

*Death in Martin Heidegger's Being and Time*¹

Mark A. Menaldo

Forthcoming in "Political Philosophies of Aging, Dying, and Death": Routledge (Taylor and Francis),

with expected publication in Spring 2021

Edited by Erin A. Dolgoy, Kimberly Hurd Hale, and Bruce Peabody

Martin Heidegger (1889–1976), who was born in Germany, is the 20th century's most influential philosopher.² He is also a dedicated and unrepentant Nazi.³ He joined the Nazi party in 1933, the same year he assumed his position of Rector at Freiburg University. Although he gave up the rectorship in 1934 and began to distance himself from Nazism, he remained a member of the party until 1945. As the precursor to all postmodern thought, his ideas changed the way people approach philosophy, history, literature, and art. In our time, one cannot open a book on literary criticism, aesthetics, linguistics, or philosophy without reading echoes of Heidegger's teaching. Heidegger's thought is complicated, detailed, and often confusing. His writing is not only obscure, but he invents terminology that has no precedent in the history of Western philosophy. The challenges of reading Heidegger's work are worsened when translated from the original German.

There is much dispute among academics whether Heidegger's philosophy centers on "a turn," or a shift, from phenomenology to ontology, from human existence to Being.⁴ Heidegger's later works are steeped in discussions of language, technology, art, and the dawn of a new spirituality. This chapter concerns Heidegger's philosophy of death in *Being and Time* (1927), his *magnum opus*. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger advances the idea that authentic being toward death enables the person to experience genuine freedom and resolve. In other words, if human beings want to understand what an authentic human life is, each individual must grapple with their finitude. Making meaning out of death is how one

understands life. Yet, Heidegger never offers concrete prescriptions. Thus, I will show in this chapter how Heidegger's philosophy of death is the catalyst for his idea of an authentic decision, which carries a great historical-political weight and implies responsibility, in the broadest sense of the word.

In the introduction to *Being and Time*, Heidegger sets his sights on the "destruction" of the history of Western metaphysics, which is the branch of philosophy that deals with the nature of being. According to Heidegger, Western metaphysics has forgotten how to ask the question of Being. The problem with metaphysics, Heidegger suggests, is that it leads philosophers astray. Western Metaphysicians look at beings conceptually, and the subject and object relationship takes precedence in philosophical analysis. Yet, these metaphysical philosophers, Heidegger argues, err by prioritizing the notion of substance or essences instead of asking fundamental questions. Consequently, they lead philosophy to a vague comprehension of Being.⁵

Heidegger intends to reboot the question of Being. In order to do this, he first proposes a radically new phenomenology of the human being which is, simultaneously, a unique starting point for thinking about Being. Second, Heidegger radically shifts the understanding of the relationship between Being, time, and the existential reality of the human being. While Heidegger's actual discussion is complex and nuanced, there is a simple way of thinking about his core idea: Being is contingent on time, and human beings mark their existence in time, which is shot through with the absolute certainty that they will die. How each person understands death makes all the difference in how they can experience life. But, first, we must ask, for Heidegger, what is the person and how is death central to his investigation?

The Person as Being-in-the-World

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger deliberately avoids terms like self, subject, consciousness, and even human being. Heidegger wants to dissolve the Cartesian-Kantian starting point of the human being, which views the subject as the source of what is rational and logical. In an effort to redefine human beings, Heidegger adopts the word Dasein. Dasein is unique among beings because it is aware of Being and also cares about its own being. Heidegger says that what makes Dasein distinctive is that it "always

understands itself in terms of its own existence.”⁶ Dasein either can be or not be. For Heidegger, it is a term that is a “pure expression of being.”⁷

