetically within moments of non-identity, negative dialectical thinking,

we know, is said to be foremost conditioned by recognition of the object's particularity and

primacy, where this also means by liberation from institutionally arranged time.[937] Its

interpretatively reflexive, "other-oriented" quality is given on both counts. Owing to these

conditions, Adorno's negative dialectic not only bears semblance to hermeneutic

phenomenology (a movement of opening oneself up to non-conceptuality) but, by prioritizing the

objective element alongside what we are calling with Heidegger "primordial time," it accounts

for materiality where the hermeneutic does not.[938] On the other hand, the dialectic, opposing

itself to *Lebensphilosophie*, does not adequately account for the triadic ecstases of lived

experience. This is largely what Gadamer has in mind when he calls on it "to retrieve itself in

hermeneutics." Critical social theory simply needs de(con)structive, hermeneutic

phenomenology on top of (or, as an ontological foundation, below) negative, historical,

dialectical materialism if it is to understand specifically that effective social critique is

encouraged by explicitly acknowledging the temporal contingency of modal shifts, I suggest.

For, if modal authenticity is a condition of such critique, then understanding its ontological

conditions, alongside the socio-epistemological conditions of Adorno's form of determinate

negation, would strengthen understanding of the conditions of performing social criticism

immanently. The real significance of the existential analytic *for* immanent critique is how it

guides the critical interpreter to come viscerally face-to-face with, and thereby to *care* for her

particular situation(s) (and, given the intersubjectivity of Dasein, the situations of others or

---

[937] On Adorno and time, see, for example, Adorno 1981: 27.
[938] Materiality includes the somatic. Dialectic makes examining the conditions of suffering possible.

situations that are collective), that either are or would be realized as candidates for immanent critique.

I draw these comparisons not to chase down tangled questions concerning the relation between hermeneutics and dialectics per se, even though these questions are important and have remained throughout this dissertation as centrally underlying concerns. Given the main intentions of these closing passages, what is still more important to highlight is how authentically resolute Dasein is essentialized by explicitly recovering its self-understanding as hermeneutical, and, for that reason, as a being who recognizes that its lived interpretations are always bound to be incomplete and to misunderstand or be misunderstood. At the bottom of its roots, modal authenticity is defined by Dasein's recognizing the "primary truth" of Being as a hermeneutic unfolding, in which "secondary truth" (i.e., truth of all things ontic) goes perpetually unfulfilled. This is partly what Nicholas Davey points to in what he has recently dubbed "*the truth-effect of hermeneutic failure*," for example.[939]

> There is an unavoidable incommensurability between what a practice seeks or anticipates and the ever-changing circumstances in which a practice applies itself. The point is critical: it suggests that hermeneutic reflexivity and hermeneutic failure are indissociable. The moment interpretive techniques or applied practices fail, hermeneutic reflexivity emerges.… In this moment, the experiencer becomes aware of her experience, she becomes experienced.[940]

As I have argued, Dasein's acknowledgement of the non-identity in identity originally occurs within acts of self-realization as being-toward-death, or in the face of what I have alluded to in Adornian terms as the "ultimate limit-concept." Building on this claim with Davey, we see that Dasein's authentic temporalization is characterized by understanding itself as perpetually doomed to fail in appropriating and expressing full understanding of Being. This is the "emergence" of hermeneutically reflexive moments. Accordingly, Davey continues by

---

[939] Davey 2017: 213.
[940] Ibid.

contending that "[h]ermeneutics here has something in common with Adorno's thought: negative dialectics (hermeneutics) designates a position which includes its own failure, i.e. which produces a truth-effect through its own failure."[941] Indeed, notwithstanding Adorno's insistence that interpreting philosophy as primarily an endeavor in understanding the structures of interpretation runs a high risk of attending to immediacy alone and thus of fortifying false consciousness, this particular way of explicating the meaning of Being as hermeneutics resonates with his central premise that, for the critical subject, "[a]s the concept is experienced as nonidentical, as inwardly in motion, it is no longer purely itself."[942] Interestingly, Adorno, like Heidegger, speaks of this as a "circular" motion, one that is propelled by experiencing a "true" form of temporality that I have proposed substantially reflects Heidegger's idea of authentic temporality as primordially ecstatic: "As a sense of nonidentity through identity, dialectics is not only an advancing process but a retrograde one at the same time. To this extent, the picture of the circle describes it correctly."[943] Against conceiving of meaning production as a process of "complete subjectification," i.e., against reifying it, Adorno acknowledges the necessary failure of (whether mundane or intentional) negative dialectical thinking. For, to put it partly with Heidegger, by virtue of the very *being of time*, or of the negative temporality of existence, critical negation cannot ever be "something positive," something that moves in an orderly, linear progression as it does for Hegel.[944] Instead, it is becoming disillusioned with one's denial of the "radical otherness" of objectivity - in finding oneself disappointed in the limits of autonomous reason and the accuracy of the subject-object binary underlying it - that is responsible for what I have described as "authentic non-identity thinking," that is, resolutely recovering the non-

---

[941] Ibid.
[942] Adorno 1990: 157.
[943] Ibid.
[944] See, for example, ibid: 158-160.

identity of what is "always and already" temporally dialogic interpretation.[945] *"The negative fact that the mind, failing in identification, has also failed in reconcilement, that its supremacy has miscarried, becomes the motor of its disenchantment."*[946]

Thinking of hermeneutic or dialectical thinking as a temporally stretched series of inexorable failures that defines both typical and critically thematic existence is useful for reflecting on both of our two concerns at hand: (1) with whether it is ethically reasonable to continue engaging Heidegger, and (2) with how Heidegger's existential analytic, while motivating negative social critique, may also motivate caring intersubjective relations. I take these concerns to be mutually entailing and the following, preliminarily responses to be mutually informing. With regard to the first concern, I view the "person versus philosopher" question to which it corresponds to be fundamentally a question of whether it is ethical to engage the *Heideggerian paradigm of hermeneutic phenomenology* while also being much aware of Heidegger's anti-Semitism and how the publications of the *Black Notebooks* have proven its influence on at least multiple areas of Heidegger's work. In this particular sense, then, reframing and prioritizing the question as one of "philosophy versus philosopher" would seem more apt. For Gordon is right that "we [cannot] sustain the old idea of the *maître à penser* that awards to Heidegger an authoritarian and proprietary control over his own thoughts."[947] As I have already noted, Heidegger's thinking has long taken on a life of its own, one that has inspired many preeminent frameworks in their own rights.[948] (For example, Levinas's thought was carried through in motivation of what he found to be both positive and negative elements in Husserl,

---

[945] See, for example, ibid: 183-186.
[946] Ibid: 186 – my italics for emphasis.
[947] Mitchell and Trawny 2017: 145 - my brackets.
[948] To historicize for a moment of analogy: we cannot know what science would have been like today were it not for Copernicus, who (not to belabor the point but also to put forward for consideration that Heidegger, fusing phenomenology with existentialism and successfully accounting for the negativity in identity where Brentano and Husserl had not, exceeded Husserl's efforts to complete Kant's "C.R.") quickly became synonymous with "the Copernican Revolution."

