

Otto Lehto © 2003

“The Story of Morality: Dasein’s flowing-in-time
as the ground for moral systems”

A Philosophy Essay

The author’s dedications go to Robert A. Wilson, without whom much less would be true.

otto.lehto@pp.inet.fi

1.1 Introduction: Preliminary sketching of the nature of our inquiry

The philosopher mustn't try and find a simple answer to the question she's dealing with, e.g. *Is laboratory testing on animals moral?* Instead she'd try and figure out if rational discourse about such abstract concepts is possible. In this exemplary problem we should try to answer *whether there ever is human activity devoid of morals?* My answer would be **never**, which means the question is faulty to begin with and would need to be dismissed, dissected and from the viscera rejuvenated.

So, it's not enough to answer a question unless one can be sure it is *at all* valid and cleared of the most hopeless tautological, contradictory and obscure concepts. Such philosophers of language as Wittgenstein have placed importance in attempts to formulate a philosophical question on a firm, credible basis. He said: „*Wovon man nicht sprechen kann, darüber muss man schweigen*“¹.“ This insight ought to be kept in mind when proceeding with a question of such level of obscurity as the one here. My starting point, then, is to question the validity of the traditional conception of *morality* as a quantitative substance that can be measured objectively. Instead, I want to “strip it down” to the basics – to phenomena which in some way are explicable and up to par with our 21st century understanding of Man's relationship to the environment s/he inhabits.

My inquiry will focus on one age-old issue: *Where does "morality" stem from?* Who or what *gives* it to man, or is it a creation of man? It could be a *creation* both in the actual historical (evolutionary) sense and also in the sense of the word being a lingual "fabrication" - an empty word signifying a bundle of things and not even in a very accurate or appropriate way. I will not, however, start from the average everyday understanding of the word and figure out its usage in different particular situations (though it could be done in such a way too). Nor will I rely on religious explanations (which, at best, only denounce the importance of finding a philosophical explanation for something God has given to man – and His ways are mysterious, i.e. beyond understanding) in settling the issue. I will rather take an existing philosophical apparatus, i.e. *Heideggerian terminology* (or rather: his theoretical framework, or web, comprising interrelated interpretations of Dasein), and take its core as the starting point for my analysis. **Dasein**² shall henceforth come to replace "Man", and around that concept I'll try and portray an image of Being-in-the-World where moral behaviour plays an integral and concrete "non-metaphysical" role, and where moral acting indeed dominates (imposes itself upon) all role-play - if in mysterious ways...

1.2 Heidegger?

Heidegger's work's *raison d'être* can be seen as an attempted overcoming of Descartes's (alleged) error of mind-body separation, one of the most rigid and all-permeating Dualisms dominating the binary-operated discourse of philosophy, which has strived in the soul-corpse mysticism of Christianity, and which on the other hand is closely bound to the Platonic origins of the history of Philosophy. As has been said, the historical canon of Western philosophical thought can be seen as a perennial rewriting of footnotes to Plato's texts, a continuing self-assertion, an uncritical (un-radical, un-fundamental) exegesis, a reiterated and re-enacted capitulation to the Unspeakable.

Heidegger demanded “destruction of metaphysics” in favour of a new perspective and locus. But, not being what you'd call an analytical philosopher, his vision is poetic, abstract – to some unavoidably *obscure*. It can be said (and it has been done) that the problematic nature of his life's work left him tied up to the very structure of Platonic-Cartesian framework from which he aspired to extricate himself. Nonetheless, a generation of nascent and/or flowering (post)modern philosophers, among them Jacques Derrida, have rediscovered Heidegger's gist by saying that even

with his faults and failures in overcoming dualism (most notably discernible from his inability to finish *Sein und Zeit*, his *magnum opus*), his oeuvre remains innovatively liberating - and in some sense yet-unsurpassed. And this indeed remains a personal conviction for me, “for good or worse.”

Heidegger’s concepts concerning Being-in-Time (as Dasein), including some essential modes of Dasein’s Being that I find helpful to my analysis (that is: the various ways in which Dasein’s Being dwells in the world), shall be utilised in our inquiry. His original works provide us with idiosyncratic insights into, in traditional terms, Man and his relationship with the World. Here then we have an already-existing framework – a map, or tools, if you like – in getting to the heart of the matter without losing connections to the Western philosophical framework completely. On top of (or perhaps *alongside*) Heideggerian terminology my analysis will provide an interpretative revelation – which is built around pre-existing concepts and insights for sure, but reflecting (and self-perpetuating) more than anything my own vantage point, my “I” (as far as the **I** is “my own”).

This essay is, then, ultimately an anathema to any ”ontotheological” exegesis, such that the Heideggerians (like any disciples of disciplinary schools) undoubtedly cherish as the most worthy contribution to the dynamics of an Ism (be it Heideggerism, Exegesism or mayhaps Philosophy-ism). Clear-cut, I’ll try instead to open up a framework for substantiating Heidegger’s *care* as an ”actual” factor in the human phenomenon. A major portion of *Being and Time* was never finished, which could provide a reason why the role of *care* is so seemingly detached from what it tries to represent - that is, from *being-moral* and human decisiveness (resoluteness). We must point out, however, that *Heidegger’s ambitions lie elsewhere*, in fundamental ontology that could and would uncover Being in “its” manifold wholeness. His inquiry was not one into ethics, but ontology.

Hence, an ethical inquiry on that basis must in its nature be, at minimum, tentatively liberal and definitely un-Heideggerian in its building up of conclusions. Indeed: he offers us but the very basic structures that will form a ground for a more thorough investigation on morality in general (with the help of a cadre of other thinkers, not least that of myself), and on the temporal functioning of *careful choice-making* in Dasein’s life in particular – certainly I aim not to provide tools to live “a moral life” in any usual (virtue-based etc.) sense. I wish to shatter illusions of sobriety and completeness that exist within various interest-groups (morally bound cliques) in favour of a true, if insecure, eclecticism - *a morality of self-abnegation that believes in the power of the Different*.

This undertaking also enables me to (claim to) avoid sinking into the pit of extreme nihilism (negation of any value system - the *perverse reversal* of the moral tradition of the Western Civilization), which is at best a violent counter-re-action (it seems futile to trace the 19th to 20th century dialectics of this) to religiously misinterpreted (i.e. mystified and thus rigidified) human affairs. One might say of the attempts of some to free themselves of morals completely: good intentions, but destruction is not the key, rather deconstruction followed by reconstruction as a self-constitutive process *ad infinitum* and probably, to Sartrean existentialists at any rate, *ad nauseam*.

Yes, my inquiry can be seen as an attempt to take the best of both of the worlds, and indeed I strive (dishonestly to the extent I affirm myself; in vain to the extent text cannot transform into meta-text) to offer a middle-ground to escape the vicious cycle of antipodean arguments such as those of metaphysicians versus nihilists, or of “pro-life” fatalists/determinists versus “pro-choice” free-will/undeterminists. This much I confess to risk; this much is at stake. (Echoing Baudrillard)

An inescapable drive towards self-opaqueness haunts any ”radical” reconceptualization of Dasein (a sort of metaphysics of self-fleeing groundlessness), for which reason any insights that’ll arise must face the fact of dislocation and disgruntling of the essay’s chronological *telos*. Such reorganizing, as

effusive outbursts of becoming-amoral, will repudiate this introductory section's meaning, but not its significance as a self-annihilating platform of ignition – A Deist non-interventionist Creator.

2.1 Man and Much More

Morality is primordially a mode of the individual Dasein, and only derivatively a collective "standard." The system is the servant, not the master. Morality is exclusively neither personal (subjective) nor social (objective), neither absolutely transient nor eternal. This I will elaborate.

As man occupies himself by assuming roles and existential programs with certain dispositions towards certain goals, he is an active choice-maker working on material available to him. This active participation in worldly affairs (or lack of it) is directly reflected on material states-of-affair and subsequently to the lives and affairs of other men. So: everything leaves a trace. On a collective level the exposition of such traces is reflected upon, judged upon. There you have a viewpoint for moral evaluation: Dasein's essential disposition to the world as seen from the non-extant outside; as materialistically deterministic (not spiritual nor involving choice); as actions, reactions, interactions. That is: Fellow men are seen as things-in-the-world, even *automata*-in-the-world, x-in/of-the-world, i.e. ultimately *men as "the world"* (a categorical imperative of the *extra-Dasein* realm of forces).