The person (Dasein) experiences life with the inevitable awareness that time is bound to mortality.⁸ Death is the individuating fact of her life, and it is through understanding death via what Heidegger calls the mood of anxiety (Angst), she can live authentically. However, she is not clear-eyed about her reality, and, in fact, experiences the world paradoxically: for the most part, she flees her reality. As a consequence, she lives inauthentically. But, for Heidegger, this is to be expected, because the person is immersed in her everydayness, which we colloquially call ordinary or common experience. For Heidegger, in everydayness, the person is absorbed in her various identities, roles, and relationships with other people. She is thrust into a world of pre-existing rules (language), roles, and moral beliefs. She may be a daughter, sister, wife, student, nun, an American, or from a tribal culture. It makes no difference, according to Heidegger, she, like all Dasein/people, is caught in a nexus of guiding roles and rules. Her experience is not genuinely individuating.⁹ The only way for the person to understand herself authentically is by understanding her life through an appropriate view of death, which points to the radical aloneness of her existence.

However, authenticity and death is only one mode of a person’s existing. To understand the centrality of death in the person’s interpretation of her existence, Heidegger first takes us through a dense explanation of the elements of her existential makeup. In the second part of *Being and Time*, with the existential analytic prepared, he shows how the person can experience wholeness through authentic understanding of death. The first part (first division), for the sake of simplicity, is a discussion of being-in-the-world and the person’s inauthentic mode. And without at least a summary of the prelude, Heidegger’s analysis of death is nearly impossible to follow. Here, I offer a summary of key points in the first part of *Being and Time*.

Human life is existentially experienced. It does not emanate from subjectivity or conscious awareness. The Dasein/person is not essentially a rational animal. Nor is human experience reducible to the sense perception of matter in motion. Human existence emanates from being-in-the-world. We can

think of being-in-the-world, one of many Heideggerian neologisms, as the complete immersion of the person in a world of meaning and relationships that let her just get along with the day-to-day. For example, she uses tools, hammers, pencils, glasses, books. How does she know how to pick up this equipment and use it? Heidegger does not see this knowledge as something developed through cognition, the dualism of the subject-object relationship. Instead, he believes that she already knows how to use these tools because she cares. The person's experience is effortless, so to speak, because the caring for things always comes first. All the things that surround her are meaningful, so her world is lit up with significance. Experience in the world of beings is not a series of isolated events, powered by her cognitive discovery of finite objects. For example, she can take the broadfork from the shed, because it is a gardening tool. She uses it to aerate the soil. But this tool does not mean anything to her in isolation. Instead, the broadfork exists in the larger context of gardening. She picks out the tool in the spring because she is going to plant vegetables for her summer garden. She gardens, because her mother and grandfather did as well, and she is trying to pass the green thumb down to her children. In gardening, as well as all her other choices and doings, she makes use of circumspect intelligibility. Her choices and getting along in the world are tied to a pre-existing web of meaning and ends (for the sake of) that she is continuously advancing toward.

Everydayness is the state of being-in-the-world; it is pre-philosophical and does not involve reasoning. In contrast, René Descartes's famous thought experiment in his *Meditations on First Philosophy* divides the mind from objects.¹⁰ Descartes creates a dualism between the immaterial mind and extended bodies or objects that the mind encounters (the subject-object distinction). Heidegger's being-in-the-world jettisons this dualism, in this condition the person and her familiarity with the world are simultaneous. Heidegger's being-in-the-world dissolves subjectivity. The person is not a thinking substance. Instead, she can move through relational space because the world is a construct of meaningful associations that enable her to act, think, feel, choose, take on different roles, live with others, and simply belong to a world. As Heidegger would say, the person, generally, dwells in a totality of involvements that are always branching out to numerous possibilities. In other words, human existence (Dasein) as

being-in-the-world, is like turning the ignition on a car. The driver, car, road, and preoccupations about where she is going, how long it will take, whether she will hit traffic, be on time or late, are meaningful relationships that happen at once. Being-in-the-world involves the person in pre-existing meaningful relationships with other beings.¹¹

The person is also temporally finite. And time, so to speak, is folded into her experience of being-in-the-world. The basic way to think about temporality is that every present moment is marked by the past and future. The person is thrown into the world and is already marked by context and tradition. Her whole life is built upon all the past moments (having-beens), which she carries into the present moment. The present is also futural, since she is at every moment simultaneously moving forward in her life (ahead-of-itself). Heidegger's structure of time works the way it does, because the person is projecting themselves into a finite horizon defined by death. The person is a being-toward-death. Non-human animals are not temporal, as far as we know, because they do not anticipate their own deaths.