313

Sartre, but especially Heidegger. As the wonderful Alphonso Lingis bears in mind: "Without these new developments, his work would have been impossible."[949]) Largely for this reason, I propose *first* that, in the specific case of Heidegger, it is inevitable, rational, and, as Adorno affirms (though I claim the Ontology too is able to affirm) that non-instrumental rationality is inextricable from ethical thinking and praxis, it is thus also not unethical for those working within the continental tradition to continue engaging his paradigm today. While this means that (again, in this case)[950] it would be sound to think along with the philosophy (ontological, hermeneutic phenomenology) but not with the philosopher himself, in doing so one also need not avoid addressing Heidegger's anti-Semitic fascism specifically. On the contrary, I propose that, *second*, recognizing this distinction can be important for efforts to critique Heidegger the person, and areas of the Ontology that are imbued with fascist ideology. Maintaining that Heidegger's thinking no longer belongs to Heidegger himself, Gordon next suggests that "we can no longer present it for appraisal as an integral whole in the manner of the grand philosophical systems of the past," and, again, he is quite right.[951] We cannot continue to engage, or we never should have engaged, the Heideggerian paradigm as a system, and not only because, according to the very precepts of that paradigm, theoretical systems or systematic thinking is to be rejected. More importantly, "thinking with Heidegger" demands now more than ever that scholars critically interpret both the hermeneutic and existential analytic by which the paradigm is defined, *and*

---

[949] For instance, Levinas drew heavily on Heidegger's expressions of the anonymity of the They (Levinas 1991: 236) while also condemning what he, like Adorno, found to be "Being's subordination of existents" (45-48); Being "has lost its face," its naturally-given recognition of alterity (45).

[950] Though not naming them, I would argue a different case for many prominent academics who in recent years have been accused of or formally charged with sexual misconduct or violence, for example. I take grave issue with the quite popular objection that "we don't take the man away from the philosopher in other cases," which is held, for example, by Babette Babich, who has written extensively on the cogency and ethicality of engaging Heidegger in the wake of the *Black Notebooks*. In particular, see "Heidegger's Black Night: The *Nachlass* and Its *Wirkungsgeschichte*" in Mitchell and Trawny 2017 (pp. 59-87) and her talk "Heidegger on Facebook and Twitter: Digital Heidegger, Zombie Texts and Philosophical Porn" (Babich 2016: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bEsYxhTs08o).

[951] Mitchell and Trawny 2017: 145.

Heidegger's (as the individual's) anti-Semitic, fascist ideology that the *Black Notebooks* have determined once and for all are covertly layered in parts of *Being and Time* and many other of his writings and speeches of the same period. Particularly, if we were to carry on this dissertation's interest in thinking Heidegger and Adorno (and, more broadly, existential phenomenology and critical social theory) *together*, our next task would be to pursue immanent critique of this issue. However, to be clear, what I am proposing is that we could do so while also continuing to affirm that ontological, hermeneutic phenomenology simply gets the fundamental conditions of existence right. (Even if we must admit that this accuracy is, to a great extent, instinctively given. After all, for both Heidegger and Adorno, primordial temporality, which gives identity its non-identity, is understood far before thematic analysis begins).

So long as we commit ourselves to critiquing Heidegger's anti-Semitic fascism in addition to carefully acknowledging that "to be" is to be hermeneutic, I find it fair to distinguish the *fundamental* elements of Heidegger's paradigm (e.g., temporal ecstasy, non-being, and being-toward-death, all of which are unavoidably tied to hermeneutics) from those that pertain to Heidegger's personal politics directly. To be sure, we would also need to remain vigilantly open to self-critical reflection, ensuring that we do not let that paradigm become a self-sustaining "totality," by which we would preclude ourselves from the possibility of extrapolating from or revising that paradigm with critical imagination. Nietzsche's urge to de-idealize prominent scholars, which echoes both Adorno's and Heidegger's calls to recover the impulsive, "playful" element of philosophical practice and everyday experience, is particularly relevant to this end: we must always work against idealizing scholars and "play at being *philosophers*" ourselves by "creating values" while partaking in *mutual, experimental* dialogue with those scholars.[952]

---

[952] Nietzsche 2002: 93-95 (BGE §6) – original italics.

Similarly, we would need to remain aware of philosophy's recursive appeal to expose the "truth-effect of hermeneutic failure," or what Adorno refers to as the "*fragility of truth*" in dialectical thinking.[953] Exegetical interpretation that is based on such awareness - just as critical hermeneutic thinking is - minimizes risks of reifying the author of a text, a text itself, or our relations to a text as evaluative interpreters. Essentially, this means that we would need to heed Adorno's appeal to "not play the game" of presenting or choosing either/or answers to questions of truth.[954] Accepting binary sets of choices (true/false, yes/no, and, what is most pertinent in our case, right/wrong) hazards reverting to the traditional subject-object dichotomy, and insofar as adhering to that dichotomy is a condition of reification, accepting such choices is thus also to hazard reifying the philosophical matter under consideration.[955] It is to render authentic non-identity thinking a nonviable possibility.

To bring this back more directly to our specific concern at hand, distinguishing the Heideggerian paradigm from Heidegger the person by means of recognizing the "fragility" and "failure" of hermeneutic thinking, and, on that basis, by resisting susceptibilities to reify either that paradigm or person, is a way to spur along efforts to immanently critique one or both of them. And, importantly, Heidegger's existential analytic is a heuristic for facilitating immanent

---

[953] Adorno 1990: 33.

