

„Martin Heidegger: Other Way“

I decided to partially interpret and provide comments for Martin Heidegger's book – “Being and Time”. I do not know how successful my effort would be but I firmly believe that every such endeavor is of great importance... It is of great importance for our fate, for our future... and so we should never give up our struggle to come to grips with that challenge.

More specifically, my goal is to comment and interpret Heidegger in order to gain better understanding of “mysterious” phenomenon of **In-der-Welt-sein (Being-in the- World)**. World... being in the world...what does that mean? Where does seeking of the answer to this arch-question lead us? And are we ourselves undergoing transformation in that process?

That is precisely, why I considered it necessary to reconstruct in detail and define individual crucial phrases from “Being and Time”. However, it is not surprising that this sometimes grew into much wider and far-reaching analysis and sometimes instigated my free associations and stream of thoughts. So I reckoned it appropriate to render all these due to one unified context. I do think that these detailed notes, analysis and “strange“ associations altogether constitute the process, which is seeking response to the quest: what does “Being-in the-World” mean?

* * *

Unfortunately, it has been quite a while that so called “incriminatory” process has started against Martin Heidegger, the process which is gaining more and more impetus and is getting more and more scandalous. Heidegger is being taunted, slandered, abused...As if dwarf predators are plaguing this titan of thought. This is absolutely abominable, disgusting situation! And there is no one to pluck enough courage to denounce those false, “prosecutors”. What is going on? The pretext for this “process” is certain details of Heidegger's life belonging to Nazi period. And not long ago, there came another enormous wave of hysterical emotions – indignation, alarm... real show, triggered by publication of the so-called “Black notebooks”!

I believe on my part it is inadmissible to ignore the existing situation, especially in view of the fact that I am trying to gain deeper insight of this philosopher's works. This is what my conscience prompts me to do. That is why I would like to remind my readers of the 1966 interview with Martin Heidegger published in “Spiegel”. And, occasionally I will provide my comments.

SPIEGEL: Professor Heidegger, we have noticed again and again that your philosophical work is somewhat overshadowed by incidents in your life that, although they didn't last very long, were never clarified, either because you were too proud or because you did not find it expedient to comment on them.

HEIDEGGER: You mean 1933?

SPIEGEL: Then how did it come about that you became rector of the University of Freiburg?

HEIDEGGER: In December of 1932, my neighbor von Möllendorff, professor of anatomy, was elected rector. Just under two weeks later, his office was taken away from him again by the Minister of Culture in Baden at the time, Wacker. The fact that the rector had prohibited the posting of the so-called Jewish Notice at the university was, presumably, a welcome cause for the minister's decision.

SPIEGEL: Herr von Möllendorff was a Social Democrat. What did he do after his dismissal?

HEIDEGGER: The day of his dismissal von Möllendorff came to me and said: "Heidegger, now you must take over the rectorate." I said that I had no experience in administration. The vice-rector at the time, Sauer (theology), however, also urged me to run in the new rectorial election. I hesitated a long time.

SPIEGEL: After that you declared yourself finally ready. How did your relationship to the National Socialists then develop?

HEIDEGGER: The second day after my assumption of the rectorate, the Student Leader appeared with two others in the office I had as rector and again demanded that the Jewish Notice be posted. I refused. A few days later I got a telephone call from the SA Office of Higher Education in the Supreme SA Command, from SA-Group Leader Dr. Baumann. I still did not retract my prohibition.

SPIEGEL: This was not known in that way before.

Precisely that is strange... that this was unknown and still remains unknown. I think that after such clear, frank responses further speculations should have seized regarding Martin Heidegger's election as the rector of Freiburg University. Can there be any doubts about his decency while dealing with circumstances of his election for the position. Or can there be any ambiguity regarding his principled position about the issue of anti-Semitic posters. So the questions are raised by the fact as to why such important details remained unknown to society and correspondingly why the speculations continued. Is not that related to somewhat outright campaign against Heidegger? And now let's go back to the interview.

SPIEGEL: You have also been accused of having books written by Jewish authors removed from the university library or from the philosophy department's library.

HEIDEGGER: Former participants in my seminars can testify today that not only were no books by Jewish authors removed, but that these authors, especially Husserl, were quoted and discussed just as they were before 1933.

SPIEGEL: But how do you explain the origin of such rumors? Is it maliciousness?

HEIDEGGER: From what I know about the sources, I am inclined to believe that. But the motives for the slander lie deeper.

SPIEGEL: That has been our observation as well. Is it incorrect that you later left the dedication to Husserl out of *Being and Time*?