So: Dasein's being-moral is primarily reflected upon as a social leaving-traces-in-the-world, where "traces" are the potentialities explored on Dasein's part – the nomadic "there" of Being; the "*been-there*." His manhood is morally a thing to others, and he is judged upon as a program destined to fulfil a purpose, a goal. This process from choice-making through engagement to material outcome is moral *as a whole*. Ergo, being-there *means* being-a-moral-interactor. To accompany this remark, the following statement must be made: The ubiquity of the "M-word" in this essay reflects what I'm up against – a world history tied to moral concepts: So, I'm not trying to trace everything back to morality, but rather morality (evasive as it is!) back to everything, to everyone, to One: Dasein.

A moral system (Law, Code of Conduct, 10 Commandments – but also more generally *any* lingual cue that serves to motivate, lead and persuade), on the other hand, behaves and shows itself in its appearances (*phainesthai* → phenomena) as different. It represents the *social*, interactive aspects of this personal morality stemming from Dasein's Being. A system is a construct by definition, but this deconstructive demystification of the origins of public (or shared) morality shouldn't lead us astray into thinking it's *groundless*, because benefits of moral systematizing are *indispensable*³ and bio-organically rooted in the essence of the emergent dimension of the world that is called Mankind.

Morality might be a misleading name, and surely it's an anachronistic Idea. Its anachronism is, however, an élitistic fact-of-the-matter turned into a subject-of-debate ruminated upon by progress-mongerers amongst other doomsday prophets. Moreover it is a word that "misses the point" and fails to confront itself. The fact remains: underneath the word morality a whole range of authentic existential functions of *being-there* can be traced and transformed into good use in the new context of Dasein-centred phenomenology. This will provide hopefully the means to take what's "good" of traditional black-and-white morality too, namely the basic tools for moral discourse. The hypothesis is: *without "morality" Dasein would not be Dasein – Dasein simply wouldn't "be"*.

2.2 The appearealization of the God-given, or: “God Giveth And Doth Take Away.”

The traditional misconception (a pre-self-consciously moral outlook on life) deals with the functioning of morality as an objective “Force of Nature” which somehow *manifests itself* in such systems as The State, The Church, The School etc. This conception – one that underlies any unilateral approach to problem solving (e.g. literal reading of Old Testament morals) – is based on an externalised image, Thing (*Morality*), created out of an urge to symbolically grasp such an abstract concept. It resembles the deification of such phenomena as Love, Beauty, Fertility – all of these have been amongst the gods in most pagan religions. Morality, in Christianity, is attributed to God alone. In His Word one can find the means to tackle every individual problem. Through these carefully chosen (handpicked-by-God) Universals one is supposed to be able to learn how to *make the right choice in every second of his life*. This is a process where Dasein presupposes the *timeless, immaculate wholeness* of the divine Universal and tacitly applies it to the *transient, capricious* (mundane) Particular. What one fails (or: “they” fail) to see is the fact that *in the beginning there was (and is) the Particular*. The Universal is merely an image, a generalised abstraction, based on the interrelatedness of the multitudinous *human* events of History. Religion deified morality and its human origins were lost, covered up and/or denounced, transferred in tradition as *a given, a gift*.

In givenness, the moment of appearance. God.

In gettingness, the moment of realization. Man.

This duality I call *appearealization* – a phenomenological unit(y).

This duality is not hopefully to be “enforced” by my wording. This duality, this two-fold, is but one stronghold of moral imperatives, of a kind of action-guidance (free will under compulsion) whereby even Heidegger in his older days would evoke a historical meaning and purpose to fold Dasein in, while simultaneously holding true to his aversions to carefree passing-on of fundament-beckoning concepts like the ego of *sub-iectum*. The Heidegger after Being and Time felt seeming compulsions (felt it a moral imperative) to fall back on certain historico-cyclical fatalistic certitude, even servitude, in service of the “*es gibt*” of his Fourfold – a curiously idiosyncratic concept a double duality; A two-fold squared (2^2), a symbol of wholeness as utilised by various religions and theologies - now the question becomes naïve and self-evident: Did Heidegger in his older days fall back on metaphysics proper, did geriatric intoxication come unto him via onto-theological musings?

But I digress. To reiterate: In the beginning there was the individual Dasein, whose interaction with his kin produced (as a *necessary product* of this interaction) an outward-reaching, externalised reflection of this individual’s aspirations and shortcomings. This reflection came about as a product of lingual transaction of thoughts and opinions. The reflection came to be called “morality” and at the instant there occurred a break-up between the Creator and the Created. The Creator, Dasein, came to hold the Created as independent of him, and as somehow having a timeless existence of its own. “Created-by-whom?” was asked. “Created-by-God” was answered. The indispensable link between Dasein (the source of the external *World-of-Morals*) and the externalised projections of his Being was lost. Fixed in a system of thought-control like Christianity, confusion escalated as the level of objectified abstraction increased side-by-side with the first Globalisation mankind has experienced: The panning of Spiritual Ideology across the horizon of Euro-American Christendom.

Yet, to oppose Church, to wish its destruction as a material process, is to run coeval the ideological struggle, dialectic, of moral concept-formation. Thus “un-Christianity” *as an assumed stance* – not as an endowed honour, denunciation, from the side of the clergy, in which case the word would “appropriately inappropriately” (becoming hot material to the *Believer-Atheist* debate by oozing of inappropriate nomenclature) mark the boundaries of Christian logic and indeed its Logos – tends to

turn one from a revolutionary into a reformist: To will God's demise is to will in opposition to the non-opponent – to will Satanic Christianity; not freedom, not hope. This leads not to an a-theistical (a-Christian) *moral purity*, but rather anti-theistical (Antichrist-ian) reformist Christianity - *apropos* we have Inverse Cross as a symbol of this latter-day Lutheranism. In another words, in order to escape the semiotic dominance of God-discourse, one goes on not against God, but *despite of Him*.

That is of course only if one is willing to disperse one's self pan-traditionally over the idea of Faith. Such taking-responsibility is often too much to ask of the bulk of self-appointed "moralists."

2.3 Amoral Fati

As there's something of an existentialist stigma to be associated with Heidegger - and naturally with any Heideggerian outlook - I'll concede to a half-hearted allegiance to the Sartrean formula: "Existence precedes essence." The sole actual "pre-Dasein existence" of Morality is *the eternally recurring manhood of all men* which allows for the continuity of human species - individuals are born and die away while the community, and communal morality, survives. Jung⁴ named it the Collective Unconscious. It is the product of subjective, symbolic representations of our own soul - our unique selfhood (our individuality as a Dasein) - combined with a sense of belonging (to family, community, nation, planet etc.), the harmony of which constitutes our being-amongst-others.

So: societal morality stems from *lingual reflections on "Being-there"* by men of different historical epochs, by *representatives* of different generations and eras. Moral Code for the individual Dasein already *is there* (as a "given") when Dasein is born and it will still lurk on even after his death.

Collective morality is also cumulative, as it for the most part progresses towards a steadier reconciliation between individual freedom and social security, though – and this is often forgotten - at the same time its history appears cyclical following the rise and fall of civilizations, each with their own own moral dispositions to the worlds they inhabit. Morality intimately relates to the Historical Unconscious, which further relates to concepts like Progress and Mankind. Indeed: The concept of a species-level historical determinant, a "Mankind", is so detached a concept from the primordial experience of "Man", Dasein, that there remains the option of talking of *two different Beings* inherent in Homo Sapiens – the social one still being an extension, *an outering* (to use Marshall McLuhan's terminology), of Dasein, but having a Morality of a qualitatively different functionality. Hence, *Social Morality extends Dasein*, but does so as a timebound, derivative phenomenon, whose destiny is in the hands of the Immortal Man, dispersed in space-time...

Henceforth I will further expose this outered systematic functionality of Morality, in the light of which the very concept appears akin to the *technical-materialistic achievements* (products of labour physical and mental) of Man, such as the multitude of tools and machines Dasein has contrived, or, say, the increased efficiency with which thermodynamical physics has been harnessed to serve our strive for comfort in the confined space of a room via the functions of an electric heater. *Social Morality stands in a similar relationship to Dasein's Ethics as does Social Technology* (e.g. the trans-communal network of transportation routes, or the state-protected water and electric supply in tightly-inhabited cities) *to Dasein's Labour-Power*. Thus, I insist on an absolute pliability of moral concepts – not despite the fact that they have concrete effects, but *precisely because of it*. The reason is the same as to why peer review in Science or Government accountability do matter – just as the Academia *vis-à-vis* Society and the Government *vis-à-vis* People, likewise Social Morality is *of, by and for* Dasein, and in a similar way is it to be held accountable - but herein lies the difficulty, since the sphere of Moral Systems is a sphere that cannot be subjected to moral judgements without

falling into opaqueness. So: To assume a stance, a relationship, to the subject-matter of this essay is to at best to picturesquely shed light to the coming-into-being of Ideologies and Ideas, but *this cannot be done amorally – and this indeed is my point*. As the thorough permeatedness of moral stances is laid out open, one cannot but to silently pass over hasty judgement-making and instead tear down walls limiting clear perception – and aren't these walls thick and abundantly around us!