[954] Ibid: 32. To be certain, the aim of recalling this appeal is not to use Adorno's words unfairly in attempt to defend what would indeed be the unfair (and horrific) position that it is ethical to justify Heidegger - the person, the political agent - unconditionally or on *any* grounds. Nor do I recall it to pose any *categorical* answers to the question of the ethicality of engaging Heidegger's paradigm, not the least of all because, first, there is no doubt that there are routes to realizing authentic resoluteness, negative social critique, and authentically hermeneutic thinking other than Heidegger's existential analytic; and, second, as Adorno's appeal itself in part implies, interpretation is always subject to change, especially as the interpreter participates in dialogue with others over time (i.e., my own reflections on the issue here may later change course). The aim, rather, is simply and tentatively to suggest that Heidegger scholars who choose to no longer engage with the particular *Heideggerian idea* of hermeneutics on the sole basis that Heidegger's hermeneutic interpretations as a personally political agent had indeed failed dangerously, might consider how they, in doing so, might risk reifying that idea, and how the consequences of that risk might contradict their own commitments to candidly exploring the nature of existence as hermeneutics in what is the very compelling Heideggerian fashion.

[955] Adorno construes the meaning of "responsibility, and specifically, whether or not someone should be construed as "being responsible," to be closely tied to this choice of accepting or rejecting either/or answers.

critique, I have argued. By uncovering the meaning of Being as hermeneutics, it nurtures recognition of the non-identity in identity, and thus motivates critical negation of the conditions and effects of structurally ideological thinking. While acknowledging that the details of this prospective argument must be reserved for another space and time, I leave this first concern by suggesting that Heidegger's form of existential analysis lays the groundwork for potentially critiquing, in Adorno's fashion, the particular conditions that gave rise to Heidegger's anti-Semitic fascism (and anti-Semitic fascism more widely), or even the paradigm of ontological hermeneutics, as one sees fit. (This would foremost involve carrying out acts of historizing, which I will broach shortly.) Whereas Adorno follows both veins of critique in his polemic against Heidegger, he neglects how supportive the Heideggerian approach to existential analysis is to endeavors in critical social theory.

Our second concern pertains to the question of whether it is rational and ethical to propose that a substructure of ethical thinking is latent in Fundamental Ontology, while also conceding that Heidegger was a morally dangerous person. Although my (here abridged) response serves more generally to propose that the existential analytic, by way of promoting recognition of non-identity thinking and participation in immanent critique, promotes the conditions for caring intersubjective relations, my response also continues to inform my proposal above that, especially since Heideggerian thinking has long exceeded Heidegger himself, it is inevitable, rational, and thus not unethical to continue to engage it. In fact, such engagement might be, indirectly, an ethical act in itself, for by virtue of "the truth-effect of hermeneutic failure," it opens up opportunities not just for negatively critiquing Heidegger's fascism, but for identifying instances where his fascism appears to inflect his work, and to reinterpret their corresponding passages according to (as Nietzsche would have it) "one's own values." (After all,

as I have pointed out, understanding and valuing the hermeneutics of thinking/being entails

recognizing and intending to resist reifying objects and consciousness, among which must

include the Heideggerian paradigm and one's interpretative relation with it.) In its much broader

form, the idea I wish to put forward for both tentative and future consideration is that, given how

Heidegger's analytic sets the existential conditions for and facilitates recognition of the need and

possibility for immanent critique, and thus because it itself can help to motivate critique of the

historical conditions of forms of social domination and violence such as anti-Semitic fascism, it

also provides an onto-existential basis for understanding the conditions and possibilities of

ethically being-with-others.

The example to take in following our concern is, of course, how one might draw out (and

how many scholars have already drawn out)[956] some of the concrete implications of *being* or

being with as authentic care, implications which Heidegger certainly modeled neither publicly as

a political thinker nor explicitly within his Ontology. While I will broach a few of these

implications, I do so from within this more discrete aim of proposing that the existential analytic,

as it supports or prepares for negative social criticism, is *for that particular reason* conducive to

realizations of ethical relations. To advance a cursory version of this proposal, I briefly recount a

few main components of Heidegger's thinking on being-with and (what he only quickly and

loosely describes to be) its connectedness with authentic resoluteness. In Section 26 of *Being and

Time*'s Division I, where Heidegger describes the everydayness of being-with, he remarks that

"even if Others become themes for study, as it were, in their own Dasein, they are not

---

[956] Some convincing attempts include Joanna Hodge, who argues that an ethics of intersubjectivity is latently central to *Being and Time* (Hodge 1995), Werner Marx, who claims that authentically being-toward-death cultivates a sense of solidarity with others (Marx 1987 and 1992), Frederick Olafson, who interprets Heidegger to locate at the basis of being-with a moral appeal to social responsibility and trust (Olafson 1998), and Lawrence Hatab, who contends that recognition of authentic being-with precedes (rather than proceeds from) Dasein's coming to terms with its guilt (Hatab 2000). Other notable examples include several essays in Nancy J. Holland and Patricia Huntington 2001, as well as texts by Rudy Visker (2009), François Raffoul (2010), and K.M Stroh (2015). We may also interpret Levinas's writings partly as attempts to draw out these sorts of implications.

encountered as person-Things present-at-hand: we meet them 'at work,' that is, primordially in their Being-in-the-world."[957] We may interpret this to mean that, while the character of mundane Dasein is not to reify others, it is nevertheless to typically relate to them in instrumental terms. This character corresponds to Dasein's *inauthentic mode of solicitude*, which "is to a large extent determinative for Being with one another, and pertains for the most part to our concern with the ready-to-hand." From within this mode, when Dasein seeks to help others, it "leaps in" for them, "[taking] away 'care.'"[958] For, as inauthentic, it has yet to self-realize as potentiality-for-Being, or, more accurately, it has yet to realize the potentiality-for-Being of *anyone* who "is there" (first because "an isolated 'I' without Others" is never "proximally given").[959] Consequently, it is not part of Dasein's average tendency to foster the well-being of others *by* helping them to help themselves, which would ultimately and ideally mean by encouraging others to self-recognize as temporally ecstatic, as being-toward-death, as constituted by non-being, and therefore as potentiality-for-Being. To take a plain example, a philosophy instructor who may be in need of improvement on their pedagogical style might provide a student with a direct and thorough answer to the question of what Husserl means by "horizons" rather than supporting that student to arrive at the answer on their own via phenomenologically hermeneutic reflection. Indeed, what Heidegger means by authentic care is essentially a matter of pedagogy, whether within or beyond formalized instructor-student relations.[960]

In Division II of *Being and Time*, Heidegger shifts his concern to disclosing how Dasein, as it comes to critically understand the both necessary *and* essential character of the They,