HEIDEGGER: No, that's true. I clarified the facts in my book *On the Way to Language*. The text reads: "To counter numerous, widely spread, incorrect allegations, let it be expressly stated here that the dedication to *Being and Time*, mentioned in the text of the dialogue on page 16, was also placed at the beginning of the book's fourth edition in 1935. When my publisher thought that the printing of the fifth edition in 1941 was endangered, and that the book might be banned, it was finally agreed, following Niemeyer's proposal and wish, that the dedication should be left out of the fifth edition. My condition was that the footnote on page 38, in which the reasons for the dedication are actually given, should remain. It reads: "If the following investigation has taken any steps forward in disclosing the 'things themselves,' the author must first thank E. Husserl.

SPIEGEL: Then we hardly need to ask whether it is true that you, as rector of the University of Freiburg, forbade the emeritus professor Husserl to enter or to use the university library or the philosophy department's library.

HEIDEGGER: That is slander.

While reading this interview it becomes clear what a malicious slander it is to label Heidegger as anti-Semite (especially painful it is for me as a Georgian Judeophil). As you see newly elected rector outrightly refuses to put up so called "Jewish posters", he refuses to withdraw books by Jewish authors as well as to ban their citations; During fierce war, despite numerous obstacles he keeps the statement expressing his gratitude to Husserl in 5th edition of his "Time and Being" thus retaining factual foundation of his dedication to Husserl... so what do these fact indicate? Certainly not his anti-Semitism or conformism, but on the contrary, they point to deep roots of black PR campaign instigated against him as it was indicated by the great thinker himself.

That is also confirmed by complete hushing up of motives of Heidegger's resignation. Let's recall related fragment from the interview.

* * *

By the way of particular interest is the statement by Richard Polt, the chairman of “Heidegger circle” regarding the fact that out of three volumes (1240 pages) published so far only nineteen extracts deal with Jewish theme and indicated passages inclusive contexts make up just 10 pages in all, which is less than 1 percent of “Black notebooks”, in other words tiny bit of rather voluminous writings that say much about the Americans, the English, the Germans...

But still what horrible things are written in this extract? As an example I will present one so called substantial “evidence” for Heidegger’s anti-Semitism, but in order to make it more understandable I will tell you it in my own words, which precisely convey the content of citation.

Heidegger writes: *What is happening now is the end of the history of the great inception of Occidental humanity, in which inception humanity was called to the guardianship of Being (Sein), only to transform this calling right away into the pretension to re-present beings in their machinationalunessence...*

In the historilessness, that which belongs together only within it also comes most readily into the unity of complete mixture; apparent construction and renovation, and complete destruction—both are the same—the groundless—what has succumbed to mere beings (das Seiende) and is alienated from Being. As soon as the historyless has ‘set in,’ ‘historicism’ begins to run rampant; the groundless, in the most diverse and contradictory forms, falls—without recognizing itself as having the same unessence—into the most extreme enmity and craving for destruction...

And maybe in this ‘struggle’— which struggles over goallessness itself and which hence can be only the caricature of “struggle”—the greater groundlessness will ‘triumph,’ which is bound to nothing and makes everything serviceable to itself (Jewry). But the authentic triumph, the triumph of history over the historyless, is won only where the groundless excludes itself because it does not venture Being, but instead always merely calculates with beings, and posits its calculations as what is real.

One of the most secret forms of the gigantic, and perhaps the oldest, is the tenacious skillfulness in calculating, hustling, and intermingling through which the worldlessness of Jewry is grounded.

As we see, in this extract is discussed the fate defining historic tendency, which turned out to be radical deviation from starting point of western humanity being. This tendency eventually brought about modernization with its scientific-technical progress, industrialization, post-industrialization, post-modernization, globalization, super integrating politics, economics and so on. Neither is this tendency result of our effort or is it occasionality or an objective historic principle. It was our fate. It was the way Being was summoning us, i.e. the way self Being opened up for us. However, the whole paradox and presumably, eternal paradox is that on this road western humanity should become more and more distanced from Being. Eventually it arrived at nihilism: opening up of Being at the same time turned into its concealing and forgetting. The term of “groundlessness” specifically indicates that big ontological occurrence: the occurrence of breakaway, distancing from Being. All above said is basically clear for anyone who has read Heidegger’s works: “European nihilism”, “Issue of Technique”, “The Turning”...