Although being-in-the world illuminates a context of significance for the person, who is temporal and therefore always ahead of herself, this does not mean she understands herself authentically. It is quite the opposite. She leans on the penetration of everydayness in her understanding of who she is. This makes her a factual being. Facticity is the person's reflexive character; she understands herself as being-in, which signifies all the overlapping contexts and situations that define "the-Being-present-at-hand-as-things-within-the-world." We can call facticity reflexivity or her practical attitude. Her practical attitude absorbs her in everydayness through curiosity. She cannot help but see her everyday world as a busy garden that needs tending, but this does not allow her to truly individuate herself. This problem is compounded by what Heidegger calls falling prey, which is the tendency to fall back on the conventional meanings of the world. The person falls prey by interpreting herself through her public, they-self¹² which denies the person her proper individuation. As a being-in-the-world, the person is saturated by the investment of meaning that everydayness offers, from tradition, others, and beings.

Individuation is only possible by properly understanding her being-toward-death. In the second part of *Being and Time*, Heidegger works slowly to explain how such an understanding is possible. I will

follow his path and also refer to his discussion of moods, or thrown-ness, which is absolutely necessary for understanding authentic being-toward-death.

From Inauthentic Everydayness to Authentic Being-toward-Death

Near the end of the first part of *Being and Time*, Heidegger says it remains to see the person (Dasein) in its totality or as a whole. A problem arises: if the person is a being always ahead of itself, how does the person's totality come into view? As a temporal being that is running ahead of itself, it is a challenge to see the person as a whole, since wholeness implies a finished quality. Heidegger examines three phenomena related to the human existence: what is outstanding, what is an end, and what is totality. Heidegger ultimately eliminates these three ideas as explanations of the idea of totality but his negative demonstration is the bridge to understanding the person's wholeness through death.

As long as the person is, she is a being that is ahead-of-itself, which always leaves something outstanding. By outstanding, Heidegger means that which is continually in a state of what it will be. The person persists in this state of "fragmentariness," which can only end in death.¹³ If death marks the point where fragmentariness ends, Heidegger asks if the person can experience this end? He rejects the idea. The person is not adequately equipped to experience death as an end because death is the loss of the being that the person is (Dasein, understood as literally being-there).

Heidegger then wonders if a person is able to experience death vicariously: through the death of others. Perhaps, Heidegger speculates, in the death of someone else, the person gets close to the experience of death, by dealing with the death of others as suffering and loss. Yet Heidegger is quick to point out that the person can never experience the death of others in a genuine sense.¹⁴ Since no one can die for another in their place, ultimately, "every Dasein must itself actually take dying upon itself."¹⁵

Death is the relational possibility unlike any other. It is an extreme "not yet;" so, as something that can never be actualized it is exceedingly nonrelational. Death is also the possibility that cannot be bypassed, while all the possibilities of a/the person can be otherwise: including but not limited to the time and place of her birth, her name, sex, occupation, and moral code. All these characteristics can be

otherwise, but we all must die. Last, death makes the person stand before its ownmost potentially of being.¹⁶ In plain terms, she may gain an understanding of the source of her meaning, solely for herself. She will sense the source of her facticity, grasp her temporality, become aware of her being-in-the-world as the ground of her experience. Such awareness depends upon her true individuation, she must be able to release herself from inauthentic mode to authentic being-toward-death.