---

[957] Heidegger 2008a: 156.
[958] Ibid: 158 – my brackets.
[959] Ibid: 152.
[960] I cite this line quite reluctantly, as it is from the *Black Notebooks*, but I find it meaningful given my suggestions here and below: "*To lead* means to educate others toward autonomy and self-responsibility; and *to lead spiritually* means to educate others for leadership and to awaken their creative powers" (Heidegger 2016: 101).

reveals to itself the possibility of being as authentic care. As I have argued in both Chapter Three

and the earlier sections of this chapter, Dasein's distinguishing the ontological conditions of its

existence (among which is the They as a necessary structure) from the social conditions of its

existence (which reflect the They as a contingent structure) precipitates its realization of the need

for social critique that is driven by understanding the non-identity in identity. Significantly,

Dasein's registering its capability to negate its ordinary interpretations of the They as an

ahistorical and inexorable set of institutional practices and norms is what motivates it to explore

how it may be in-the-world differently; i.e., to discover its possibilities for embracing forms of

modal authenticity. When Dasein *is* modally authentic, it rhythmically renews its resolution to

de-normalize instrumentality as that which has "primarily and for the most part" determined its

relationality, and in doing so it affirms its potential as a socially critical agent. Authenticity is co-

defined by Dasein's anticipatory readiness to negate the appearing "totality" of the They,

towards de-reifying its consciousness and critiquing cultural exchange. Although Heidegger

points to this necessary connection but only in brief, alongside disclosing the possibility of

modifying how it relates to "objectivity," Dasein discloses the possibility of modifying how it

projects itself intersubjectively. Specifically, it comes to explicitly understand, and value, how

others too are structured by potentiality-for-Being.[961]

> [T]his authentic disclosedness modifies with equal primordiality both the way in which the
> 'world' is discovered … and the way in which the Dasein-with of Others is disclosed. The
> 'world' which is ready-to-hand does not become another one 'in its content', nor does the circle
> of Others get exchanged for a new one; but both one's Being towards the ready-to-hand
> understandingly and concernfully, and one's solicitous Being with Others, are now given a
> definite character in terms of their ownmost potentiality-for-Being-their-Selves.[962]

---

[961] In this way, Heidegger, I suggest, remains too closely tied with Husserl's notion of "analogizing apprehension,"
which is essentially an act in which the subject "proves" the existence of other minds by posing a series of analogies
with her own (embodied) experience. On the other hand, as Heidegger is clearly interested in laying out the
Ontology programmatically, it is understandable why he would find the need to frame the issue as such.
[962] Heidegger 2008a: 152.

As "solicitously" being-with, Dasein responds to its primordial "responsibility for the other's becoming," or for caring authentically for the other (a claim on which Heidegger does not sufficiently expand).[963] Rather than "leaping in" for the other, it "*leap[s] ahead* of him, not in order to take away 'care' from him, but to first give it back to him as such." [964] That is, Dasein attempts to motivate the other to undertake existential analysis to viscerally discover their onto-existential conditions and thus their opportunities for being authentically "free" themselves. À la Nietzsche, in *On the Essence of Truth* Heidegger frames authentic care in terms of Dasein's understanding that, as thrown facticity, Dasein is "called" to "continually [supply itself] with new standards." In contrast to when it is inauthentic, Dasein is here concerned with "considering the ground for taking up those standards or the essence of what gives the standard," while it also grasps that it would be "mistaken [to] take himself, as subject, to be the standard for all beings."[965] Together, these are the two main elements that constitute being as authentic care. Dasein resolves (1) to critically interpret *why* and *how* it chooses to adopt a particular belief and carry out a particular corresponding act, and (2) to guide others to do the same *while* respecting, and engaging in rational discourse about, what they choose to believe and do when these choices diverge from Dasein's own. Accordingly, the essential meaning of authentically being-with lies in resoluteness for valuing, as Heidegger puts it in his 1927 lecture course, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, how "the *realm of ends* is the *being-with-one-another*, the *commercium of persons* as such, and therefore the realm of freedom…. An end is an existing person; the realm of ends is the with-one-another of the existing persons themselves."[966] Liberating its habits from exchange values, Dasein relates to others not as those who "show up," within its mundane

---

[963] Heidegger 2010: 260.
[964] Ibid: 115.
[965] Heidegger 2008c: 132 – my brackets for clarity.
[966] Heidegger 1982: 139.

environment(s) typified by equipmentality, as means for fulfilling "work." Rather, it seeks to relate to others in their particularities and encourage them to "free" themselves from commodified time.

As embedded in these elements of experience, authentic being-with is further characterized by Dasein's recognition of the need and possibility for advancing *purposeful intersubjective discourse*. (Here I am building on Heidegger to draw out these ideas explicitly.) Understanding that it need not limit itself to, and that there are intellectual and ethical limits to, the "chattering" discourse of the They, Dasein's resoluteness to be with others as authentic care involves determining to make the most of its time with others, and to give others opportunities for making the most of their time with it. For, modal authenticity is impelled by candid awareness of the finitude of time and, consequently, of thinking. This entails that Dasein not only respects the time of others as much as it respects its own, but, as we have seen, that it recognizes the finitude of hermeneutic existence in itself, that its "understanding" is never finished, and, because authentic Dasein has come to terms with the fact that one "is there" always and already as social collectivity, that "understanding" is at its best when it is appropriated in dedicated collaboration with others. Largely for these reasons, Dasein's authentically being-with ultimately manifests, quite Socratically, as care for the pursuit of truth within caring and careful dialogue. As Heidegger hints in the passage above, while this may or may not imply changes to *the content* of Dasein's relations with others, it most certainly necessitates changes to *the form* in which those relations unfold. And, while the form that Dasein chooses its relations to take may vary across particular situations or over time, it always at least rests on a basic set of values that oppose the values of exchange society, including openness to experience (which is channeled through Dasein's self-understanding as temporally ecstatic), intellectual humility (Dasein

acknowledges the finitude and thus the failure of hermeneutic thinking), and "letting the other be" who they are or want to be (Dasein meets its innate responsibility to foster the other's own being as authentically caring).

