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Temporal Being and the Authentic Self

Dr Joseph Naimo
University of Notre Dame Australia

The central concern of this project is twofold: firstly to supply conceptually plausible answers to Heidegger’s unanswered questions regarding the temporality of Being, which he raised at the very end of *Being and Time*. Secondly through this examination the aim is to explore the process of discovery and sense of authentic being as uncovered and developed by Heidegger. Overall this project is situated methodologically within Process Philosophy, and it is from this perspective that draws attention to the role of human agency in which individuals are spatiotemporally construed in terms of Space-Time-Event-Motion (STEM) entities.¹ Heidegger situates *Dasein* (human existence) in a temporal stream moving towards the nothingness of death. For Heidegger the spatiotemporal nature of one’s life is understood from the standpoint of Being-in-the-world, as an engaged participant, coexistent with the world, so that contextually it is through this engagement in recognition of this facticity or thrownness that one may come to recognise one’s own authentic self. This discovery, however, brings to light a tension between the individualistic sense of authentic self and the coexistent Being-in-the-world they-self (*Das Man*) that emerges from Heidegger’s analysis. Somewhat problematic then is the coexistent phenomenological recognition that one does not live in isolation and as such one may question what of the contingent, constraining and influencing factors that shape one’s sense of self particularly against the backdrop of self-other relations. Part of this analysis therefore is to provide the departure points of critique to later consider authentic inter-relations of community.

For Heidegger ‘moods’ reveal significant details about the fundamental structure of the world and also our way of Being-in-the-world in two subtle ways. “Moods assail us”, Heidegger says, disclosing that we are ‘thrown’ into a world not of our making, we find ourselves firstly in the world. Secondly, moods indicate something shared, not simply inner and private, by tuning us into the world. Things in the world, like events and situations, therefore exude a quality that resonates with us as mood. Being-in-the-world reveals that we find ourselves in the world in a particular way such that we have a ‘there’, a meaningfully oriented situation in which to act and exist; hence we are disposed to things in ways that matter to us. Heidegger says that “Disposedness is an ‘attunement’, a way of being tuned in to things in the world.”² ‘Mood’, ontologically speaking, as a way-of-being, explains the inherent receptive capacity
we exhibit that enables sharing, the dynamics of affective social tuning via certain moods and relative understanding.³

Heidegger observes that our primordial experience is a unified experience of being in the world in an inseparable way. Departing from Husserl’s articulation of the unfolding of ‘inner time’ (‘impression’, ‘retention’, ‘protention’) Heidegger developed instead an understanding of “human beings as a ‘nexus’ of lived experience ... he recognises the priority of the ‘lived’ world [Lebenswelt] ... its three temporal dimensions ... ecstasies, in which we, as temporal beings, exist all at once”.⁴ Heidegger contends that “Being is essentially temporal”, in that “Being is always understood in terms of time explained by its temporal structure”.⁵ Yet Heidegger’s claim requires demonstrating how the temporal structure of Being, indeed of each Dasein, can be construed and understood. An endeavour remaining unanswered that Heidegger himself admits at the end of Being and Time. Arguably, however, one way to achieve this end requires a greater perspective shift than that taken by Heidegger whereby one’s existence is not simply hermeneutically observed as an entity occupying some volume of space for some duration of time but instead as being made of spacetime in a constitutional, compositional four-dimensional form. Heidegger, in Being and Time, is at pains to articulate the rather fundamental element of temporality as integral to being. My contention is that the concept of STEM containment-field as a four-dimensional embodying concept provides the appropriate conceptual mechanism to further ground Heidegger’s endeavour.