Death is the nonrelational possibility that is most hers, but she finds it hard to face. It is easier to evade this truth because she is busied by things in the world and is invested in her identity (Dasein's public self). This state of inauthenticity is neither lamentable nor blameworthy; it is just how the person finds herself. Thus, the change to authentic understanding is neither a conscious or moral choice. The person does not wake up one morning with newfound resolve and say, "today, I start being more authentic." Nor is authentic being-toward-death some eureka moment, a fact or method that she discovers by way of contemplation. Instead, she becomes aware of this extreme possibility through attunement. The person must tap into revelatory moods.

Moods and Death

Moods, according to Heidegger, are not simply emotions or feelings in one's head, but are the person's antennae, which attune her and dispose her toward beings and others. Moods are akin to alternating sound frequencies. The person is constantly tuning into one mood and out of another. Moods act as filters that are phenomenologically prior to sense perception and cognition, they also reveal essential truths to the person. For example, Heidegger thinks of boredom as an especially helpful mood. It is not boredom for this one thing or activity, but a profound and fundamental boredom, in which the relational nexus seems to melt away. This mood is vital in experiencing time and the world differently as it awakens the person from her inauthentic slumbering through the world.¹⁷ Whereas cognition is both partial and short-lived, Heidegger's great insight regarding moods is that the person is perennially in and out of moods. If attuned appropriately to mood, she gets nearer to a primordial and authentic understanding.

Heidegger thinks anxiety (Angst) is the most revelatory mood because anxiety is triggered in the face of death.¹⁸ Like, boredom, anxiety is a fundamental mood, and is not anxiety about any single worldly thing, but a mood concerning being-in-the-world as such.¹⁹ One might say that anxiety makes the person reflexively aware of the core truth of her being-in-the-world, which is that it both reveals and conceals her being. She senses the ground of her inauthentic mode. As being-in-the-world, she is always choosing and moving through possibilities, which reveals beings and a public in their everydayness. Simultaneously, by moving through these possibilities she covers over the truth of her being as she flees from and evades the ultimate meaning of being-in-the-world. This covered truth, which is the basis of her existence, is that Dasein is her thrown disclosure.

Disclosure reveals the person as thrown-ness, which means that she is merely cast into the world that is going to be familiar and significant to her, and also be the reason for her absorption in everydayness. She is always concerned with the nearest thing, and, as a result, does not take notice of her thrownness. In her everyday inauthentic mode, her site of thrown disclosure does not register. But anxiety looms. Anxiety, according to Heidegger, is not the dread associated with an outcome, such as becoming ill; it is not an affliction, and there is no cure. When properly attuned to anxiety, the person's involvement with things and others is interrupted, which breaks the seamless chain of everyday possibilities and relationships. Thus, anxiety interrupts her very being, demonstrates her facticity to her self, and may attune her to the truth that she is a being-toward-the-end. Anxiety clears a path for her authentic understanding.

Misunderstandings of Death: Inauthentic Mode

Before Heidegger explains authentic being toward death, he walks us through three inauthentic misunderstandings of the person's experience of death. These misunderstandings originate from the public interpretation of death. These public meanings are essential because they are the standard ways the person interprets herself. Yet, each misunderstanding eventually points back to authentic being-toward-

death. Death is not a distant and abstract possibility. Death is not a statistic, or an event that happens. Finally, death is evaded and viewed as demise.