Forgetting Being, distancing from Being is the history of western metaphysics. Even more, it is the history of Being! ”Jewry” according to Heidegger epitomizes this fundamental tendency, which does not imply insulting, abasement and discrimination of the Jewish nation. What does fundamental ontological analyses of the history of western metaphysics have to do with anti-Semitism? Just tell me I have an impression that these prosecutors or maligners have not even read Martin Heidegger’s works. Or as if they have read but understood nothing at all, or even having read and understood they are trying demagogically to provoke public with fabricated accusations.

Yes, we speak about the history of western metaphysical thinking as about the history of Being: this is the way to humanism, scientific progress, domination of planetary technique, the universalization of power, governance and control and eventually to the nihilism. The greatest adepts of this history are Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche... Do really think that Heidegger is obsessed with hatred and phobias towards them? Or he does not pay respect to their genius? Or the scale of their thinking does not thrill him? Are we so dumb?

* * *

Thus, the process of the revelation of meaning of Being starts with analysis of Da-sein. We need to

interpret more accurately the meaning of this key concept. “*The being(das Seiende) whose analysis our task is, is always we ourselves. The being (Sein) of this being (das Seiende) is always mine. In the being of this being it is related to its being (Sein)*”. (p.39) Yes, this analysis does not deal with human, person or subject in general, which traditionally is well known to us from the history of Western philosophy, but deals with what is only, extremely and always my own. Also, with something that is one of a kind and unique. We speak about my being, your being that cannot be replaced with anything else, as we should not view it as a single occurrence of some generic family (say, e.g. humans). And in this, in always my being I always have special understanding of my own being. But in no way should we confuse this “understanding” with so called understanding as a cognitive method or with perceiving or reflecting something. “Understanding” in Heidegger’s way carries absolutely new and extremely deep connotation. “I know I am Irakli Batiashvili... 54... a politician... a lecturer...that this is my family... my street... that I’m working on this book now... that it is somewhat strange weather today... that this person turned out to be detestable...” – this is merely just gaining awareness of some things, reflecting on some things, their objectivization or thematization, but not understanding them as initial existential definiteness of my being. The latter is primary in ontological terms and awareness, reasoning, contemplation, cognition are derived from this initial existential. i.e. they are derivatives of initial understanding. As to what this phenomenon of initial understanding means, we will talk in detail later.

Heidegger points out: the essence of this being (das Seiende) lies in its to be. The whatness(essentia) of this being must be understood in terms of its being(existentia) in so far as one can speak of it at all. Yes, characterization of any being(das Seiende) implies cognitive perception and description of its certain features (essential or non essential). We say that this ring is made of gold, that it is round, smallish and of certain weight; that this sycamore tree has this type of bark, this type of height, this width of trunk, branches, this form of leaves and so on; that this person is ginger, stout, hypertonic, envious, good manager and so on and so on. Correspondingly, cognition of any living being implies defining his essential features. Exception is only Da-sein! My characterization, as of a Da-sein, is impossible by the description of objectively present features. Why? Because my essence lies not in some stable “first-rate” features but in existence itself. I am in the first place existence i.e. being-towards; I am act, intentionality and possibility of something ... precisely that is essential in me...

The fact that I am, firstly, possibility and that my essence does not imply something formed, defined, ready features, parameters and things alike but implies precisely being as potentiality - is one of crucial

points of Heidegger's philosophy. Yes, thinking ensuing from this point in its creative evolution leads us to a cardinaly different understanding of human existence, to the other dimension; in this dimension starts break up of longstanding stereotypes, great cataclysms and not only at theoretical level but also in reality ... this is way to new form of my and your existence – this is the way to attempting a new life...

* * *

We - some creatures... population ... we have bred ... I feel nausea ... paleontological process of such enormity ... billions of years and then suddenly a human ... they have bred, infested the whole planet ... this dining room stinks ... there's bustle ... what's the worth of that guy? He is choosing a dish ... shoot him and it won't make any difference?! Civilization of worms ... it seems I still feel heavy ... I still feel bad ... God, have mercy on me! Fill me with your blessing and strength! Give me back joy of being in the world...

... „Silence spreads through all the world” ... Terenti, Terenti... that, which is unattainable for philosophical reflection, can open in poetry ...”boredom follows such inclement weather but I felt the whole world”.....

... fresh air... here I'll train again, I'll start with horizontal bar... no, I should not smoke even once in a thousand years.. all night in dream holding a knife... I was to slaughter someone... Ossetian queen, Ossetian queen... slut! I have to break through this viscous circle... now I can transcend it... leave behind that pathology... inner force... continuous process... you must believe! Holy fathers truth... God, fill me , fill me and reunify me !