2.4 Wille zur Freiheit

Without the "free will" of men can there be no morality? Is there then no moral system that can serve as the basis for human action, since don't men (excuse my phallogocentrism) have "a choice" (this choice being always "moral" in nature), if - and only if - *free will* is present, in "making the right/wrong choice" and in "judging prudently/carelessly"? Well, "**free**" **choice-making** is always contextual and thus limited to begin with. Still, in Dasein's interaction with(in) the world, morality is essential (that is: in the essence of the experience) and not to be understood as "optional," though its *manifestations* are very much case-dependent and subject to radical, abstract (per)mutations as Dasein flows in time - as Dasein transcendently negates the moral certitude of its Now.

Will stands at the centre of morality as a spiritual (psychic) aspect of Dasein – even if its "freedom" is an illusion par excellence, a fabrication of history, caused by defective philosophical reasoning and insufficiently acute understanding of Man's psyche and of the causality of events, surviving over ages as but an anachronistic metaphysical lingual image, a vividly fanciful metaphor.

The metaphysical burden of the term "free will" forces us to proceed with caution. After all, morality is nearly always associated with religion, for reasons historical, as the following illustrates:

The 10 Commandments mean much more for every citizen of the modern world, whether a believer or a heathen, than do all the other inscribed plates of historical value combined. This historical heritage survives to our day, and I don't even have to elaborate on the intertwined history of Church and State to make it clear that the influence of the Judeo-Christian moral system (also expressed in Islamic Shari'a) divinely ordained is embedded into any Constitution, trans-Atlantically. This confusingly theocratic development of our secular society is of course a source for much confusion for the average person, trying to accept the role of the *subliminal historical echo of Christianity* (its *karma*, if you like) that tends to get in the way of non-metaphysical moral discourse in every turn - whether one talks of politics, societal norms or simply of the hardships and toils of Dasein's everyday circumspection as being-with-others-in-the-world.

2.5 The Mounts of Megiddo: Harmageddon Now!

*"Quantus tremor est futurus,
quando iudex est venturus
cuncta strictre discussurus!"
- Dies Irae, Thomas of Celano*

In all the modes of being-in-the-world one faces constant pressure, whether recognised or not, to make a choice. We are forced (*power* is exerted upon us through an extant power-centre of opposition we reckon with by varied degrees of compliance) to "take responsibility" firstly by "having-to-choose", and secondly by having to make *the right choice* with a limited, and controlled, knowledge-flow from all the Daseins involved, from all the externalised power-centres concerned,

from all the informants available. To put it in another way, the *personalised moral burden is an information package* with the Other's power (and ultimately Dasein's *potentia*) quantified in a binary code whereby Dasein's living-force, *bios*, gets digitized as a cute cue, a weighty word, of good-bad opposition: A Weltanschauung of a binary-coded matrix of *us against them*. This is how the life- and death- instincts of the species function; this is sociohistorically operating "Darwinism."

The burdening-of-responsibilities by the Other is a perennial lack-of-judgement of Dasein.

It's a *double burden*: We are put into a position of having to decide ourselves what we are to do in each situation (whether to obey, to resist or to innovate?), and it is moreover expected of us to "be responsible", i.e. to foresee, in the face of case-dependently self-materializing consequences, the Judgement of the Other(s), as the all-seeing Panopticon of Other-Morality (as opposed to Dasein-Morality) vigilantly oversees the individual process - and dutifully frowns upon one's misdeeds.

In the concept of "Other-Morality" is inherent the objectification of the judging subject (in Sartrean terms: the Other), but also the subjectification of the moral system - and indeed the unconscious (often pre-lingual) self-transfer of tradition (morally endowed habituality), like a viral epidemic, uses the human host as the necessary vehicular carrier, host, of the very *essence* of the phenomenon; be it the essence of a molecular-level viral genealogy or a lingual-level moral "memealogy."

In both forms an information flow transfers into action, and ultimately self-propagation.

The history of a Gesellschaft indeed is a Geist; an unconscious shadow perpetuated by the passing-on of memes. Yet be not benighted: The Other-Morality is of a different order of appearance than Dasein-Morality, so the primordial moral potential of man cannot be explained away (even if and when it is accounted for, remembered, stored, reminisced, judged-upon or neglected in carelessness) as a historical movement of lingual cues and concepts affected by a dialectical survival of the fittest where Hegel fuses frictionlessly into Darwin: Isms, no accident, of the same (the 19th) century...

Everyone obeys a moral code. This code is (for the) individual, but at the same time, due to Dasein's being-in-the-world, *concretely* contextual and shared. Ergo, "moral standards of co-operative existence" stem from the subjective codes, turned into politics out of pragmatism (even "Social Darwinistic," or rather: "Huxlean-Spencerian") *Musts*, e.g. in order to alleviate one's emotive burden (of insecurity, powerlessness etc), resulting from the simple yet profound sharedness of Man; Species-Being. In situations of immediate bio-sexual survival, entities-in-the-world bring either death and decimation ("Evildoers" of George W. Bush's rhetoric) to the Species-Being or balancingly enhance the Good of the community - the community-spirit, the ancestral imperative, the historical Geist, the Man-God servitude of consecutive generations...

The movement towards *individuum*-centeredness, this atomistic sociological conception of man as a citizen, actor, player, consumer, *unit* (Lat. *unus*, One) is surely the stuff of modernity, the essence of the media-rich Gutenberg Galaxy as seen by Marshall McLuhan. From Species-Being to being-amongst-entities-in-the-world; from Species-Morality to Dasein-Morality - *E Pluribus Unum!*

That is indeed how the "founding fathers" of USA put it, how they experienced the symbiosis appearealizing in their space-time, how they witnessed the translocation of the locus of moral beckoning from *the plurality of sameness to the unity of difference*. There indeed hardly is anything truer to the Enlightenment than the Great Seal of the USA, in which of course is depicted the gaze of the Eye ("I") that oversaw the unfolding of plans as given to man by the grace of the good God.

This Story is one of the main Great Narratives ever told, and subliminally the stuff of our hero-legends is much the same as it always has been; the archetypes remain the same even as the violent moral negation of the “elsewhe(re)n” conflicts with the much-touted concept of steady progress.

Still, the reversal of the “direction” of morality’s path opens up two apparent contradictions:

Firstly, the living-together (*syn-biosis*) and breathing-together (*con-spiracy*) as promised by a Story, such as that of the Great Seal, claim liberation from “plurality” and dissent whereas factually they hold these exact values in high regard. This, I believe, is an attempted denunciation of the *right-to-be-wrong*. But, the very form of morality disallows for any such truth-claim! Denouncing at a certain space-time Dasein’s right-to-be-wrong, *event-ually* (“in and through events”) will take the form of denouncing Dasein’s right-to-be-right, i.e. *a posteriori* a moral system claiming to be against Dasein’s right-to-be-wrong will simultaneously be against Dasein’s right-to-denounce-the-right-to-be-wrong, that is, *be against the Truth of itself as far as the self is of Dasein*.

Secondly, doesn’t it seem faulty to still claim primacy to Dasein when evolutionarily or historically the direction has been established as *E Pluribus Unum* – that Plus begat the Unum? I think I can see a way around this. Plato, for one, had the concept of *anamnesis*. That the higher functions of the mind would gain mastery of life (through virtuous lifestyle, i.e. through moral existence) only through a rediscovery of something you already knew – or rather, *didn’t know you knew*...

So that moral reappropriation of reality for the individual is factually a harnessing of that what the species sub-consciously did “there” in the functions of the “das Man,” what the species experienced as a given – *this would mean it was always Dasein but you were better of not thinking about it!*

Now I feel however that I must expound further the non-variant archetypes of social morality:

Some(space-)times, making an “unfortunate” choice causes tumultuous incidents - one might for example seize someone’s life and be named a *wrongdoer*. One has been an undertaker in an imagined game of chance. This word on its part reflects yet again the moment of choice of a Dasein. He has “failed”. His choices (say, driving with alcohol in one’s blood) proved *wrong* (immoral).

The failure *is* the condemnation; the act *is* the punishment.

The rest is ceremonious embellishment - the rites of the court remind Dasein of the necessity of social self-maintenance of law-abidingness; they remind that choice-making in the act is morally predestined. A culture with its moral hypothesizing presupposes a subject-of-Code, be it however crude or refined, Dasein as an in-between of Heaven and Hell: A Citizen at the nexus of public sphere, a Worker at the equilibrium of supply and demand, a Life on a calendar-bound course towards inevitable extinction. The democratic condition in particular – it being the first to truly be open for moral self-negation – is inevitably one of sweet promises and high hopes (Rights, Freedoms, Possibilities) but also of conflicts and paradoxes resulting from the necessarily outlandish and illusionary nature of the dreamy utopianism of republicanism and democracy-ism (obscenely enough, in our semantics the very *real* word “democratism” sounds like an artifice).