As an abstraction, the person understands that one dies or people die. Yet, this understanding is always distant and peripheral because it happens to someone else, “to a stranger or a neighbor.”²⁰ Death counts, fatality rates, and lifespans distort the phenomenon and encourage the notion that death belongs to no one. In truth, death is the person’s ownmost potentiality of being.²¹

Next, the person misinterprets death as an end, particularly as an event. When she worries out loud that “I am going to die,” she is interpreting death as something that will happen to her. However, death never occurs to the person because she cannot participate in such an event. Death itself is closed off to the person who dies, so she cannot be present (or represented) in her own death.²²

Since the person is separated from the experience of her own death, as long as the person exists, there appears to be something outstanding in her being. Heidegger observes that death marks a change to no-longer-being-there, and what is outstanding is liquidated, while the representable character of the person is dissolved.²³ This liquidation presents a paradox, because Heidegger began his analysis with a view to wholeness; death, however, does not provide wholeness. It just ends what is outstanding. Death, therefore, must mean something within the person’s outstanding character. Heidegger articulates this added significance as a question: is human existence (Dasein), “always already its not-yet?”²⁴ To clarify the meaning of outstandingness, Heidegger offers an analogy to ripening fruit. When a fruit is ripening it possesses two simultaneous characteristics. At each stage of ripening, the fruit is both its ripeness and unripeness. In Heideggerian form, we would say that the un-ripe fruit contains its not-yet. The potential for what the fruit is and can be is contained solely in the fruit. The fruit achieves its fullness in peak ripeness, and, so to speak, it fulfils itself. Like the fruit, the person also contains her not-yet in her being. She moves through a steady stream of lived possibilities, but she always contains the seed of her ownmost possibility. She is in life and toward death. Unlike the fruit, the person never reaches fulfillment or a finished state in death.²⁵ Death is not the person’s *telos* (final end) because it is neither a state the person can enter into or something that becomes present to her.²⁶

Since there is no direct experience of death, death cannot mean something for the person apart from her existential structure. The not-yet (death) is an extreme. This simple truth about the person is indisputable, but she stubbornly clings to the notion that death is a separate thing. She misinterprets death as the demise of a living being lurching toward its end. The sciences support this misunderstanding. Our common views of human demise have their basis in biology and psychology. Our notions about demise gives meaning to those who are dying. But Heidegger argues that dying and death are not the same. These distinctions are significant for the living. And this form of misunderstanding gives rise, according to Heidegger, to the anthropology of death, which is the variety of ways that societies handle death and dying as a social event; but, the experience of dying is another modality of living and does not reveal the character or nature of death itself.²⁷

These three misunderstandings--death as a distant or abstract possibility, death as static, and death as an event--point to the power of the inauthentic mode of death. The public evades and veils death by comforting the dying about the prospect of everything returning to normal, as if dying was a social nuisance. This approach to dying does not permit the person "to have the courage to have Angst about death."²⁸ However, the inauthentic misunderstanding of death is not totally incorrect. There is a public certainty about death. The public tells the person, "you are going to die." Yet this public proclamation is also an evasive maneuver because it enables the person to understand death as an "event in the surrounding world, the certainty related to this does not get at being-toward-the-end."²⁹ Once he has addressed the misunderstandings and fleeings from death, Heidegger begins his movement to an authentic understanding of death.

Anticipations of Death: Authentic Mode

Death is always close to home because it is possible at any moment for the person. But there is no clarity concerning when it will happen, and this uncertainty marks death with indefiniteness.³⁰ She may die in childhood or old age, slowly in the suffering of a disease or all of sudden. It is the indefiniteness of death that makes it utterly strange. This is a strangeness that the person is usually not attuned to, because

she keeps busy taking care of everyday “urgencies and nearby matters.”³¹ The person must traverse a long arc of attunement to awareness. In the mood of anxiety, and in attunement to her being, which I will describe below, she is pulled away from her inauthentic state toward an authentic one. In authenticity, the person has the possibility of understanding herself as a being toward death, which is, according to Heidegger, her “ownmost non-relational possibility not-to-be-bypassed.”³² All roads lead to the person’s death, and it is her’s alone.