* * *

And thus, I always have pre-understanding of that totality, **within which, on which and towards which** becomes understandable the “for-the-sake-of-which”, “in-order- to”, “what-for”, “what-in” and eventually “what-with” of my taking care(das Besorgen), which makes possible my encounter with thing at hand; I always proceed from this totality and my understanding always circulates in it. Precisely, this totality is the phenomenon of the world. Hence, my practical relation with things at hand is founded on understanding of the world’s wholeness. The world –**within which, on which and towards which** is freed an inner-worldly-being, namely, thing at hand and correspondingly it is also disclosed for me. And this disclosedness itself (i.e. the structural unity of those relations how this being (Seiende) is freed and correspondingly is understandable for me) is worldliness. Yes, I can encounter beings not in isolation but to what extent the world is preliminarily disclosed to me. The worldliness of the world lets me encounter the beings.

The worldliness as the order of disclosedness of the beings – such is amazing and completely new comprehension of the universe. The world not as “a huge box”, “container” or conglomerate of the beings - of minute particles, organisms, humans, planets, stars, galaxies.... – which are permeated with scientifically available causality or other connections, but the world as that wholeness **within which, on which and towards which** the beings are disclosed in this or that concrete circumstances and the worldliness as the structure of this disclosedness itself. Yes, in my everyday activities I have latent , nonthematic understanding of the world. But at some point it may come out from that latent form, it may become evident and I may obviously experience, perceive the worldliness: that is how occasionally shines out this phenomenon even in everyday routine, as it is associated with this shining and disclosedness.

Thereby, Heidegger’s existential analytics liberates us from ancient “idol” and shows us that the world is neither objective reality nor subjective construction. The world discloses itself in my every concrete situation – it is **within which, on which and towards which** this situation is disclosed. It has such order of the being(Sein): the world is “da” in my concrete situations and it does not exist otherwise. This is absolutely different interpretation of the world’s phenomenon, which was unknown before Heidegger to either western or eastern thinking. After publishing of “Being and Time” we were given opportunity

to get familiar with this completely new understanding. But have we absorbed it? Have we started shifting our thinking on this new vector? I do doubt it ... I reckon “familiarizing ” remained just as only “familiarization” ... but taking in the unique understanding of the “world’s worldliness” still belongs to future!

* * *

So, let’s sum up at this stage as how existential analytics interprets the Being-in the-World and correspondingly the phenomenon of the world. For this aim, for more demonstrability, I think, it is better to bring an example from everyday life situation (I am doing my best to maximally clarify perhaps one of the most difficult fragments in “Being and Time”).

We are going on holiday in our mini Hyundai Getz(i.e. by car) to Lopota Lake resort: my grandson, my daughter, my wife and I. CD player is on: we are listening to Joe Coker. Occasionally my mobile phone rings and I have to talk about some affairs. I even receive an sms once or twice... this route along Gombori pass is quite “tricky”:narrow and winding. But we are lucky with the weather: it’s warm.It is not hot. We are surrounded by a spectacular view: mountains, greenery, blue sky, the sun and vast space. Occasionally we talk... “Going on holiday” is an affair of my taking care - concern(in a broad sense), yes, pleasant, necessary affair, i.e. affair at hand for me. In the same way is a car at hand, the road, luggage, CD player with its music, our mobile phones... with these things I have not theoretical-cognitive, but practical-consumptive (i.e. caring) relation. For science neither car nor luggage, or road or telephone exist on their own in nature. These things and affair at hand exist in total relevance; in particular, during this journey I deal with car, with luggage, with road, with mobile phone... also with this picturesque landscape – with mountains, fields, rivers, the sun, sky and obviously with the weather in general (which is generally extremely important factor at hand in our life): I encounter nature precisely as thing at hand that is to say surrounding landscape of my journey and not as an object of scientific cognition. But this journey is itself to something and for something: I am heading towards Lopota to have a nice rest there with my family. But eventually what for am I going there? Because of possibility of my being, - yes,

having rest with my family is one of the most significant possibilities of my being together with my family; That's how are interconnected in total relevance above-mentioned things at hand: "For the sake of which I am directed to something in order to... and for this, at this and with this and this I deal with ..."

During this journey I am with my wife (she is driving), with my daughter and grandson: occasionally we talk, chat, laugh... sometimes I play with the kid, ... and they in their turn are "da"-with-me: they are also going on holiday, i.e. they are engaged in affair at hand i.e. in journey. They also relate to different things at hand – car, candies, road, mountains, weather... and eventually to the above mentioned total relevance. Yes, my wife, daughter and grandson are not merely there as e.g. this suitcase, but they are "da"-with and, specifically their being for me as a "Da-sein" discloses in form of "Mit-dasein"... if with a car or luggage I have pragmatic-caring relation, towards my wife, my daughter and my grandson and to myself this relation has character of concern(die Fürsorge): I take care of my folk, I love them, I am connected with them with whole my life... I want to them to have rest and to rest myself...