Modernity being so, in historical, ideological and existentialist contrast (in order to explicate the Dasein’s self-destructiveness inherent in all cries for Universalities), in the ascetic purity of the moral certitude of concentrated totalitarian rectitude, in the extreme, *the Social exists in and of ecstatic condemnation wherefore the Private is the Collective’s condemned-upon lack of telos*.

Such is the absolute abnegation of Dasein's Existenz; such is the inherent strive in all moral systems – as, by definition, any totality promises totalitarianism. Moreover, such is the lamentable outcome of ill-conceived social theories for which the private and the public meet in reciprocity; Rarely do sociologists and politicians fail to address their calumnious condemnation of a minority, of a factional opposition, of a threatening independence. It ought be remembered that Adolf Hitler was first and foremost a demagogue, that is: an exemplary democrat, a totalizing will of the *demos*...

It is the dark side of industrialized republicanism that the society's harmonious saturation would express its totalitarianism (in an age of transnational corporatism where border disputes play minute role) through the functions of the *parliament*, but also through the various conjunction-points for collective fluxes such as those of the *media* (the market-place of ideas and wills), *as a circulatory death wish*. This translates (as far as the well-being of the human organism is of any concern) to a Collective Thanatos: A suicidal instinct eliminating mutations indiscriminately, i.e. arbitrarily...

2.6.1 Civilization Over One Nation

So, Man is a moral animal. But is it so *exclusively*? What is meant by this? Anthropocentrism? A practice of an illusioned, disempowered mammal? To me it seems quite likely that Man is only one amongst a multitude of species-Beings capable of moral judgements and "free" will, because these attributes cannot be dimmed down to on/off modes - even Man has only a type, a degree, of each. Yet any law, religious or "secularised" (that is, allegedly post-mystified), is grounded on the priority Dasein gives to *itself* and reflectively to its *species mates* - as some kind of benevolent co-Daseins - in the tacit endorsement of Community over Individual. Our (unconsciously) accepted and (unreflectively) presupposed *moral ensemble* represents, in its social manifestations, (more or less successfully) the way things "*should be in the human community (but are not)*." This communal/ist, social(ist), dwelling of morality is revelatory enough of the process of *civilization*; The very concept loses its content if scrutinized as a stagnant state of (human) affairs (in a Nation-State), since *the lack (as of yet)* of harmony, concord and symbiosis - as promised in the established canon of (community-specific) Moral Word - functions *eschatologically and retrospectively* to drive the Now of the community wayward as Writ, or, as within the community gets called this pull from the future, "forwards" (towards its end-state) - this transpersonal moral resonance that recognises in Time *a soteriological promise*. Civilization is a work-in-progress. The trans-Dasein existence of the Other as present in the morality-professing Collective Unconscious reveals the cumulative function of history as an acted out entropy-defying self-sustenance with (species-level) affecting-from-distance annexing the praxes of the *physioexistentially-separated-in-space-time*.

A Collective Unconscious perhaps at times and places has been unseparable from one's nationality and one's epic ancestry, but undoubtedly the interplay of identities as professed by blood-bound genetic organelles (state, community, tribal order), religious prophesies (Abrahamic dream of Zion), secularized prophesies (rights, freedoms, Progress), transnational bodies (capitalist corporations and World Banks; socialist syndicates and Internationals) and post-World War II trends and youth culture oscillations have all permanently disgruntled and dislocated the regional asymptotic continuity of a *national* "Collective Identity" (a dying breed indeed!) in favour of a prominently more eclectic and synergistic "free market of moral systems." The main effect of this has *not* been, as far as I see, an ahistoricalization akin to a standstill, but rather a transtraditionalization akin (in much of the "post-modern" West) to a rediscovery of the *rhizomatic* (contra arboreal or tree-like) *flourishing of cultures* ever since the early onset of the agriculture-worshipping God-Empires of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Phoenicia, Indus Valley, Greece, China etc. This re-rootedness to the common, global sources of the Dasein experience is unfortunately not an unequivocal fact, but more

like a capricious blow of wind, threatened by the vicissitudes of the world condition leading to resurgences of rigid moral formulations - relapses into nationalistic xenophobia, for example. For an undertaking of an inquiry into the Dasein experience of moral potential, this tendency is off-setting, for there can be no moral understanding of even very elementary sort as long as fear and hate are given foothold, as they are in present circumstances by a universal *différance of love*.

2.6.2 With Us - Against Us

A civilization's various (re)lapses into tribal rage tend to occur during certain reformatory eras. The resonance of moral dimensions within a civilization during its imperialistic nation-state phase, for example, constitutes a nationalistic (nazi) resonance of physical allegiance as so pivotally recorded in Nuremberg rallies of "robotic" (pre-programmed) mass obedience. Even more dangerously is it expressed in collective struggles against unsound frequencies of ireresonance *within* and *without* the realm of the true believers (brethren-in-morality). Of off-beat dangers within, the rootless nomads, the Jews - the archetypal internationalists - would by necessity be raised on a marked pedestal when a moral tone *meant* a nationalistic tone. The herein emphasised structurally bound, concrete relationship of moral concepts to Dasein's behaviour transforms into the possibility of a successful ecosociopoliticohistorical analysis of Moral Systems. As an example, Wilhelm Reich's analysis of the mass psychology of fascism bears strong witness to the unveiled moral archetypes of ("sexually armoured") Hitlerites. That is: transpersonal Morality's manifestations can be subjected to causal analyses with great potential for success. This is clear from the nature of Moral Systems to "explain themselves away" - to reveal in their make-up *the totality of imperfection they represent*.

To again compare the most malignant and out-of-control Systems to computing jargon: The abiding and spreading phase of an intralingual system is a function of time (in the truest mathematical sense), and as such a subject to an analysis, which - due to the nature of the subject-matter - must have a causal (i.e. historical) tone. And, to nod approvingly at Richard Dawkins's (the new father of that social offshoot of evolutionary biology, of what is often called "memetics") direction, St. Paul's proselytizing Christianity (Islam even more so and, alas, Scientology too) as a System-with(in)-a-History indeed can be seen as a lingual virus or - preferably as I'll elaborate - a cancer, a system whose characteristically *professed* and on the other hand *actualized* functions are at odds in just the right proportion as to maintain a self-perpetuating *holding-back of Dasein's potential* in favour of and in servitude to a subliminal, subconscious thrust to lingual cues necessitating behavioural patterns which, not to exaggerate nor overstretch a metaphor one bit, are schizophrenically self-destructive - just like computer worms and viruses, which spread by turning the functions and mechanisms of various computing algorithms "against themselves" and as such in fact often work more like a cancerous excrescence than a viral infection. Yet the point remains that the lingering-on of run-away moral systems is a struggle horizon (becoming, abidance and ebbing-away - all in a horizon, *horos*, marking the boundaries of thought) to be disentangled and deconstructed with the weapons of a causal analyst, such as the ones social scientists indeed have access to. Of exemplary methods, it'll suffice to mention a *chic* bundle: Socio-Economic game theories such as those of von Neumann, Morgenstern and Nash to explicate the subtle variables of interpersonal - even long-distance - communication and interaction, such as the interchange of moral imperatives and the forming of power-hierarchies as present in any social network based on profit, self-interest or any variation thereof. The far-reaching methodical compatibility of functionalist and causalist sociology to the study of a moral oscillation of "the masses" is well established, to our greatest comfort.

2.7.1 Post Iesu, ergo propter Iesu?

While so much is within the grasp of a scientist of the *societas*, the coming-into-being phase (the becoming) of such systems eludes persistently even the most vigilant stander-by and sharer of history. That is, the point of departure, as it were, for the outered cue to extricate itself from the possession of *Dasein* (the point after which, to follow Heidegger's lead here, careful reckoning deteriorates into idle chatter) is a leaving of a birth-canal for run-away systems - even though there occurs simultaneously a death, a quieting (*quietus*), of an effective exertion of Free Will over matter and the Other(s) on *Dasein*'s part. So: The Legacies and Ideologies of such figures as, say, Jesus and Marx that share their names do not strictly belong to them, but to the ideological realm of run-away Systems, and as such to the realm of *no-one-yet-everyone* ("das Man"). This helps to understand what the elderly Marx meant with his facetiously apt remark: "*I am not a Marxist.*"

There are Marxists, but their Existenz is not of Marx, but after Marx. (Post hoc, ergo propter hoc.)