When examined from the standpoint of Being-in-the-world Heidegger observes that ‘everydayness reveals itself as a mode of temporality’. Heidegger subsequently advances a conditional argument: “if temporality makes up the primordial meaning of Dasein’s Being and this entity is one for which, in its Being, this very Being is an issue, then care must use ‘time’ and therefore must reckon with time”.⁶ Heidegger equates one sense of time by which “entities within-the-world are encountered-time as “within-time-ness”.⁷ Through the “uncovering of the inner-time-consciousness of Dasein’s Being-in-the-world” the endeavour to penetrate the ‘inner heart of time’ sees the project move from the Being of time to the time of Being”.⁸ Indeed Heidegger contends that the “primary item in Care is the “ahead-of-itself” explaining that “Dasein exists for the sake of itself”.⁹ As such reckoning that ‘[A]s long as it is’ “right to its end, it comports itself towards its potentiality-for-Being”. The ‘ahead-of-itself’ as an item in the structure of Care discloses that in Dasein something is left outstanding, “not yet become actual”.¹⁰
Heidegger’s construal of this analysis is in terms of *Dasein* achieving ‘wholeness’ though in doing so he inferred would otherwise liquidate its Being-in-the-world as capable of being experienced as an entity.\textsuperscript{11} Ontologically the quest consequently became characterising *Dasein*’s being-at-an-end and of achieving an “existential conception of death as an existential projection of an authentic Being-towards-death”.\textsuperscript{12} Though this observation is very significant, it ushers in a phenomenological shift. In summary my contention is that to be a ‘being-there’ (*Dasein*) as a Being-in-the-world is to Be an actualising temporal being, hence a STEM embodiment first and foremost. To be is to be temporal. Heidegger of course did not believe that time was a thing in and of itself independent of the world and specifically not independent of *Dasein*. On close examination Heidegger claims that “[B]ecause Dasein as temporality is ecstatic-horizontal in its Being, it can take along with it a space for which it has made room, and it can do so factically and constantly”.\textsuperscript{13} Heidegger endeavours to analyse the coupling of space and time but never really captures the conceptual, let alone the ontological understanding, that being can be thought of as the spatialisation of time (spacetime) and together the enactment of the process of corporeal existence within the world/universe. Space and time are interconnected as Einstein’s theory of relativity has resoundingly demonstrated. One need only look out into the night sky at the distant stars to realise one is also looking back in time. Though Heidegger was critical of the scientific enterprise much of what science has achieved must be recognised.

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger claims that *Dasein’s existence, facticity* and *falling* reveal themselves in the phenomenon of death (or Being-towards-the-end).\textsuperscript{14} *Falling*, in this sense as Heidegger describes, is a kind of fleeing in the face of death such that being-towards-the-end has a ‘mode of evasion’ in the face of it, which takes the ascription of *inauthenticity*. *Dasein*, we recall is constituted by ‘disclosedness’, an understanding equated with a state-of-mind such that to ‘comport’ oneself towards death is “Being towards a possibility of *Dasein* itself, as the possibility of authentic existence”.\textsuperscript{15} Hence the manner in which one comports oneself is central to achieving authenticity. Not surprising that the characterisation of being-towards-death involves anxiety (a state-of-mind) and ordinarily anxiety is directed towards cowardness. Though Heidegger sees this construal of anxiety as a perverted state.\textsuperscript{16} *Dasein*’s selfhood is taken formally as a ‘way of existing’ and not as an entity present-at-hand. Heidegger claims that the ‘I’ for most part is not the ‘who’ of *Dasein*, he says instead “the ‘they-self’ (or *Das Man*) is its who”. Heidegger claims that “Authentic Being one’s Self takes the definite form of an *existentiell* modification of the ‘they’ announcing that this
modification must be defined existentially.\(^{17}\) However, it seems that this way of understanding the self makes it a relative term, perhaps as intended. For when *Dasein* brings itself back from the “they”, and the “they-self” is modified, it becomes “authentic Being-one’s-Self”. Apparently, since *Dasein* is lost in the “they”, it must first find itself and it can find itself only because it has, already in itself, possible authenticity.\(^{18}\) Most significantly what still remain undiscovered through this analysis are the substantive (factual) constitutive elements against which the relative authentic *Dasein* rests and not arguably the adapted version of the juxtaposed *Das man* self or the ‘they self’.