This journey is a factual demonstration of de-distancing: I am going away from Tbilisi, but Lopota is also far away, although we are gradually getting nearer it, i.e. we are overcoming the distance; near is this river and this bridge, which we approached... at the same time journey has the character of an directionality because we are travelling (i.e. we are approaching our destination) in some direction: we are heading towards Kakheti region, to east... we are driving and ahead of us is the road, on this side there are mountains, over there is a settlement, behind us is the road we have covered... for scientific cognition does not exist near or far, this side or that side, Kakheti region and so on. For it exist measurable distances, coordinates; but while travelling I precisely have to deal with farness, nearness, regions...

So, because of possibility my being, because of my and family rest I am directed to the resort in order to stay there... I am travelling towards Kakheti region, to Lopota... it is still far but I am gradually approaching it... I am travelling with my wife, my daughter, with my grandson... by this car, luggage... here this road... here these mountains, further those Caucasian range, blue sky, white clouds, bright sun, space, vast space... and suddenly the world also shines out for me... worldliness of the world shines out as whole disclosedness of everything which I deal with during this journey: it is an amazing moment! And at this moment I on my part seem to open out for the infinite universe... and I feel this flash of my

relation with the world does not in any way resemble those relations: with the things at hand, other humans... it is something completely different! Thus, during this journey it is certain for me its “for-the-sake-of-which”, which in its turn ascertains “in order to”, this in its turn ascertains “what-for” and this – “what-in”, and this - “what-with”... so, precisely significance(die Bedeutsamkeit) of this wholeness is the worldliness of the world, which usually bears latent, nonthematic character in my life but sometimes it incredibly shines out as the individual flashes as I just tried to tell now...

* * *

Cosmic painting... an amazing firework of colours... grand scales... the world, being-in-the world, ... God, all-embracing! Make me feel your breath...

It is good, good! Important work has been performed on my own self... three days are left... it is annealing, annealing...iron will... I want a woman ... sex...woman is still reality..., no, I have to move to another orbit... once and for all I must transcend it... this circle... now I have a chance... big transformation... what else is left... there will be no more fails... how small I am! What we live with... and such an immense world, Being...

Baudelaire ... “Let us chase the distant glimpse!”

Again I recall an episode of my being in the monastery: I am standing on a bell tower... it is evening... I am watching the sun setting in the clouds against horizon... vast sky surrounds me, vast space, very big space... this is what fills me most of all: the God, the Universe, Being ...

* * *

Now Martin Heidegger starts detailed analysis of Da-sein as the Being-in (Being-in the-World) i.e. revealing its constitutional equally-primary points. In the first place there again arises a general question: so what does “Da-sein” mean? Why not a “human”, or “subject”, or “person”? Our mind has traditionally got used to these terms, hasn’t it! What is this that Da-sein implies which notifies essentially something other than above-mentioned traditionally deeply-rooted terms? Pronouncing “Da” means the essential disclosedness of my being. And precisely “da” points out that something is there and something – here: that plane is there, far in the sky, but I am with this book here in this room at this table and I here as the existing “somebody”. Yes, my own being(Sein) is that light, that openness, i.e. de-distancing-directing-caring being in which everything is illuminated and sorted out: as distant or close, right or left, upper or lower, useful or useless, pleasant or disgusting, or merely environmentally encountered... Therefore, we speak about being(das Seiende), which itself is always its “da” i.e. open (illuminated) being (sein), or Dasein.

Not am I merely me, as something being (das Seiende), but “I” itself means this disclosed being (Sein). In this “light” of Da-sein something is revealed and something stays concealed in the darkness.

And finally, Da-sein does not mean some “human creature”, even the extremely unique and only one, but „**Da**” of **Being (Sein)**. Yes, concept of Da-sein already preliminarily implies at least very vague understanding of “Being” itself. Da-sein is precisely the Da of „all-embracing” Being, its shining forth, concretization, fundamental and unique occurrence, its “jump”... and at the same time, I am myself Da-sein - only and unrepeatable Irakli Batiashvili...

* * *

My being-towards-World, towards other and myself discloses in idle talk, as senseless, groundless flitting: I talk about everything and nothing! I am fluttering, flitting from one thing to another... The wonderful illustrations of idle talk are present day political “talk-shows”. In my curiosity, I am everywhere and nowhere: it discloses everything and nothing at the same time! And there is nothing concealed for me in ambiguity, but only in order that everything would remain vague, covert and I, rootless, would be locked up in everywhere-and-nowhere-being.