The realm of titular claimants to historical figures of prominence is the realm of Otherness and the most widespread "stuff" of politico-historical moral reaching; this aspiration to universalize a particular, communalize a habit, castrate a truth, confiscate a secret, appropriate a mystery...

2.7.2 The Right-To-Be-Right

Archetypal moral forms serve to dissociate *Dasein* from his ahistorical "birth right" *to be right*. The right-to-be-right is what "the Right" in the political spectrum worship in the "*es gibt*" trinity of Family, God and the State. The *es gibt* of the organized left, on the other hand, prominently involves such Jeffersonian-Marxist claimants as the right to have Life/Liberty/Happiness or the right for a just distribution of wealth and for rebellion - all rights-to-be-right in specific historical circumstances. Yet, the right-to-be-right is forevermore rediscovered and, again, lost. Its rediscovery is not in any Ism, but in the non-subtracted multitude of Isms, i.e. not in the Isms at all but presupposing them. *This pre-Ism, pre-concept immediacy of morality is the right-to-be-right.*

This peculiarly Western Enlightenment concept of *Being-for-Ism* carries an outered Idea into *being-without-the-right-to-be-right*, i.e. *being-wrong*. Stalinist sympathizers forfeited Marx's right-to-be-right. Ayn Rand stuck unto Big Business corporatism's right-to-be-right and made a popular religion out of a socio-economic system that never existed. World War II and the establishment of the UN negated nationalism's and fascism's rights-to-be-right, the Holocaust Hitler's right-to-be-right. *Transcendental negations of the Real, of the True, are an a priori for a collective consensus.*

The yet-poorly-understood impetus for Isms to self-perpetuate themselves is factually a function of the Collective Unconscious and of the abusers of language (a position that any *Dasein* periodically transsubstantiates himself into), who subconsciously allow for its taking place (and time). As such, the symbiotically synthesizing mechanism of mankind (as all transcendental dialectic) is up against *itself*, just as *Dasein* corrects itself and abides yet stronger and more flexibly as a result of its own reflection, but via that same mechanism lays bare the emptiness of its yesterday, and ultimately of its today. Isn't this what the French existentialist attest to? And isn't it a sorry gloom!

But I believe – indeed I have to! – that only a preliminary glimpse on Being is achieved by leaving this relativistic idea floating in the air, *on Nothing(ness)*. The aim in my essay is, as Social Morality's basic functioning is touched upon, to firmly yet gently embrace the authentic and immediate *Dasein* experience and to do so with the full reckoning of the transcendental projection

that it Is (*Sei*). Being eternal self-perfection, Morality and Religion find their true haven in Man. As Heidegger's world-view can one reach/teach, the calling-forth of Destiny opens up "free Freedom," but *not* a beckoning to be misconstrued as a call for irrationality: Indeed there can be no Freedom without Boundaries, no Logos without a Logosphere, no Time without Space, no *Sein* without *Da*!

The right-to-be-right is *always and never* the right-to-be-wrong.

2.7.3 Seasons don't fear the Reaper, nor do the Wind, nor the Sun or the Rain...

An up-to-date example: In the light of behaviorist resonance (a concrete dimension of transpersonal psychology), the structural and ideological differences between a muslim *Jihad* towards a global *imma* under *Shari'a* on one hand, and a WASP *progress* towards a global *capitalism* under *New World Order* on the other hand are miniscule, even though the former is predominantly a pre-democratic, oral and counter-evolutionary meme while the latter explicitly advocates (a kind of) democracy, is based on legalistic discourse and professes Evolution and Progress. The functionality of moral resonance, then, is concretely bound to the adaptability of *Dasein* to the function of loosely-bound peer-groups (WASP/Islam), life-programs (progress/jihad), *Gemeinschafts* (New World Order/*imma*) and *Gesellschafts* (capitalism/*shari'a*) *ready-at-hand for Dasein*. These obviously have various compositions and world-dispositions at display. Importantly too: That which *isn't* openly at display - *the esoterica of the social organelle's structure* - is closely bound to the unique lure of what constitutes the System's essence, its *seductive reward for Belonging* - and conversely its *blackmailed punishment for Abandoning*. Thereby expressed relationship between the social and the private is also the meeting point between *given* revelation and *experienced* revelation, between *Given Moral Standards* and *Experienced Moral Sentiments* - A moral standard is nothing more than sentimental non-variance, that is: *behavioral resonance*.

Such non-variance being at the heart of any collective effort, intuitively the breaking-point of a *Dasein* with an Other is a breaking point between a System with another System, whereat the interpersonal non-variance (which even at the most rigid systematizations of moral sentiments presents itself to necessitate peer squabble and an anti-systematic flow of flexibility) serves to invalidate the sought-after "good" state of temporary security and comfort *on both sides of the issue*. Thus the security of *morally-bound groups* (and which group isn't such?) is expressed as a matrix of inclusion-exclusion (*us against them*) and this serves to make *a defection* an insecure moment of letting-go and reaching-out. Yet such letting-go is an everyday issue for *Dasein*, possibly as far as to constitute the history of its Ego-ism. The schematic process of individuation, broadly speaking, is an encapsulation of *Dasein* in a fold of *will-fully* opened-up pathways - that is: rules, codes of conduct, methods, inductions and general "lessons of life," within the scope and worldview of which *Dasein* roams as a master. Yet the cracks on the walls of one's Church, if looked into, prove to be pathways to new realities, and - if one ventures deep enough - it is to be expected to find one's domain extended or at any rate relocated and transfigured onto new horizons. The resulting homesickness, to extend my unapologetically poetic figure of speech, can result in desperation (Sartre's *nausée*, Heidegger's *Angst*) but *must not do so*: without dwelling at length in implications of the opening-up of a moral horizon solely as a *Dasein-Domain*, I propose we - as in the Deleuzian reading of Leibniz - embrace spiritual nomadism; an acceptance of a kind of a "Jewish" mentality (archetypally put).

This would be nomadic rootlessness to uproot rooted fears of the foreign/alien and the not-yet-but-soon - which correlate respectively to xenophobia and neophobia or, *apropos* my schematology, to *spatio-territorial homesickness* and *temporal-horizontal tunnel vision*.

2.7.4 Da-Sein, Fort-Sein, Da-Sein...

Dasein's systematic dwelling in and flowing in between Systems and Isms is a *transcendentally regulated Story*, where Free Will (*Ego*, in another words – no reason to maintain a difference in this context) reaches out as a breach in space-time; as non-local, non-temporary pure *Wille zur Macht*, if you like – a function of the world and a constituent of it yet always not-yet-there (wherever it sees its Moral Destiny). The full panoply of competing moral stories is quite literally a horizon of historical Da-Sein (experience), but none of the ready-at-hand Stories encaptures the World's Future, Present nor indeed even its Past "an sich" as each dominant Story (whether its emphasis is on the People, on Gods, on Nation, on Classes or what have you) of each epoch transforms the reach across space-time as a horizon fixed on a purpose and Destiny. This relativistic space-time conception can probably best be witnessed within the sphere of anthropology, e.g. Benjamin Lee Whorf and the Hopis. In sociology the disentanglement from existing historical paradigms such as Dialectical Materialism or Enlightenment Progress can prove a task for a life-time – yes, even if initiation into them may be a matter of a few months, or, more accurately, a few books. Thus, the persuasive intra- and inter-institutional Grand Narratives (as Lyotard phrased them) of the modern *civitas* serve a collective moral Destiny, something T.S.Kuhn labelled under *paradigmatic "normal science"*. Acting-for-others (as Fate commands) and acting-for-ego overlap, as it stands, but the Ego's sphere is a spiral surge *against* - and an escape from - the unwarranted influence of self-destructiveness as present in Other-Moralities of ready-at-hand Systems, because (to make this clear) the systems-at-hand are simply moral cues for behavioral obligations, that is, cues for entering into a relationship with Other Dasein(s) that implies order, hierarchy and purpose.

It is likely that in the world of apes they look at each other's worldly disposition exactly like we look at our kin. They just don't have fancy words to describe this social evaluation. And by this I mean nothing else than the fact that only through (human) language is morality discernible and abstractable; only through symbols, signs and cues is the memetic network of communal spirit to live on forevermore. In this light the postmodern syndrome is tightly knit to ethicality, and not only as a *relativistic* (trans-traditional) turmoil, but as an *anti-historical* and *anti-traditional* (virtual) reality; as a *New Morality* could Fukuyama's eco-social "End of History" be [re/ap]proached – or, more appropriately, as a "Morality of an End of Morality," a very conventionally structured Moral Story, then. Here, I believe, Mark Twain's remarks on his reported death reverberate soundly.