Heidegger construes the “I” as the subject of logical behaviour of binding together, such that “I think”, means I bind together. “All binding together is an ’I bind’ together”\(^{19}\). I bind together from the factual state, as I contend, enabled only as a constituted four-dimensional STEM entity. Heidegger indeed believes that the *subjectum* is ‘consciousness in itself’, not a representation but rather the ‘form’ of representation. The ‘I think’ says Heidegger, “is not something represented, but the formal structure of representing as such, and this formal structure alone makes it possible for anything to have been represented”.\(^{20}\) Essentially Heidegger is contending that the ‘I’ as articulated as the *res cogitans* is not pointing to a substance as present-at-hand but instead to a process as “I think something”.\(^{21}\) *Dasein* becomes essentially *Dasein* in so far as authentic existence constitutes itself as anticipatory resoluteness; and as such resoluteness, as a mode of authenticity of care, is thought to contain *Dasein’s* primordial Self-constancy and totality.\(^{22}\) However, if this primordial nature is not construed in any substantial manner what is not clear in this analysis is whether there is a distinction between mind as ‘I’, and mind as *Dasein*, though not an ‘I’ substantively construed, but nonetheless recognisable simply, as Heidegger insists, a process? In one sense we are told it is ‘consciousness in itself’ as the ‘form of representation’. Yet in another sense, somewhat conflated, what is recognised is a process; but of what, consciousness? Heidegger says ‘I binds’ and as such what he identifies is the process of the ideational activity of grasping, seizing, in making meaning by constantly attaching to objects in the world in an identifiable manner. Detaching from the ideational aspect of mind is however not a detachment from existence. Instead detaching from the ideational aspect of the mind can provide access to a full emersion of authentic or core being, an understanding that has a long history in many Eastern meditative traditions. Given that Heidegger’s analysis of the ‘conscience’ is consistent with the idea of nullity (no-thing-ness) though exhibiting a capacity as so construed which in-forms as the ‘call of conscience’; arguably then is equiprimordially
consistent at least descriptively of what I have previously argued is one’s unique Signature-Energy-Frequency (SEF) (Principle of Individuation).23 An analysis quite consistent with Heidegger’s analysis of Dasein’s Being-in-the-world but in this case expanding the conceptual description of Dasein in terms of embodied STEM agency.

*Heidegger’s Unanswered Questions*

*Being and Time* we know was an incomplete work to which Heidegger in the final section of the work returned to the question of the meaning of being. At the very end he raises these questions after recognising that: “The existential-ontological constitution of Dasein’s being is grounded in temporality. Hence the ecstatical projection of Being must be made possible by some primordial way in which ecstatical temporality temporalizes. 1) How is this mode of the temporalizing of temporality to be Interpreted? 2) Is there a way which leads from primordial time to the meaning of Being? 3) Does time itself manifest itself as the horizon of Being?”24 It is with a measure of humility pace Heidegger I provide conceptual responses to these questions. For the first question as it is constructed an answer arguably emerges from the perspective of Being as constituted four-dimensional or spacetime as provided in this paper i.e. STEM containment-field (human being); and previous works where I have laid the foundation for this conceptualisation.25 The second question at this stage of human development is the most challenging. One can however advance by inference to best explanation what is conceivably an appropriate hypothesis in the manner of a principle of individuation and identity: Signature-Energy-Frequency (SEF) principle. Frequency, in the sense of resonance is fundamental in Nature associated with all forms of communications: auditory, chemical and relative energy transmission/expresssion.