Idle talk is a usual way to be together. It implies in itself public interpretation (publicness) - I talk as are talked generally, discussed generally, assessed generally... And as I give myself a chance to be lost in „Man” in this public interpretation (publicness), I constantly prepare temptation to myself: being-in-the-

world is tempting in itself. Heidegger writes, that since the way in which things have been publicly interpreted has already become a temptation to itself in this manner, it holds Da-sein fast in its fallenness. Idle talk and ambiguity, having seen everything, having understood everything, develop the supposition that Da-sein's disclosedness, which is so available and so prevalent, can guarantee to Da-sein that all the possibilities of its being will be secure, genuine, and full... The supposition of "Man" that one is leading and sustaining a full and genuine „life”, brings Da-sein a tranquillity, for which everything is „in the best of order” and all doors are open. So falling Being-in-the-world, which tempts itself, is at the same time tranquillizing.

But this tranquillizing does not push me to quietness and inactivity, but on the contrary urges me towards effervescent activity. In my boundless curiosity and restless omniscience (that has peaked in present day informational era), when I flit from one thing to another and as if encompass everything, I have an illusion of obtaining some universal understanding of my being: who am I, in spite of all cultural, ethnical, race or gender differences?! I think that I already possess such a universal understanding. And thus I am going to an alienation from the ability of authentic being. As Heidegger remarks, falling Being-in-the-world, as tempting-tranquillizing, is at the same time alienating. And in this self-estrangement, I become entangled in numerous “characterologies”, “typologies” of explanations of my own being. These phenomena of temptation, tranquillizing, alienation and self-entanglement are characteristic of specific kind of Dasein's falling, which Heidegger calls downward plunge: *“Da-sein plunges out of itself into itself, into the groundlessness and nothingness of inauthentic everydayness”* (p.167).

Thus, such a brilliant analysis of “fall” is presented in “Being and Time”. As we have seen, Heidegger sharply emphasizes that terms “fall into”, “a plunge”, does not carry any ethical semantic load in no case. They only express one of the fundamental ontological structures of Da-sein and not “moral decline of human”, “corruption”, that is, some kind of “ a night view” (the words that author himself uses) of his nature. Ontology is a basis! That is why explanations of pure ontological problems of “fall into” precede any discussions and evaluations about “human's sinking or not sinking in sin”. Moreover, the latter is possible again and again on the grounds of original ontological “fallingness” of Da-sein. You may trust or not trust in falling of human in sin as your being-in-the-world is an existence, thrown and fallen from the very beginning. You are primordially fallen! But from where? From what kind of radically different form of being (which we cannot call Da-sein any longer and in which you are not you)? Why? Because “I” and “You” express only Da-sein and nothing more! Or, maybe this falling is from nonbeing? Yes, consistent phenomenological explanation of “fall into”, “fall” still points at this “where from”, no matter how hard we tried to close our eyes... Where have I fallen from? Or, what does phenomenon of “fall into” mean even more profoundly? But an answer to this question is impossible in the limits of existential analysis. The answer remains concealed... “Fall” leads us to the question that is eternally unanswerable for me and you, as for Da-sein! Behold, what a marvelous transformation biblical theme of “the Fall” has undergone by Heidegger in pure ontological problems.

* * *

He is playing in the sand... He has made a cake... My Vako... Children... What a purity! Or why I am this Irakli Batiashvili? Known by everybody this way... even by myself... I feel nauseous... I am known this way in the family, in the street, in politics... I became like that... Fallen being-in-the-world... But authentically I am only a stranger... always stranger... Existence... Bang! Terrorism... Explosion... Bliss from the blast... Orgasm... Esthetics of destruction... What I am thinking about! I am constantly thinking... Calm down! Great transformation of nervous system... Inner center, equilibrium... I am hungry! When will I buy dumplings... All in all, I am an animal... One of the representatives of population... Byron... Lord George Gordon... “Remembrance”... I should not be late!

...Do you want to get up? - No...

Are you hungry? - No...

Would you like to read? - No...

To smoke? - No...

To drink? - No...

Write? - No...

Sex? - No...

Go out of doors? - No...

Watch TV? - No... I want only to lie this way... Like a dead... Ataraxia... Absolute zero... Stoics...

Epictetus, Seneca... Ha-ha... Seneca's pupil Nero... Only Ataraxia... And I don't even want to think... And maybe only after that starts movement to the truth... Strange attitude of mind... Attitude as existential...