These aspects of a *moral system* do not immediately concern us further, however interesting they may be, since morality as a system is but a reflection on a more primordial sense of Dasein's *flowing-morally-in-time*, an idea that deserves further substantiation - and will this get.

2.8 Παντα ρεῖ & The Confusion of Flux

The Flow Heraclitus talks about in his famous "*Everything flows*" (as far as it is translatable unequivocally into *Heideggerese*) represents **Being-in-Time** (as a Dasein).

Constantly, and without delay, while fixing our attention on a problem-at-hand, we seek to re-adjust. This re-adjusting of one's priorities and causes-of-concern leads (indeed *flows*) into a new subjective "reality-tunnel" within the scope of the prevalent "social reality-tunnel."⁵

Every *now* Dasein experiences offers a situation ready-at-hand (within one's immediate grasp). At every such moment (and indeed there is nothing beyond these moments) Dasein makes a moral

judgement – an act which concerns itself with the future (and as such transcends the immediate presence), yet faces the past as that from which to *build up the ground* for one’s moral decisions.

The past, then, represents the absolute moral reality for Dasein, but does so *in the present concerning itself with the future*. Such is the route through which “timeless” morals arrive at an individual judgement. Here one may notice how the role one assumes (or indeed *plays out* as the “freely acting” protagonist) is in actuality always “lagging behind” – of the vanguard of sociological ideas, of the avant garde of aesthetical experiences etc. – because it stems from things (experiences, moral engagements, past definitions of “good vs. bad” etc.) gone by, to which Dasein (in his less than omniscient vision and with his faltering epi-subconscious capacity for memory-retrieval) has naturally only limited access. The past is ready-at-hand only to the extent one is able to bring back any past experiences in the unmediated presence and re-link them in a never-fixed self-correction to newly-opening visions; to newly revealed promises and threats, engagements and dis-engagements, clinging-on’s and letting-go’s - i.e. to the whole reality-matrix of the Now.

Enough’s not said, however. While making this future-orientated foreseeing judgement, Dasein *at the same time* occupies a mode of *judging-afterwards*. This is the backwards-oriented reaching of Dasein’s morality – a judgement is laid down upon the manifold events and interrelated subjective frames, images, sensory perceptions of the past. Since being-there *is* being-moral, the so-called “objective past” is actually a moral story; a grand narrative, a mythos. To relate this preliminarily to the established conceptuality of history, you might look at, say, the Enlightenment mythos or more recently the self-righteous mythos of Post-Modernity, and recognize these violently loud surges in time, these demarcated traces of actions and reactions by the Historical Dasein as skindeep marks of struggle on the body of time-binding humanity; as stories to tell of battles sought, fought and won.

The movement of history (which in fact stands for permutations within culturo-memetic conceptuality), as exemplified in the “social movements” (where “*the movement*” is “*the flow*” of Dasein) and “counter-cultures” (which, as a rule, aspire not to “counter” productivity but wasteflows, to put it in “economic” terms; in terms of efficiency), is a self-perfecting mechanism to “ensymbiate” (that is: *to bring into unison* through mutual recognition via symbols) the time-bound experience of humanity besought by discord and misery. The story of the collective struggle is the story of Man’s Ascent – or, counter-evolutionarily, Redemption – to Divinity; fermenting of the soil for existence. In another words, the *receptivity* to historical cues (such as those of “isms”) on the semantic level reflects Dasein’s moral stance on the multitude of causal experiences being-in-the-world opens up, and likewise the transpersonal multitude of such experiences noncausally linked constitutes the moral dimension of language, culture, and history. As this experience level is found and expressed within manhood, the ahistorical Dasein ultimately is the sole creator of historical morality in all its manifold and picturesque convolutions.

To make a list of man-instigated run-away moral cues is an impossibility as an idea and endeavour, since any such list would never be complete while the historical Dasein’s story unfolds in time. Moreover, any such list would be less complete an interpreter and depicter of human affairs than, say, Tolstoy’s War and Peace (a monumental revelation of rooted moral bonds etc.) or any such aesthetically pleasing plotted Story, wherein found “stories-within-the-Story” are perpetually recurring moral resonances of the West, and as such obvious transcendences of geographical or demographical demarcations and contours of a novel’s happenstances (the word *milieu*, as an example, derives from Latin “medius” + “locus”; a midpoint, *a centre of a con-fusing flow of moral resonances*) – transcendences that nonetheless are indebted to and presuppose a collective moral destiny of a World, usually within the framework of (blandly put) bourgeois (post-Declaration of Human Rights) ecosocially expressed ends-in-themselves of Science, Productivity, Copulation etc.

Moreover, the grand narratives – which constitute a historical (future-oriented) *leitmotif* – express themselves in subtle as well as candid exclamations. The world-orientation of a struggling protagonist (as Dasein) functions as a historical witness to the behaviorist repetition set in motion through interpretatively utilized moral cues (this stands, especially in the context of an *oeuvre*, for textual compositions - its wordly syntax) whereby the Collective Unconscious *affirms itself* or - more specifically - its *human* reality as a drive functioning above man's higher faculties of reason (Kant would probably expand on this). And here I must emphasise the factual reality of moral horizons (as coded reality-tunnels for Dasein, as it were): By “invading” a Dasein, a moral system transforms *potentia* into *actualis*. Here *potentia* refers to Dasein's kind of Being (Heidegger's “potentiality-for-Being-its-Self”), his inherent *power*, while the transformation is an entering-into-an-act (Latin: *actus*), and is as such morally pre-determined. This collapse (if not Luciferian “Fall”!) of the potential state into an “actual act”, interestingly enough, resembles the *du jour* physical mechanics of the quantum level whereat the collapse of the indeterminate state vector (*potentiality wave*) into a particle with a measurable momentum ostensibly marks the limits of laboratory observation, and possibly even the limits of physico-scientific “objectivity” of today (according to Heisenberg of *Physics and Philosophy*). These musing, sadly, disallow further parallels as of now between micro- and macrocosmic phenomena due to my quantum incompetence...

The self-conscious transcendence of *actus* inherent in Dasein – the trans-state, trans-system leap – reflects the power of Dasein to master his thrownness in the world to the extent that his own historical realm (Life Story) stands above and beyond the historical realm of moral systems yet intersects with it and *reciprocally outers and internalizes information* at (t)his infirm milieu, *locus*.

2.9 Locating the Locus, or: Life, The Universe and Everything

The morals of the past are not, as has been argued, strictly “passed on” to Dasein, but they meet the filters known as the mind's faculties. This incidentally is the factor which makes historical progress possible at all. That is, such functioning is Dasein's essence, *Existenz*. Most of this filtering follows the Morality in its *unconscious*, unprocessed form, and little conscious interpreting is involved. Dasein has assimilated this “reality tunnel” (which contains the basic tenets and limits of how one is to utilise his thinking processes) from the “their-world” more or less unfiltered, yet now regards it as personal, subjective and *true* – this is where a moral system becomes as *Weltanschauung*:

“The ‘they’ even hides the manner in which it has tacitly relieved Dasein of the burden of explicitly *choosing* these possibilities. It remains indefinite who has ‘really’ done the choosing.” [BT, p.312]

This again reflects the fact that morality of Dasein in the society is seemingly inexplicably objective, though it fundamentally stems from the “shared subjectivity” of Historical Dasein.

To will Morality is to wish Transcendence. It is an attempt to overcome the present by predicting the future in the act of choosing. This act “takes” time and inevitably is *a means towards and end*. Here the means corresponds to the anticipation of the future, but is also “towards-the-future” in a specific, morally predestined way. Dasein making a choice has already an idea of the outcome of his actions, he can foresee the future; anticipate the causal chain of events that will start rolling forward like a snowball, affecting everything from the immediate environment in Dasein's everyday life to the *future web of possibilities* that will open up⁶ ahead of Dasein and thereby limit the scope of Dasein's freedom in offering a new situation, whether “dilemma” or “opportunity”: these words are merely interpretations of *the situation present-at-hand offering* (“*es gibt*”) in its

opening-up a framework for the choices ready-at-hand. Such a framework contains and “gives” in its opening-up limited options from which Dasein is to construct various methods of solution and dissolution, within the scope of which Dasein indeed is omnipotent and has free will⁷.