Significantly, as authentically being-with *toward* a collective pursuit of truth, Dasein's care is additionally comprised by resoluteness for *authentic co-historizing*. If Dasein "exists essentially in Being-with-Others," its historicality is inevitably informed by the social discourse in which it participates.[967] This is most apparent in the "call" of Dasein's conscience or to Dasein's primordial responsibility. In Chapter Three, I argued that "They" are the others with whom Dasein shares a (whether general or particular) socio-cultural framework who both refer and are referred to by the call. Now we understand this event in terms of Dasein's socially relational care; that is, Dasein is "called" to engage in meaningful, critical discourse, motivating desire to determine with others the historical conditions of their collective "world" toward discerning what are their collectively own possibilities. While I regret the absence of space and time to flesh out some of the potentially concrete implications of this event here, I at least wish to tentatively suggest that this "call" to authentic co-historizing occasions collective attempts to realize more just communities.[968] Toward exploring this idea, we would choose to renounce, but still engage, the elements of the Ontology that contradict the practicability of these particular forms of relations and resolutions. Such a project would involve critiquing and abandoning Heidegger's claim that authentic co-historizing is fundamentally an endeavor in retrieving the *"destiny"* of a community, clear reasons for which have been given in the earlier passages of this

---

[967] Heidegger 2008a: 436.
[968] In *Ethics and Finitude: Heideggerian Contributions to Moral Philosophy,* Lawrence Hatab intimates that the "call" is both referred to by others and provokes efforts toward achieving ethical communities grounded in democratic ideals: "Human existence displays an intrinsic capacity for ethical responsibility, construed as a primal, ecstatic openness-to-others-that-matters. Such responsiveness to others is the existential source of obligation, conscience, and guilt, which generate the claim of ethics. Such a claim cannot collapse into communalism, however, because part of responsibility is letting others be, measured by the obligatory openness and singularity of the human person" (Hatab 2000: 196).

section. "*Only in communicating and in struggling does the power of destiny become free.*"[969]

However right Heidegger is to at least implicitly correlate the possibility of patiently partaking in critical discourse on the one hand, and the possibility of freedom (authentic resoluteness) on the other,[970] from the *Black Notebooks* we know for whom he had envisioned that freedom, that "realization of destiny," specifically to be. That we are able to choose to critique and renounce the anti-Semitic ideology that inheres in his notion of authentic co-historizing, while also choosing to embrace how the idea of authentic, intersubjective care entails shared analysis of societal structures that engender false consciousness of communal powers to enact social critique and change, points us back to the concern of whether it is ethically rational to continue taking Heidegger or his paradigm seriously.

What I have been provisionally proposing here inflects my preceding proposal for an affirmative response to that concern. Not at all ignoring Heidegger's anti-Semitic influence on what has become for us the Heideggerian *paradigm*, that paradigm teaches us to comprehend how, as inspirited by hermeneutic facticity, we are always in an experiential position to amend our own interpretations, our interpretations of another, or another's interpretations in us. We do not need Heidegger to have personally valued or to have put into practice the ethical implications of authentic being-with to be moved by the existential analytic and the self-realizations it engenders, nor do we need this to refine and develop his framework within our own distinct philosophical affairs.[971] As Husserl reminds us, the ideal of philosophy, and of phenomenology

---

[969] Heidegger 2008a: 436.

[970] R.P. Buckley pointedly interprets the issue as such: "A community historizes in that it goes back to its own past as the ground of authentic possibility for that community. For Heidegger, communal historizing only takes place through participation and struggle. Only by entering into dialogue and conflict with the others who share the horizons can a community historize" (Buckley 2012: 177).

[971] To take another tricky example, Heidegger writes in "What is Metaphysics?" that "[a]nother possibility of such manifestation [of modal indifference] is concealed in our joy in the presence of the Dasein - and not simply of the person - of a human being whom we love" (Heidegger 1998: 87). There he suggests that modal authenticity entails rediscovery of what we could call "primal love," or a naturally comprehensive kind of love that finds meaning and

in particular, is to be for everybody, and in their own way: "'*Reflection' of any kind* has the characteristic of being a *modification of a consciousness* and, moreover, a modification which essentially *any consciousness* can undergo."[972] For us, the Heideggerian approach to critical phenomenological reflection should not lie beyond that ideal.

---

expression in forms that are oppositional to doctrinal truths. Connecting this, first, with the notion of authentically being-with as *holistic* care (i.e. how, with unbounded resolve and an eye toward time, Dasein rationally and tenderly bodes to all of its social encounters), and, second, with the fact that Heidegger was an anti-Semitic, racist (and sexist) fascist, it would, needless to say, be extraordinarily unreasonable to suppose that Heidegger truly believed or practiced the idea that modal authenticity engenders something like "primal love" for all others. But does this mean that we do not or cannot find this relation of love and understood temporality to be true in our own lives and reflections? What do our, not Heidegger's, experiences of self-temporalization and loving care intuitively tell us? (For me, Rainer Maria Rilke, and bell hooks (with Erich Fromm), each nearly sums authentic care up):

"For one human being to love another: that is perhaps the most difficult of all our tasks: the ultimate, the last test and proof, the work for which all other work is but preparation…. Love is at first not anything that means merging, giving over, and uniting with another (for what would a union be of something unclarified and unfinished, still subordinate--?), it is a high inducement to the individual to ripen, to become something in himself, *to become word and to become world for himself for another's sake"* (Rilke 1993: 41).

"To bring a love ethic to every dimension of our lives, our society would need to embrace change. At the end of *The Art of Loving*, Erich Fromm affirms that "important and radical changes are necessary, if love is to become a social and not a highly individualistic, marginal phenomenon." Individuals who choose to love can and do alter our lives in ways that honor the primacy of a love ethic. We do this … by choosing to work with individuals we admire and respect; by committing to give our all to relationships" (hooks 2001: 85).

[972] Husserl 1983: 178 (§148).

325

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, Theodor W. *Against Epistemology: A Metacritique*. Translated by Willis Domingo. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1984.

———. *Kierkegaard: Construction of the Aesthetic*. Translated by Robert Hullot-Kentor. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

———. *Negative Dialectics*. Translated by E.B. Ashton. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Hegel: Three Studies. Translated by Shierry Weber Nicholsen. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1993.

———. *Aesthetic Theory*. Translated by Robert Hullot-Kentor. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 1997.

———. *Metaphysics: Concepts and Problems*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann. Stanford: Polity Press, 2000.

———. *The Adorno Reader*. Edited by Brian O'Connor. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2000.

———. *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. Edited by J.M. Bernstein. New York: Routledge, 2001.

———. *Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. Rodney Livingstone. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.

———. *Jargon of Authenticity*. Translated by Knut Tarnowski. New York: Routledge, 2003.

———. *Minima Moralia: Reflections From a Damaged Life*. Translated by E.F.N Jephcott. London: Verso, 2005.

———. *History and Freedom: Lectures 1964-1965*. Translated by Rolf Tiedemann. Stanford: Polity Press, 2006.

———. *Lectures on Negative Dialectics: Fragments of a Lecture Course 1965/1966* Malden: Polity Press, 2008.