What a nonsense I am talking?! Yes... I don't even want to think... I have become silent... I am done...

* * *

We delved more deeply into separate aspects of Heidegger's existential analytics, “dived”, followed logical “streams” and emerged on the huge surface of terrorism... As if it is also very strange, isn't it?! Where is Heidegger and where is terrorism?! But again and again there is nothing strange in it... We will see soon how organically theme of terrorism is connected with Heidegger's existential analysis and, in particular, how investigation of the most important facets of “Being and Time” brought us to the necessity of consideration of ontological bases of terrorism...

Terrorism is a new type of war: asymmetric, viral war! Huge network of Islamic international terrorism covers modern world; it does not represent some monolithic system, but has very pluralistic differentiated character. In this respect, it is really contemporary, postmodern phenomenon of “rhizome” type, and that is all its power.

* * *

Nearly everyday pictures of death now in Asia, in the Near East, Russia, Europe, America... Explosions, ruins, corpses, blood... It is already everyday life... Everyday panic and fear... Existence imbued with fear... Besides, everything is committed by an invisible hand... Enemy is not seen... We live in the world where attraction to death holds sway and its ontological basis - being-towards-death - is the pronounced tendency of our modern existence... it might have never been so pronounced during the history of mankind. We have just seen this phenomenon "found" by Heidegger more lively and voluminously... We do not simply comprehend it abstractly, but feel it lively, when breathing air of present day world... "Being-towards-death" is a great discovery of a great German philosopher, profound, multilateral disclosure of which requires subsequent evolution of thinking and the following "series" of global being...

Certainly, proceeding from Martin Heidegger's existential analytics, both medieval Christian asceticism and modern terrorism should be considered as inauthentic forms of being-towards-death. Terrorism is, after all, ugly and sick masking of being-towards-death, while masking given in asceticism, as self-torture for faith, is appeared as a strong energetic factor of creative evolution of the Western civilization at the certain stage. Both the great deeds of hermit and horrible actions of suicide terrorist at a deep level are conditioned by Thanatos impulse, that is, ontologically are based on existential of being-towards-death, but in such a way, that neither of them have their authentic understanding of death. Both are in illusion, but in illusion of hermit a way to new life takes shape, and in illusion of terrorist - way to nowhere.

I wonder if the time is near when, as Nikolai Berdyaev indicated, the new spirituality of Christian world would be founded on the authentic-being-to-the-death? Is the time near when our beliefs and God-seeking will emerge out of „Angst“, as from true understanding of death? Is the time near when our disclosedness to death, as the greatest courage, will appear to be the source of God's love? Are we ready for it? Are we ready for rebirth?

These questions arise when one follows the new way of Heidegger's thought, yes, the other way... and answers to these questions are on this way too... Finally I would like to recollect once more some phrases of Martin Heidegger from his interview with "Spiegel": *"Only a god can save us. The only possibility available to us is that by thinking and poetizing we prepare a readiness for the appearance of a god, or for the absence of a god in [our] decline... We can not bring him forth by our thinking. At best we can awaken a readiness to wait [for him]... I call it another [kind of] thinking."*

* * *

Heidegger's amazing analysis of attunement („die Befindlichkeit”), as of fundamental existential of Da-sein, and of its temporality instigated me to a very interesting undertaking: phenomenological consideration and explanation of neurosis. Neurosis - disease of XX-XXI centuries... Syndrome of the epoch... Our task is not in its explanation by neurophysiological, psychological or socio-political factors. We must describe this phenomenon in its uniqueness, that is, how it represents and shows itself to us: our method is phenomenological, after all! We also have to explain its ontological essence; namely, what does neurosis mean and imply in itself as an attunement, i.e. as one of the fundamental characteristics of my being? What is its temporal structure? Hence, we consider neurosis as one of the types of attitude. Why?

Neurosis is an attunement and not just some pathology and some internal state. It grabs me wholly, takes hold of me, defines me and discloses my-being-in-the-world in absolutely specific way. It is primarily one of the forms of my fundamental openness and not anomalous state and process present and proceeding inside of me that I comprehend simply by reflection, or find and study by psychoanalytical research. Psychologization (that is, comprehension and study as of psychological givenness) of neurosis, as well as of any attunement, is of secondary character and is possible in the result of certain cognitive “operations” which we carry out on initial, “raw” phenomenon of attunement. This latter possess only character of existential...

Neurosis is defined as an anomaly, disease. But this “disease”, as we have already said, ontologically is fundamental existential of Da-sein, and, namely, attunement (in pure Heideggerian sense of this term). Moreover, it is one of the dominant attunement of contemporaneity. We really can characterize XX and XXI centuries as epoch of neurosis... We live in the permanent era of anxiety...