Matter, we can understand according to relativity theory, is inter-convertible to energy as was made famous by Einstein’s mass-energy equation \( E = mc^2 \). The fabric of the Universe according to this observation is physical and as such is reducible to energy. Planck’s constant is a formula used by physicists to describe the constant proportionality between the energy emitted or absorbed by an atom and the frequency of emitted or absorbed light.26 Energy characterised as such is the fundamental substance of the Universe definable in terms of frequency. Here is one way to think about how primordial time could lead to an expression and to the meaning of Being as Heidegger hoped to answer. Humans are born within the world from pre-existing beings, our parents. Developmentally through our animated
conscious engagement with the external world of things our observations are partially turned outward via our sensory channels whilst concurrently existing as a contained and spatiotemporally embodied entity, incessantly contending with the inner interpreting sensing modes of being whether emotively charged or other cognitive and visceral senses. As animated spatiotemporal embodied beings the external world of sensory information constantly requires transformation into sense receptive, ideational or conceptual meanings. Of course, how the fundamental energy of the world transforms itself into the manifold entities and elements of the universe remains to be answered?

For the third question I answer yes, explaining in sum by saying ‘Being’ and ‘Time’ is the union and process of existence. That is Being is the spatialisation of time bound in union, the relation of the enacting process of embodied existence in STEM being. Heidegger, as the title of his work exemplifies examined ‘Being’ and ‘Time’ as added, somewhat to which we exist in time, just like occupying space only for a period of time. ‘Being-in-the-world’ was so significantly part of what it is for Dasein to exist that Heidegger, I believe, missed the crucial point of connecting being ‘with’ time so that ‘Being’ and ‘Time’ are coexistent as they are of course.

**Authenticity**

Authenticity as developed in *Being and Time* refers to a “way of relating to our existence” described with no specific content, no universal platform issuing from every authentic Dasein.²⁷ Heidegger shifts the idea of human existence understood as a unity with a phenomenological account of “Dasein owning up wholly – that is wholeheartedly – to itself in its existence”.²⁸ Hence on this account to own up to oneself in one’s existence is to exist authentically such that the deep structure of human is revealed as *falling thrown projection*.²⁹ As such then being authentic is to stand resolute against the *Das man* (the ‘One’), of the general everydayness. In authenticity the “public understanding of my world” is used by “projecting on my own possibilities”³⁰ achievable it is contended as STEM causal agents. The role of conscience calls to turn Dasein into the reticence of its existent potentiality-for-Being characterised as a resonant sense of understanding equiprimordially, I argued, of one’s SEF. Finally Heidegger’s account of authenticity remains somewhat undeveloped though providing an excellent basis to work from if reconceptualised in the manner undertaken in this paper. The task now then is to build on this framework.
NOTES

1. Space-Time-Event-Motion (STEM) provides a framework and perspective to facilitate inquiries into the human condition, even, the nature/nurture debate philosophically. Each STEM is a moving space-time agent, an ongoing event of life whose own constitution is subject to one’s environment (e.g. epigenetic process). Each STEM agent is construed as an ecosystem, operationally a self-organising system of Being. Genetics alone can only provide an incomplete account of the mechanisation of human existence. Since the human body is largely a reciprocating organism and the subject of ongoing compositional change (particularly epigenetic chemical change, cellular change, emotional and intellectual change, to say the least.).


3. Examples of conditions seemingly conducive to generating shared moods are funerals; group dynamics as experienced during motivational seminars; celebratory elation experienced by a team of winning competitors; two people in love, etc. Though I add anecdotally it is not unusual to walk into a room and sense the overall mood of those present and similarly what is often referred to as the tone of a crowd at an event.


7. Being and Time, 278.


13. Being and Time, 420ff. In Heidegger’s analysis where Dasein takes in space relates to the engagement with equipment relative and limited to a fallen state; such to bring something closer (e.g. in its use) one moves the thing from its “thence” and as such “making-present forgets the yonder”. But this analysis also demonstrates what is crucially lacking in Heidegger’s overall analysis and that is the perspective of embodied space. Instead Heidegger seems transfixed on the ecstatico-horizontal temporality as developed in the following pages: 421-423.


17. Being and Time, 312.

18. Being and Time, 313.


22. Being and Time, 370.