Authentic being-toward-death is not one of the person’s lived possibilities, which means that it cannot be “actualized.”³³ For example, the person does not become authentic by teetering close to the edge of death through morbid brooding or “thinking about death.”³⁴ For Heidegger, death is a pure possibility, and if the person is authentically disposed to death, she does so only by anticipating death. Anticipation is unlike any other of her possible relations in the world. In everydayness, different beings become available to the person as something to take care of; thanks to the influence of the public theyself, the person can be just about anyone except for her ownmost self, which is an authentic being toward death. In contrast to her inauthentic mode of being, anticipation of death brings the person near to an understanding of “the possibility of the measureless possibility of existence.”³⁵ How does the person experience a measureless possibility? Anticipation permeates her atmosphere; it affects her and changes her disposition. Instead of neglecting anticipation, she chooses to listen. In anticipation of death, she stands in an openness to her primordial disclosure as a being-toward-death. In other words, she lays herself open to this fact of existence, during her whole life she is with death. Once she anticipates death, she is now free and capable of grasping death as death, and no longer does she try to outrun or evade death.

Difficult as it may be to form an image of what Heidegger means by authenticity, the person’s inauthenticity serves as a helpful contrast. In everydayness, the person is ensnared in a worldliness that spins with endless possibilities. The person presses into these possibilities. As if gravity were working on her, inauthentic understanding pulls her into a spatial and temporal movement that misinterprets things presently at-hand, including her sense of self. In contrast, authentic being-toward-death jolts the person

out from her movement in everydayness. This rupturing attunement makes a startling announcement: that her existence is founded on nothing at all. The measureless possibility of existence is groundlessness. There is no other possible way to be for the person. Being-toward-death is both a measureless possibility and an absolute necessity.

As an authentic being-toward-death, the person becomes free. She does not liberate herself from the world and others, as David Thoreau sought at Walden Pond. Instead, she becomes free to release herself to her authentic movement, which is “project.”³⁶ Authenticity is not a monkish disengagement, according to Heidegger, as the person never ceases being-in-the-world and moving through her lived possibilities. It is a modified engagement, as she is “torn away from the they,” which is the first time the person feels a sense of lostness, confusion, and insecurity about her identity. She realizes that her ownmost self and public they-self are misfit.³⁷ Lostness is the precondition for the person’s becoming free; since death is unavoidable, freedom from the fear of death enables a vivid grasp of existence. At the same time, she has no familiarity with her own non-existence, since non-existence is a non-relational possibility. Death is the one thing that holds the person existentially together, since she shares her own death with no one else. Yet, nothing in her experience can aid her understanding of no longer being here. Therefore, according to Heidegger there can be no philosophizing about death nor a learning to die. Death radically individualizes the person, and it opens up the person for possibilities that are not in everydayness, fallen-prey, or ossified roles of the public they-self.³⁸

As an authentic being-toward-death, the person inhabits the whole potentiality of her being. Wholeness is not a moral condition in which the person reaches greater human fulfillment. Indefiniteness characterizes her full existential understanding. Through anxiety, the person is particularly attuned to this indefinite certainty, and she is free to stand in the face of its thrownness. That is, the person has one foot in the existential movement of things that matter to her in the world, and the other in an “*absolute threat to itself arising from the ownmost individualized being of Dasein.*”³⁹ As an authentic being-toward-death, Dasein is attracted to the core of what it means to be. Yet, to be in this attuned authentic state depends upon some sort of existential suspension. The person is an absolute threat to itself. As an authentic

person, she is now ready to live resolutely, in her strange and ungraspable freedom. She can own her being-toward-death, and choose her possibilities in light of their alterity. That is, her ways of being are irreducible to the objectifiable, conventional, or take-for-granted. Not only can she project herself authentically, but can also live with others in this way.

Authentic Death and the Political

In what way can the person in an authentic mode return to community and live with others? Heidegger never speaks of politics proper, but he intimates his views in other works. Namely, in the *Introduction to Metaphysics* he speaks of an “authentic happening in the history of a people.”⁴⁰ This book, which he produced from a series of lectures delivered in 1935, is especially troublesome in Heidegger’s corpus, since it is here that he speaks of “the inner truth and greatness of National Socialism.”⁴¹ In *Introduction to Metaphysics*, Heidegger casts the German people as the torch bearers of authentic history. It seems that the radical individuation of authentic being toward death can be experienced as a collectivity.