First of all, I deemed it necessary to do partial and very general review of famous lecture course of Freud “General Theory of Neuroses” (1916-17). Why? What is common between existential analytics (the way we follow now) and psychoanalysis?

* * *

What is the specificity of how obsessive neurosis discloses my-being-in-the-world? Obsession implies that something pulls me back constantly... Something returns me always to same, but this something is unknown, concealed, forgotten, that is, “repressed”. I constantly do one and the same... return to one and the same... going round vicious circle which does not let me out of his hands... My being-in-the-world is

always caught, seized, pulled back by the having-been(„die Gewesenheit“), but this latter is completely concealed for me. The having-been pulls me back and I am unable to go freely forward: “One step forward, two steps back”... My past being, as my “old” thrownness, pulls me back... But everything this remains unconceived for me!

* * *

Precisely in a unified scope of the horizons of future, having-been and present I ascertain what is „for-the-sake-of-which”, „in-order-to”, „what-for”, „what-which”... Only in this scope can everything become ascertainable in essence. And therefore, my being is disclosed in the wholeness, on the wholeness and towards the wholeness of this significance(die Bedeutsamkeit), as far as this wholeness is disclosed and encircled with the unified temporal horizon. And that means, as Heidegger tells us, that precisely on the grounds of horizontal structure of ecstatic unity of temporality, being(das Seiende), which is always is its Da, owns something such as disclosed world. In other words, the world is disclosed for me, that is, my being-in-the-world is possible as far as my existence and the world are always encircled with the unified temporal horizon.

The world manifests itself in this temporality. World exists as disclosedness-shining forth in the scope of unity of these horizons of temporal ecstasies. It does not exist in another way. It is not some “ready” “big” depository of modern physicist or traditional metaphysicist, where everything is stored. It is neither objective, nor subjective. The world is transcendent. And that means that it exists as ecstatically disclosed. The mode its existence is also temporal: *“The world is transcendent, grounded in the horizontal unity of ecstatic temporality. It must already be ecstatically disclosed so that innerworldly beings can be encountered from it”*(p.334).

* * *

And most importantly, Heidegger’s thinking completely differs from that of traditional philosophy because it concerns only single, unique being-in-the-world. It does not concern generally a man’s (that is, subject’s) relation to the world; it has nothing in common with such a “generality”. No, this thinking is one-time and, therefore, unique, but, at the same time, universal in this uniqueness. This is the whole “strangeness” of this thinking! That’s why we can not call it completely “philosophical”, as the mentioned term finds room in the frame of traditional paradigm as well. “Being and Time” is the description, analysis and interpretation of Martin Heidegger’s one-time, unique existential “experience”, which can be discovered again and again by me, by you, and by someone else, as highly authentic as well. And reading this book I really find out, that it refers me and just me, that is, my only, unique being-

in-the-world. Yes, this fundamental “peculiarity” of Heidegger’s philosophy is still remains unconceived even for its many competent experts. This is philosophical thinking transformed into poetry. This is absolutely new dimension, which had been unknown before...

* * *

This other way of thinking is, in the end, is the other way of life: you are existing authentically and, therefore, don’t simply “inhabit” in some surrounding, but at the same time are permanently disclosed for the worldly wholeness, the same way as worldliness is disclosed and shone forth for you; you are existing and, therefore, are disclosed for death: this is continual readiness for death, standing on the edge, the greatest courage, the greatest risk... you are existing and, therefore, never experience stupefaction, petrification in some solid personal mould, as you are an infinite spectrum of opportunities and uninterrupted dynamics, rebuilding, transformation, differentiation... You are existing, and, therefore, breathing, feeding and charging mainly not by your daily life, but by the Being... by that which does not exist... Source of energy for you is this nothingness... You look at this nothingness: you are an **expectation of God**, permanent readiness for his approaching, or the final disaster!

The more is challenge and danger, the more chances of your great transformation and salvation, or full degeneration. In the face of global technicalization and politicization - these most powerful challenges of existence - your existing either will reach unseen intensity or be finally degraded, closed, buried... Your readiness and expectation of God either will reach unimaginable heights or suffer a final collapse. Just this is meant by Heidegger’s **other way**: radically new level of your existence - complete transformation and completely new religious spirit. But this is the lot of the chosen! Though, the history has a sense precisely because of such chosen individuals: everything else is a slag and ruins.

And, let us finish this discussion with the words of Heidegger himself: **Only a God can save us!**