The timebinding Will is thus - quite concretely - the (power) centre of the World-of-Morals, and any liberation of this centrefold (i.e. milieu-territorial) phenomenon from Bad Faith (exoneration from Guilt; redemption from Original Sin) is, then, not miraculously instantaneous but always-already “a project”: *a thrown projection into the future.* (Vide Heidegger’s *Geworfenheit*)

Dasein thus makes a moral choice *always* when “he” consciously *is*. Being conscious means (to a degree corresponding to one’s self-reflecting spiritual awareness) being in *the flow* (Being-in-Time), and hence being at some place in a certain manner for an amount of time *is* “a moral act” by itself, even if in everyday *idle talk*⁸ such “doing just about nothing” and lack of interaction with one’s environment, if only temporal, is seen negatively and negatively alone: “one is not *doing anything*” - an obviously deficient and fallacious claim, for one *chooses* to do what one does even if one *chooses* “not to do anything special,” nothing “worth mentioning”. This *lack of deep concern and care*⁹ is just one mode of being-moral, however inauthentic and self-negating. Indeed: being-moral occurs as different shades of dedication to varying causes-of-concern, but it’s inherent in our Being. Moral variance can be explained away as variations of “dedication to G(o)od” only if the non-humanity of the counterstance to one’s moral disposition is declared a fact. To put it in another terms: To call something “immoral” (in the sense of Evil) *an sich* is to refute the stance’s Dasein-ness, its humanity. *Hence there can be no inter-system standards of Good* – even if every *intra-system* Good reaches out to the very limits of its *Weltanschauung* and claims to *possess the world*. So: The systematically schematized phenomenal world’s bifurcation into a good-evil matrix is an affirmation of the moral-system-in-hand’s reach – and thus also its limits. *Goodness is a variable* – one with a *nomadic locus* in Dasein’s Existenz. Good serves as a transcendental horizon, and as such it resembles *lack* more than substance. The moral imperative of a “must” and the soteriological (salvation-based) transcendental promise of any historical Moral System result in non-compromised “*totalitarianism of the actus*,” whereas the (Kantian-Hegelian) synthetic compromise appears on the level of *potentia*, from which all *actus* (and moral resonance) may materialize. The transcendent Existenz, through the nomadic redefinition of “Good,” thus affirms its self as a lack of moral certainty, as an oscillating “variable”: *self-contradicting-in-time (i.e. ateleological) non-substance*.

Plato’s Socrates said that no one would do wrong were they only fully aware of the consequences of their actions. That is: nobody *freely* chooses (nor wants) to do “*wrong*.” I believe so. Different individuals have different routes through which they come to “a conclusion” (the choice which their reality-tunnel is most prone to accept and contently put to rest), but *for them* this conclusion is just – hence the conciliatory and relativistic nature of advanced moral systems, which subsequently have acted as the transcendental Third in the historical process of symbiosis, where One meets the Other *without fusion* - without the ameobic resignation of individuality that one encounters in the blood-dynasties and work-hierarchies of lower lifeforms *and indeed of pre-democratic human societies*. The experience of pre-democratic manhood of oral tradition is most vitally alive as the Immutable Logos of a rootless Tribe, while in contrast the pan-deistic Enlightenment Logos (which, at least historically, has abode over the Western Christendom) is more prone to (commerce-cultural) symbiosis. The pre-democratic monotheistic experience stands in a correlative relationship to the first tentative enunciations of Moral Promise under the guise of Yahweh (“Nation Under God”) – hence the suitability of Judaism and Islam to Semitic patrihierarchies based on a transgenerational immutable bond (“Convent”). From the anti-democratic pre-civilizations beset with wanderlust to the more refined and settled men-of-letters social contract States of modernity, the self-concealment of Moral Reality under the guise of Word has served to, as it were, consolidate this auspicious (but

as of yet unuttered) getting-together of manhood by serving as a historically inscribed, scripted Story (like the Script of a Play) with an altogether too-firmly and illusionarily established cause and direction. This has been an appropriate (at any rate seemingly necessary) evolutionary stepstone for man's conceptually analytic outlook on the human experience, but the historical propagandistly authoritarian reliance on a third party (be it *the Bible* or *the Declaration of Human Rights*) now can be seen as an unconscious yearning for ever more intricate *symbiosis* – a dimension which, when deconstructed, proves to be a social moral derivative of the experience that Dasein *Is*. All moral systems, then, can be analysed from the perspective of the type of a space-time realm they provide for Dasein - that is: what kind of a deliverance to a good tomorrow they offer at the price of restricted freedom today. As such all moral systems share an unconscious foundation - that is: They claim to say more than they *can* say by functioning instinctively, pre-conceptually.

Freedom, essentially, is a *totality of imperfection*. It is the non-restricted access to the alternatives ready-at-hand in the *act of careful choice-making* where one's freedom is limited by one's mental and physical capabilities – *one's psychosomatic reach across space-time* - and nothing else. Dasein leaves traces of a world-disposition *willed* to realise potentialities inherent in the moment-of-choice. One can find meaning, then, in the concept of responsibility, but it is responsibility of perfecting the self-transcending world-disposition; *not* of simply responding to socially given calls. "Socially Givens" serve greater good only when they represent greater awareness or level of information (more extensive non-causal reach of experience) than the individual may possess – that is, they represent Dasein's Being more deeply than the conceptual formations of the Dasein-in-question.

So: The moral system is a social function of transforming individual moral dispositions into reflecting and resonating the accumulated awareness of mankind – the confluence of ideas into a collective pool, which reaches across space-time in at least two fundamental ways: trans-individually and trans-generationally, reflecting both the contemporaneous and the continuous Dasein. *Always* when this fact is forgotten, the Master becomes the Slave – willingly, self-negatingly.

Being-conscious comes with a burden, then, of making the right choices constantly in a continuous transcendence of the present avoiding self-destructive relapsing into *care-less* fleeing-the-moment-of-choice in the mode of inattentive withdrawal from "Being-there". Such withdrawal is as such nothing more (and nothing less) than *degenerate* "falling-away" from Dasein's kind of Being unto a self-negating mode of instinctive wholehearted embracing-of and falling-into the "*their world*". Morality, then, and the concept of "good" (as the *sought-after-not-now-but-soon*) derive from **Being-there in conscious and resolute transcendence of one's temporary world-dispositions.**

3.0 Inconclusive Postscript

Morals deconstructed, one is faced with aspects of human psycho-social historical reality. In Heideggerese we may talk of Dasein's existential potentiality-for-Being-its-Self. This also means that moral systems such as State Religion cannot denounce their indebtedness to the socio-psychological evolutionary shared subjectivity. With what credibility might any such entity claim infallibility, then? Indeed: the Collective Morality is nothing but an artificial and *artistic* - at least as far as Religions are concerned - expression of Dasein's moral flowing-in-time, and, as is the relationship between the portrait and the maiden it depicts, the picture shouldn't be mistaken for the real thing. Hopefully in psychotherapy patients may be guided on a path towards authentic self-expression, and *not* being advised to give up individual aspirations in favour of full thrownness into the Collective Unconscious and its reality-tunnel which is lagging behind of the evolutionary

forefront, whose brainchildren have undoubtedly always dwelt in the margins before surging onto the Mass Collective as Ideas and Isms to corroborate the story of Morality's meanderings.

To be sure, the collective representations of morality are authentic to a great extent – to an extent as great as the greatness of the ancients persists in us; to the extent to which we stand on the shoulders of Giants and not on those of pathological weaklings... The Collective Unconscious functions on a level beyond the wit of any one individual - lest perhaps the Nietzschean *Übermensch*..? However, we shouldn't be fooled into believing that *a pragmatic tool* deserves the admiration belonging to its creator, the historical Dasein. The Collective Unconscious feeds on people who criticize it. The freedom-aspiring individuated potentiality-for-Being which lies dormant in the soul of man at too many an occasion, at too many a collective moment of outbursts, aspires to *be free to be moral* (to have the-right-to-be-right), "but," as Heidegger puts it [BT, p.313]: "because Dasein is lost in the 'they', it must first *find* itself. In order to find itself at all, it must be 'shown' to itself in its possible authenticity. In terms of its *possibility*, Dasein is already a potentiality-for-Being-its-Self, but it needs to have this potentiality attested."

Aside of being of help in liberating the psyche on an individual level, Heidegger's concept of **care** (as the mode in which Dasein's moral choosing is self-consciously transcendental) may also be used in promulgating social and text critique to perhaps bring people face to face with their entrapment in the "their world" where "Dasein makes no choices, gets carried along by the nobody, and thus ensnares itself in inauthenticity" [BT, p.312]. This kind of iconoclasm would facilitate our seemingly inevitable movement, flow, towards an age of libertarian cosmopolitanism, an age when nomads roam in care.

Notes & references:

1 - Ludwig von Wittgenstein's revered (and feared) work titled 'Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus' is, as some don put it, structurally ambitious yet confusing. It contains a wholly original perspective on many fundamental philosophical (including ethical) questions. The words quoted here end the opus, and could be translated roughly as "Whereof one cannot speak, thereof must one remain silent." This is preceded by a sentence which clarifies the issue, I think: "That which can be stated, can be stated clearly." Yet, his study bears no immediate interest to me or my work.