Alber, Karl. *Martin Heidegger im Gespräch*. Freiburg und München: Verlag Karl Alber, 1970.

Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly

Review Press, 2001.

Aho, Kevin. "Why Heidegger is Not an Existentialist: Interpreting Authenticity and Historicity in *Being and Time*." *Florida Philosophical Review* 3, no. 2 (2003): 5-22.

———. *Heidegger's Neglect of the Body*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2010.

Babich, Babette. "Heidegger on Facebook and Twitter: Digital Heidegger, Zombie Texts and Philosophical Porn." https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bEsYxhTs08o. 2016.

Bambach, Charles. *Heidegger, Dilthey, and the Crisis of Historicism*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Barash, Jeffrey Andrew. *Martin Heidegger and the Problem of Historical Meaning*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2003.

Benjamin, Walter. *Selected Writings, Volume 1: 1913-1926*. Edited by Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1999.

———. "On the Program of the Coming Philosophy." Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, 1: 1913–1926. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Bernstein, Richard. *The Fate of Art: Aesthetic Alienation from Kant to Derrida and Adorno*. University Park: Pennsylvania State Press, 1992.

———. *Adorno: Disenchantment and Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Blattner, William D. *Heidegger's Being and Time: A Reader's Guide (1st edition)*. London, New York: Continuum, 2006.

Bowie, Andrew. *Adorno and the Ends of Philosophy*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013.

Braman, Brian J. *Meaning and Authenticity: Bernard Lonergan and Charles Taylor on the Drama of Authentic Human Existence*, 2008.

Brentano, Franz. *Psychology from An Empirical Standpoint*. Translated by Tim Crane. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Brody, Richard. "What Does it Matter if Heidegger Was Anti-Semitic?" *The New Yorker*. *https://www.newyorker.com/culture/richard-brody/why-does-it-matter-if-heidegger-was-anti-semitic*. 2014.

Brogan, Walter. *Heidegger and Aristotle: The Twofoldness of Being*. Albany: State

University of New York Press, 2012.

Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Touchstone, 1970.

Buckley, R.P. *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Crisis of Philosophical Responsibility*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2012.

Burke, Donald and Colin J. Campbell. *Adorno and the Need in Thinking: New Critical Essays*. Toronto: Toronto University Press Incorporated, 2007.

Calarco, Matthew. *Zoographies: The Question of the Animal from Heidegger to Derrida*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Cook, Deborah. *Adorno on Nature*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Crowell, Steven. *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Space of Meaning: Paths Toward Trancendental Phenomenology*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2001.

Capobianco, Richard. *Engaging Heidegger*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011.

Crétien, Jean-Louis. *The Call and the Response*. Translated by Anne A. Davenport. New York: Fordham University Press, 2004.

Dahlstrom, Daniel O. "Scheler's Critique of Heidegger's Fundamental Ontology." In *Max Scheler's Acting Persons: New Perspectives*. Edited by Stephen Schneck. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002.

———. *Heidegger's Concept of Truth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Dallmayr, Fred. *Between Freiburg and Frankfurt: Toward a Critical Ontology*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1991.

———. "Adorno and Heidegger." Review of *Adorno und Heidegger: Untersuchung Einer Philosophischen Kommunikationsverweigerung,* by Hermann Mörchen. *Diacritics* 19, no. 3/4, Heidegger: Art and Politics (1989): 82-100.

Davey, Nicholas. "The (impossible) Future of Hermeneutics." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 48, no. 3 (2017): 209-221.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Spirit: Heidegger and the Question*. Translated by Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Descartes, René. *Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy, 4th edition*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1999.

Dilthey, Wilhelm. *Selected Works, Volume III: The Formation of the Historical World in the Human Sciences*. Edited by Rudolf A. Makkreel and Frithjof Rodi. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Dreyfus, Hubert. "Overcoming the Myth of the Mental: How Philosophers Can Profit from the Phenomenology of Everyday Expertise." *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 79, no. 2 (2005), 47-65.

Dreyfus, Hubert and Paul Rabinow. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Dreyfus, Hubert and and Mark Wrathall. *Heidegger Reexamined*. *Volume I: Dasein, Authenticity, and Death*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Düttmann, Alexander Garcia. *The Memory of Thought: An Essay on Heidegger and Adorno*. Translated by Nicholas Walker. New York, London: Continuum, 2002.

Eriksen, Niels Nymann. *Kierkegaard's Category of Repetition*. Copenhagen: Søren Kierkegaard Research Centre, 2000.

Farias, Victor. *Heidegger and Nazism*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.

Føllesdal, Dagfinn. "Husserl's Notion of Noema." *The Journal of Philosophy* 66, no. 20, Sixty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division (1969): 680-687.

Freyenhagen, Fabian. *Adorno's Practical Philosophy: Living Less Wrongly*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Foster, Roger. *Adorno: The Recovery of Experience*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007.

Fritsche, Johannes. *Historical Destiny and National Socialism in Heidegger's Being and Time*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Translated by David E. Linge. Oakland: University of California Press, 2008.

———. *Truth and Method*. Translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. London, New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011.

Gallagher, Shaun. *Hegel, History, and Interpretation*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.

Garbrecht, Oliver. *Rationalitätskritik der Moderne: Adorno und Heidegger*. München:

Herbert Utz Verlag, 1999.

Gregory, Wanda Torres. *Heidegger's Path to Language*. London: Lexington Books, 2016.

Hancock, Ralph. *The Responsibility of Reason: Theory and Practice in a Liberal-Democratic Age*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2011.

Hatab, Lawrence J. *Ethics and Finitude: Heideggerian Contributions to Moral Philosophy*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000.

Haugeland, John. *Dasein Disclosed: John Haugeland's Heidegger*. Edited by Joseph Rouse. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Heidegger, Martin. *Der Spiegel* Interview. 1966. Translated by Richardson, W. In *Heidegger: The Man and the Thinker*. Edited by Sheehan, T. Chicago: Precedent Publishing, 1981.

———. *Discourse on Thinking*. Translated by John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

———. *On the Way to Language*. Translated by Peter D. Hertz. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

———. *The End of Philosophy*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.

———. *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Translated by Albert Hofstadter. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1975.

———. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Translated by William Lovitt. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

———. *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*. Translated by Albert Hofstadter. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.

———. *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena*. Translated by Theodore Kisiel. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

———. *The Principle of Reason*. Translated by Reginald Lilly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

———. *Heraclitus Seminar*. With Eugene Fink. Translated by Charles H. Seibert. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1993.