While Heidegger does not outline a political order, it does not come as a great shock that Heidegger flirted with National Socialism, especially at the beginning of the movement, manifesting itself as it did as a supreme totality. As Joseph Goebbels, the Nazi minister of propaganda, claimed in a 1935 lecture, National Socialism “did not strive for a totalitarian state but for the totality of an idea.”⁴² Such a totality seems to defy the inauthentic mode and the metaphysical principles of, say, the liberal order. In contrast, with its insistence on the communal over the individual, it is not a surprise how many Germans were swept up by the totality of Nazism, losing their self-identity, and merging themselves with the organic wholeness of the *Volksgemeinschaft* (people’s community).⁴³

By losing their individual identity, the authentic person might feel she could merge in the movement of the historical greatness of a people. Living resolutely as a people, and freely for death, I venture to say, could justify immoderate forms of violence and death. For example, it is not far-fetched, I think, to see how Heidegger’s ideas could translate into notions of heroic death for Germans in war and

the violence against other, inauthentic, collectivities. In each case, such actions are grounded in the release and movement of an authentic being toward death that sheds all factual or practical conventions, including, moral codes, conscience, and law.

Martin Heidegger argues that the person is not really alive until she understands what death is. But everything in her life militates against this understanding. If the person ever truly wants to be free, she will stop worrying about and living for others. As Heidegger counsels, she will rally her energies, shake things up, and make ready death in her actions. It is hard to envision what an authentic life looks that is not damaged by Heidegger's political baggage. But in a 1961 lecture, Heidegger was asked how we might recover authenticity, to which he replied, "we should simply aim to spend more time in graveyards."⁴⁴ Perhaps, at the end of all of the neologism and philosophizing, the mystery of death and Being for Heidegger is quite simple, after all.

Bibliography

Cusher, Brent Edwin, and Mark Menaldo. *Leadership and the unmasking of authenticity: the philosophy of self-knowledge and deception*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2018.

Descartes, René. *René Descartes: Meditations on first philosophy: With selections from the objections and replies*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Farias, Victor. *Heidegger and nazism*. Temple University Press, 1989.

Heidegger, Martin, and Joan Stambaugh. *Being and time*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.

Heidegger, Martin. *The fundamental concepts of metaphysics: World, finitude, solitude*. Indiana University Press, 1995.

Heidegger, Martin. *Introduction to metaphysics*. Yale University Press, 2000.

Kleinberg, Ethan. *Generation existential: Heidegger's philosophy in France, 1927-1961*. Cornell University Press, 2005.

Murphy, Raymond Edward, Francis Bowden Stevens, Howard Trivers, and Joseph Morgan Roland. *National Socialism; Basic Principles, Their Application by the Nazi Party's Foreign Organization, and Use of Germans Abroad for Nazi Aims*. US Government Printing Office, 1943.

Rockmore, Tom. *Heidegger and French Philosophy: Humanism, Antihumanism, and Being*. Psychology Press, 1995.

Sheehan, Thomas. *Making sense of Heidegger: A paradigm shift*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.

Sluga, Hans D. *Heidegger's crisis: Philosophy and politics in Nazi Germany*. Harvard University Press, 1993.

Safranski, Rüdiger. *Martin Heidegger: Between good and evil*. Harvard University Press, 1999.

Turino, Thomas. *Music as social life: The politics of participation*. University of Chicago Press, 2008.

¹ I would like to thank the editors for their time and valuable remarks, and especially Erin Dolgoy who worked extensively with me on getting this chapter ready for publication. I would also like to thank all my teachers who helped me advance in my study of Martin Heidegger's philosophy in undergraduate and graduate school, including Jonathan Lee, Harvey Rabin, John Riker, and Jerry Weinberger.