2 - Heidegger pinpointed the fundamental and irrefutable social aspect of man's existence when he chose *Dasein* as the word to describe Man. *Da-sein* literally means 'being there'. That is, Man not only 'is', but always already occupies a mode of ***being-in-the-world alongside-entities***. In another words, whatever man does has an aspect of 'reaching out' to what's there to be sensed and experienced. From this perspective there couldn't be any *literal* 'pure introspection', at least not in Dasein's average everydayness.

3 - Charles B. Guignon [CC p.217]: "*Morris Eagle points out that people currently seeking professional help suffer less often from the classical neuroses Freudian theory was designed to treat and more often from problems of self 'experienced as feelings of meaninglessness, feelings of emptiness, pervasive depression, lack of sustaining interests, goals, ideals and values, and feelings of unrelatedness' ... Eagle suggests that they ultimately spring from such social factors as 'the lack of stable ideologies and values ... or an atmosphere of disillusionment and cynicism in the surrounding society.'* [Emphasis mine]

4 - Carl G. Jung, Man and His Symbols (p.41-42): "*There are many symbols, however (among them the most important), that are not individual but collective in their nature and origin. These are chiefly religious images* [my emphasis]. *The believer assumes that they are of divine origin - that they have been revealed to man. The skeptic says flatly that they have been invented. Both are wrong. It is true, as the skeptic notes, that religious symbols and concepts have for centuries been the object of careful and quite conscious elaboration. It is equally true, as the believer implies, that their origin is so far buried in the mystery of the past that they seem to have no human source. But they are in fact 'collective representations,' emanating from primeval dreams and creative fantasies. As such, these images are involuntary spontaneous manifestations and by no means intentional inventions.*" Here Jung is talking about the revealing fact that religious moral symbols have their roots in the psyches of the ancient men. This is very appropriate a perspective to my analysis here, since I am emphasising on the fact that moral representations like Religions and their Laws stem from the relationship between man and the world individually, and derivatively from the relationship between the interacting mankind and the environment they inhabit collectively. The collective mode gives birth to

Religion, which is fundamentally collective, but which aims at and functions by addressing the individual Dasein's being-moral-in-the-world. Hence, I find Jung's argument supporting my standpoint, namely, that the collective System is but a reflection on subjective Dasein's self-relation to the world.

5 - Robert Anton Wilson, Schrödinger's Cat: "*Consider the epistemological plight of the Terran primates [in the 1980's]. They knew that they were made of molecules, which were made of atoms, which were made of subatomic particles, which were expressions in space-time of quantum probability matrices. This knowledge, alas, was so recent that it had never been integrated into their philosophies, or into the rules of their social games, like religions, politics, economics, etc. Their whole **social reality-tunnel** [my emphasis] was based on pre-quantum superstition and ignorance. The sociological nexus was Euclidean-Aristotelian-Newtonian; even Maxwell and Einstein had only been digested by a few.*" Here R.A.W. is obviously playing a game of detached objectivism (not the Randian type) by talking of "*Terran primates*" instead of men. The message, however, is clear: the social reality (tunnel) seems to be quite unreceptive in the short run to revolutionary shifts in scientifico-intellectual understanding, as Thomas S. Kuhn among others helps us to understand. Note too, that one could well talk of the 'Collective Unconscious' instead of the 'Social Reality-Tunnel' – the latter is the unstable contingent transsubstantiation of the bulk of the former in the fleeting Now. At this point I should comment on the connection between a Moral System on one hand – as an archetypal Form that exists on *micro-scale*, on the scale of power-relations of the most confined and esoteric kind, as well as on *macro-scale* or on the scale of million-fold masses – and on the other hand "a reality-tunnel" of a Collective, of a Social bond. The Society's (territorially bound; nation/blood-bound) reality-tunnel is a Moral System at the "*sociological nexus*," at the level where all dichotomies appear as topologically-bound civil wars, where compromises are made in the the historical Collective's all-seeing embrace: The "deep time" (Geist) of the Collective, the unspeakable of Wittgenstein, Derrida's logocentrism.

6 - As Heidegger said [OTM, p.71]: "[...] *the opening [is not] the mere opening of presence, but the opening of presence concealing itself, the opening of a self-concealing sheltering.*" In this lecture Heidegger relates this Opening to *aletheia* – Greek for 'truth'; literally 'unconcealment.' It might be debatable what exactly he means by this sentence, but nonetheless I believe it talks of the act of transcendently flowing from one 'self-concealing sheltering' to another. This flowing *itself* is moral. The dichotomy between the 'now' and the 'soon' (the discontinuous shift from 'moment 1' to 'moment 2') is thoroughly an artificial one, and as I've stated before: *There is nothing (Da gibt kein Sein) beside the eternal 'now'* which is experienced as a flow. Since the 'now' one faces is very much in one's grasp, the opening-up is moral in a concrete way. That is: the opening-up does not open up an objective vision, but rather allows one to experience an experience – this experiencing happens only with the moral sanctioning of the Dasein-in-question. In the end even the aforementioned word pair "moral sanctioning" proves tautologous – as does "moral acting."

7 - It needs to be ascertained, however, that opportunities should primarily be defined as limiting and restricting, and *only secondarily as liberating*. Charles B. Guignon put it like this [CC p.235]: "We are free to the extent that we find ourselves enmeshed in contexts of shared meaningfulness that make it possible for us to grasp what situations demand from us and which options make sense."

8 – Idle talk "signifies a positive phenomenon which constitutes the kind of Being of everyday Dasein's understanding and interpreting." [BT p. 211] ... "What is said-in-the-talk as such, spreads in wider circles and takes on an authoritative character. Things are so because one says so. Idle talk is constituted by just such *gossiping* and *passing the word along*." [BT p.212] ... "Idle talk is the possibility of understanding everything without previously making the thing one's own. If this were done, idle talk would founder; and it already guards up against such danger. Idle talk is something which anyone can rake up; it not only releases one from the task of genuinely understanding, but develops and undifferentiated kind of intelligibility for which nothing is closed off any longer." [BT p.213] From these excerpts it becomes obvious how low an image Heidegger gives of the unreflective kind of interaction between social groups and individuals he sees as permeating the collective human reality. I have my doubts that he altogether meant it when he apologetically said that "[t]he expression 'idle talk' ["Gerede"] is not to be used here in a 'disparaging' signification."

9 – 'Care' ['Sorge'] is a term which features prominently on the pages of Being and Time. He[idegger] says: "Dasein exists as an entity for which, in its Being, that Being is itself an *issue*. Essentially ahead of itself, it has projected itself upon its potentiality-for-Being *before* going on to any mere consideration of itself. In its projection it reveals itself as something which has been thrown. It has been thrownly abandoned to the 'world', and falls into it concernfully. As **care – that is, existing in the unity of the projection which has been fallingly thrown** [my emphasis] – this entity has been disclosed as a 'there' ... it constantly expresses *itself* in addressing itself to the very object of its concern and discussing it ... Such concern [may take on such modes as] concernfully reckoning up, planning, preventing, or taking precautions." This, I believe, is the term which most aptly exemplifies the Heideggerian stance to morality. His numerous writings *concerning* (pun unintended) 'care' and 'resoluteness' have aroused in me many of the ideas this essay puts into words – and, too, hopefully heeds the call of the historical sense of urgency as present in Heidegger.

Bibliography

I - Heidegger

- CC [various contributors], "*The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*" edited by *Charles B. Guignon*, © 1993 Cambridge University Press
- BT *Martin Heidegger*, "*Being and Time*", Basil Blackwell (1962), Macquarrie/Robinson translation from the original "Sein und Zeit" (7th edition)
- OTM *Martin Heidegger*, "*On Time and Being*", © 1972 Harper & Row, Inc.
- W. T. *Jones*, "*The Twentieth Century to Wittgenstein and Sartre*" (revised 2nd edition), © 1975 Harbert Brace Jovanovich Inc.

II – Non-Heidegger

- Deleuze, *Gilles* / Constantin V. Boundas, "*The Deleuze Reader*," © 1993 Columbia Uni. Pr., NYC
- Werner *Heisenberg*, "*Fysiikka ja Filosofia*," © 2000 Arthouse, Helsinki
- Carl G. *Jung*, "*Man and His Symbols*", © 1964 Aldus Books Ltd
- Thomas S. *Kuhn*, "*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*," (2nd Ed) © 1970 Uni. of Chicago Press
- Wilhelm *Reich*, "*The Mass Psychology of Fascism*", Vincent R. Carfagno translation © 1970 Mary Higgins as Trustee of the W.R. Infant Trust Fund, Souvenir Press 1997
- Robert Anton *Wilson*, "*Schrödinger's Cat*," Orbit © 1979 by R.A.W.