———. *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*. Translated by Richard Taft. Bloomington:

Indiana University Press, 1997.

———. *Pathmarks*. Edited by William McNeill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

———. *Ontology - The Hermeneutics of Facticity*. Translated by John van Buren. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999.

———. *Introduction to Metaphysics*. Translated by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

———. *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*. Translated by William McNeill and Nicholas Walker. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001.

———. *Identity and Difference*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2002.

———. *The Essence of Human Freedom: An Introduction to Philosophy*. Translated by Ted Sadler. London, New York: Continuum, 2005.

———. *Being and Time*. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper Perennial Classics, 2008 (2008a).

———. *Towards the Definition of Philosophy*. Translated by Ted Sadler. London: Continuum, 2008 (2008b).

———. *Basic Writings*. Edited by David Farrell Krell. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Thought, 2008 (2008c).

———. *Ontology: The Hermeneutics of Facticity*. Translated by John van Buren. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008 (2008d).

———. *Being and Time*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. Albany, State University of New York Press, 2010.

———. *Bremen and Freiburg Lectures*. Translated by Andrew J. Mitchell. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012.

———. *The Event*. Translated by Richard Rojcewicz. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

———. *Ponderings II-VI: Black Notebooks 1931-1938*. Translated by Richard Rojcewicz. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 2016.

———. *Ponderings VII-XI: Black Notebooks 1938-1939*. Translated by Richard

Rojcewicz. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 2017.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by
  A.V Miller. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

———. *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*. Translated by H.B. Nisbet. Cambridge:
  Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Fritz Heinemann, *Existenzphilosophie - lebendig oder tot*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1954.

Helmling, Stephen. *Adorno's Poetics of Critique*. London, New York: Continuum, 2011.

Hodge, Joanna. *Heidegger and Ethics*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Holland, Nancy J., and Patricia Huntington. *Feminist Interpretations of Martin
  Heidegger*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001.

hooks, bell. *All About Love: New Visions*. New York: HarperCollins, 2001.

Honneth, Axel. *Pathologies of Reason: On the Legacy of Critical Theory*. Translated by
  James Ingram et al. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Horkheimer, Max. *Eclipse of Reason*. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Edited by Gunzelin
  Schmid Noerr. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press,
  2007.

Huhn, Tom. *The Cambridge Companion to Adorno*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
  Press, 2004.

Hulatt, Owen. "Normative Impulsivity: Adorno on Ethics and the Body." *International
  Journal of Philosophical Studies* 22, no. 5 (2014): 676-695.

Husserl, Edmund. *The Crisis of the European Sciences*. Translated by David Carr.
  Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

———. *Cartesian Meditations*. Translated by Dorian Cairns. Norwell: Kluwer Academic
  Publishers, 1977.

———. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological
  Philosophy: First Book*. Translated by F. Kersten. Norwell: Kluwer Academic
  Publishers, 1983.

Jameson, Fredric. *Late Marxism: Adorno, Or, the Persistence of the Dialectic*. London,
  Brooklyn, Verso Books, 1990

Jay, Martin. "The Concept of Totality in Lukács and Adorno." *Telos: Critical Theory of the Contemporary*, no. 32 (1977): 117-137.

Kafka, Franz. *The diaries: 1910-1923*. New York: Schocken Books, 1948.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Norman Kemp Smith. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.

Kierkegaard, Søren. *The Concept of Dread*. Translated by Walter Lowrie. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

―――. *Søren Kierkegaard's Journals and Papers: Soren Kierkegaard's Journals and Papers, Vol. 5: Autobiographical, Part 1: 1829-1848*. Translated by Howard V. Hong. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978.

―――. *Papers and Journals: A Selection*. Translated by Alastair Hannay. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1996.

―――. *The Sickness Unto Death*. Trans. Alastair Hannay. New York: The Penguin Group, 2004.

―――. *Kierkegaard's Writings, XV: Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits*. Edited by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Kompridis, Nikolas. "Heidegger's Challenge and the Future of Critical Theory." *Habermas: A Critical Reader*. Edited by Peter Dews. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.

Kosík, Karel. *Dialectics of the Concrete: A Study on Problems of Man and World*. Translated by Karel Kovanda and James Schmidt. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 2012.

Lapointe, François. "The Anglo-American Response to Edmund Husserl: A Bibliographic Essay." *Man and World* 12, no. 2 (1979): 205-245.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1991.

―――. *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1998.

Long, Christopher P. and Richard A. Lee, Jr. "Between Reification and Mystification: Rethinking the Economy of Principles." *Telos* 120 (2001): 92-112.

Lotz, Christian. "Reification through Commodity Form or Technology? From Honneth Back to Heidegger and Marx." *Rethinking Economics: A Journal of Economics,*

Culture, and Society 25, no. 2 (2013): 184-200.

Löwith, Karl. "My Last Meeting with Heidegger in Rome." 1936. *New German Critique* 45, Special Issue on Bloch and Heidegger (1988): 115-116.

Lukács, Georg. *History and Class Consciousness*. Translated by Rodney Livingstone. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1972.

———. *The Theory of the Novel*. Translated by Anna Bostock. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1974.

MacDonald, Iain. "Returning to the 'House of Oblivion': Celan Between Adorno and Heidegger." *Adorno and Literature*. Edited by David Cunningham and Nigel Mapp. New York, London: Continuum, 2006.

———. "What is, is more than it is: Adorno and Heidegger on the Priority of Possibility." *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 19, no. 1 (2011): 31-57.

MacDonald, Iain, and Ziarek Krzysztof. *Adorno and Heidegger: Philosophical Questions*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008.

Malpas, Jeff. "Assessing the significance of Heidegger's *Black Notebooks*." *Geographica Helvetica* 73, no. 1 (2018): 109-114.

Marcuse, Herbert. 1971. *Essay on Liberation*. Boston: Beacon Press.

———. *One Dimensional Man*. Translated by Douglas Kellner. Boston: Beacon Press, 1991.

———. *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory*. Amherst: Humanity Books, 1999.

———. *Heideggerian Marxism*. Edited by Richard Wolin and John Abromeit. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. "The German Ideology, Part I." *The Marx-Engels Reader, 2ⁿᵈ edition*. Edited by Robert C. Tucker. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1978.

Marx, Karl. *Capital, volume 1*. Translated by Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1990.

———. *Early Writings*. Translated by Gregor Benton. New York: Penguin Classics, 1992.

———. *Grundrisse*. Translated by Martin Nicolaus. New York: Penguin Classics, 1993.