² His influence among French philosophers is well documented: See, Kleinberg, Ethan. *Generation existential: Heidegger's philosophy in France, 1927-1961*. Cornell University Press, 2005; Rockmore, Tom. *Heidegger and French Philosophy: Humanism, Antihumanism, and Being*. Psychology Press, 1995.

³ See, Farias, Victor. *Heidegger and nazism*. Temple University Press, 1989; Sluga, Hans D. *Heidegger's crisis: Philosophy and politics in Nazi Germany*. Harvard University Press, 1993; Safranski, Rüdiger. *Martin Heidegger: Between good and evil*. Harvard University Press, 1999.

⁴ See, Sheehan, Thomas. *Making sense of Heidegger: A paradigm shift*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.

⁵ Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, 1996, 3/5. Throughout this chapter when referring to *Being and Time*, I will use the standard practice of adding the page number of the English translation followed by the original German edition. Italics in quotations are Heidegger's.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 10/12.

⁷Ibid., 10/12.

⁸ In German, Dasein is commonly understood to mean existence. But Heidegger emphasizes its literal meaning, there-being. English translators of *Being and Time*, leave the term untranslated. Dasein is the term of choice in commentaries as well, but I will not apply that convention here. Instead, for the sake of making this chapter as readable as possible, I will render Dasein as the person.

⁹ Cusher, Brent Edwin, and Mark A. Menaldo, eds. *Leadership and the Unmasking of Authenticity: The Philosophy of Self-knowledge and Deception*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2018, 3.

¹⁰ Descartes, René. *René Descartes: Meditations on first philosophy: With selections from the objections and replies*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

¹¹ Heidegger calls this spatial and temporal relational nexus the care structure.

¹² Public Dasein interprets itself the modes of idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity.

¹³ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 225/242.

¹⁴ Ibid., 222/239.

¹⁵ Ibid., 223/240.

¹⁶ Ibid., 232/251.

¹⁷ See Heidegger's The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics (28/29).

¹⁸ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 232/251.

¹⁹ Ibid., 174/186.

²⁰ Ibid., 234/253.

²¹ Ibid., 234/253.

²² Ibid., 223/240.

²³ Ibid., 225/242.

²⁴ Ibid., 227/245.

²⁵ Ibid., 227/245.

²⁶ Ibid., 228/246.

²⁷ Ibid., 230/247.

²⁸ Ibid., 235/254.

²⁹ Ibid., 237/257.

³⁰ Ibid., 238/258.

³¹ Ibid., 239/258.

³² Ibid., 240/260.

³³ Ibid., 241/261.

³⁴ Ibid., 241/261.

³⁵ Ibid., 242/262.

³⁶ Project is a form of Dasein's understanding, which means that it moves toward its lived possibilities in a vivid way, either becoming or not becoming its possibilities.

³⁷ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 243/262.

³⁸ Ibid., 244/264.

³⁹ Ibid., 245/266.

⁴⁰ Martin Heidegger, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 9/7.

⁴¹ Ibid., 213/152.

⁴² Murphy, Raymond Edward, Francis Bowden Stevens, Howard Trivers, and Joseph Morgan Roland. *National Socialism; Basic Principles, Their Application by the Nazi Party's Foreign Organization, and Use of Germans Abroad for Nazi Aims*. US Government Printing Office, 1943, p. 175.

⁴³ Turino, Thomas. *Music as social life: The politics of participation*. University of Chicago Press, 2008, p. 208.

⁴⁴ Wilson, Hope. "An Inquiry Into How To Live a Good Life" What Philosophy can Tell us about Everyday Life, September 18, 2015. <https://sites.psu.edu/philosophyandeverydaylife/2015/09/18/post-2-how-can-we-live-authentic-lives-heidegger/>