Marx, Werner. *Is There a Measure on Earth? Foundations for a Nonmetaphysical Ethics*. Translated by Thomas J. Nelson and Reginald Lilly. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

———. *Towards a Phenomenological Ethics: Ethos and the Life-World*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1992.

May, Rollo. *The Meaning of Anxiety*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1996.

McCarthy, Thomas. "Heidegger and Critical Theory." *In Ideals and Illusions: On Reconstruction and Deconstruction in Contemporary Critical Theory*. Edited by Thomas McCarthy. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991.

McManus, Denis. *Heidegger, Authenticity and the Self: Themes From Division Two of Being and Time*. New York: Routledge, 2014.

McWhorter, Ladelle and Gail Stenstad. *Heidegger and the Earth: Essays in Environmental Philosophy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Mill, John Stuart. *An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy*. 1865. BiblioLife, LLC, 2009.

Mitchell, Andrew and Peter Trawny. *Heidegger's Black Notebooks: Responses to Anti-Semitism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017.

Moran, Demot. "What Does Heidegger Mean by the Transcendence of Dasein?" International Journal of Philosophical Studies 22, no. 4 (2014): 491–514..

Mörchen, Hermann. *Adorno und Heidegger: Untersuchung einer philophischen Kommunikationsverweigerung*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Banality of Heidegger*. Translated by Jeff Fort. New York: Fordham University Press, 2017.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil*. Edited by Rolf-Peter Horstmann. Translated by Judith Norman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

———. *Writings from the Late Notebooks*. Edited by Rüdiger Bittner. Translated by Kate Sturge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

———. *The Gay Science*. Edited by Bernard Williams. Translated by Josefine Nauckhoff. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

O'Connor, Brian. *The Adorno Reader*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2000.

———. *Adorno's Negative Dialectic: Philosophy and the Possibility of Critical Rationality*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2005.

Olafson, Frederick. 1998. *Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics: A Study of Mitsein*. Cambridge University Press.

Painter, Corrine and Christian Lotz. *Phenomenology and the Non-Human Animal: At the Limits of Experience*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2007.

Paci, Enzo. *The Function of the Sciences and the Meaning of Man*. Translated by Paul Piccone and James E. Hansen. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1972.

Patios, Georgios. *Kierkegaard on the Philosophy of History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2014.

Phillips, James. *Heidegger's Volk: Between National Socialism and Poetry*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005.

Philipse, Herman. *Heidegger's Philosophy of Being: A Critical Interpretation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Radloff, Bernhard. *Heidegger and the Question of National Socialism: Disclosure and Gestalt*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 2007.

Raffoul, François. *The Origins of Responsibility*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010.

Raffoul, François and Eric S. Nelson. *The Bloomsbury Companion to Heidegger*. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Richardson, John. *Heidegger*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Rilke, Rainer Maria. *Letters to a Young Poet*. Translated by M.D. Herter Norton. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1993.

Rockmore, Tom. *On Heidegger's Nazism and Philosophy*. Oakland: University of California Press, 1997.

———. "A Progress Report on the Ongoing Heidegger Reception." *Studies in East European Thought* 68, no. 2-3 (2016): 229-39.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness*. Translated by Hazel E. Barnes. New York: Washington Square Press, 1992.

———. *Jean-Paul Sartre: Basic Writings*. Edited by Stephen Priest. New York: Routledge, 2001.

———. *Critique of Dialectical Reason*. Translated by Jonathan Ree. Brooklyn: Verso, 2010.

Scheler, Max. *Ressentiment*. Translated by Lewis B. Coser. Milwaukee: Marquette Studies in Philosophy, 1994.

Schürmann, Reiner. *Broken Hegemonies*. Translated by Reginald Lilly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003.

Stevens, Wallace. "Notes Toward a Supreme Fiction" (1942).

Stroh, K.M. "Intersubjectivity of Dasein in Heidegger's Being and Time: How Authenticity is a Return to Community." *Human Studies* 38, no. 2 (2015): 243-259.

Taussig, Michael. *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Tillich, Paul. *The Courage to Be*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.

Theunissen, Michael. *The Other: Studies in the Social Ontology of Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, and Buber*. Translated by Christopher Macann. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1986.

Trần Đức Thảo. *Phenomenology and Dialectical Materialism*. Translated by Daniel J. Herman and Donald V. Morano. Dordrecht: Reidel Publishing Company, 1986.

Tymieniecka, Anna-Teresa. *Phenomenology World-Wide: Foundations — Expanding Dynamics — Life-Engagements A Guide for Research and Study*. Norwell: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.

Uexküll, Jakob von. *A Foray into the Worlds of Animals and Humans: with A Theory of Meaning*. Translated by Joseph O'Neil. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Vallega, Alejandro A. *Heidegger and the Issue of Space: Thinking on Exilic Grounds*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008.

van der Heiden, Gert-Jan. 2014. *Ontology after Ontotheology: Plurality, Event, and Contingency in Contemporary Philosophy*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Verdega, Ernesto. "Adorno's Mimesis and its Limitations for Critical Social Thought." *European Journal of Political Theory* 8, no. 4 (2009): 493-511.

Visker, Rudy. *The Inhuman Condition: Looking for Difference after Levinas and Heidegger*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2009.

Vogel, Lawrence. *The Fragile "We": Ethical Implications of Heidegger's Being and Time*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1994.

Weil, Simone. *Gravity and Grace*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Watts, Michael. *The Philosophy of Heidegger*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Withy, Katherine. *Heidegger on Being Uncanny*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015.

Wisser, Richard. "Das Fernseh-Interview." In *Erinnerung an Martin Heidegger*. Edited by Günther Neske. Pfullingen: Verlag Günther Neske, 1977.

Witkin, Robert. *Adorno on Music*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Wolin, Richard. *The Heidegger Controversy: A Critical Reader*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1992.

Wrathall, Mark and Malpas, Jeff. *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2000.

Young, Iris Marion. *On Female Body Experience: "Throwing Like a Girl" and Other Essays*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2005.

Young, Julian. *Heidegger's Later Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Zahavi, Dan. "Phenomenology, Hermenutics, Existentialism, and Critical Theory." In *The Routledge Companion to Twentieth Century Philosophy*. Ed. Dermot Moran. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Zimmerman, Michael. *Eclipse of the Self: The Development of Heidegger's Concept of Authenticity*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1986.

Zimmermann, Michael. *Heidegger's Confrontation with Modernity: Technology, Politics, and Art*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1990.