



**HEIDEGGER WITH DEWEY:
MITSEIN, SOLICITUDE,
AND EDUCATION**

Ryan Krahn

HEIDEGGER WITH DEWEY: MITSEIN, SOLICITUDE, AND EDUCATION

Abstract: Contra claims that depict Martin Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit* as lacking an ethics of Others, I interpret the very Being of Dasein as *Mitsein*, ontology as ethics. On the basis of this ethical interpretation of Heideggerian ontology, I draw out the implications such an interpretation has on our ontic, solicitous comportment towards Others. I consider *vorausspringen*, a mode of positive solicitude, as opening up the possibility of a certain pedagogical orientation that serves as a practical, institutional counterpart to Heidegger's ontology. I argue that this Heideggerian pedagogy is neither individualistic nor autocratic, but instead mirrors John Dewey's "directed freedom."

Keywords: *Mitsein*, Solicitude, Pedagogy, Dewey, Being-with-others, Intersubjectivity.

Resumen: Contra la acusación que afirma la ausencia de una ética de los otros en *Ser y tiempo*, de Martin Heidegger, interpreto el verdadero ser del Dasein como ser-con (*Mitsein*) y la ontología como ética. Sobre la base de esta interpretación ética de la ontología heideggeriana, extraigo las implicaciones que ella tiene sobre nuestro comportamiento óntico, solícito con los otros. Considero el "*vorausspringen*" un modo de solicitud positiva, en cuanto abre la posibilidad de una cierta orientación pedagógica que actúa como aliado práctico, institucional, a la ontología de Heidegger. Argumento que esta pedagogía heideggeriana no es individualista ni autocrática, sino que refleja la "la libertad dirigida" de John Dewey.

Palabras clave: Ser-con, solicitud, pedagogía, Dewey, ser-con-los-otros, intersubjetividad.

Academic information: 2nd Year MA, University of Guelph, Ontario, Canada (Supervisor: John Russon and Jay Lampert). Email: rkrahn@uoguelph.ca

HEIDEGGER WITH DEWEY: MITSEIN, SOLICITUDE, AND EDUCATION

The brevity of Martin Heidegger's explicit treatment of *Mitsein* (Being-with) and of *Anderdasein* (Other Dasein) in *Being and Time* has led some commentators (Levinas, Löwith, etc.) to call into question the sufficiency of his treatment of Others, not only for his own project of fundamental ontology but also for any type of ethical practice or praxis (e.g. a working politics, etc.). Although the implications of *Mitsein* and references to Other Daseins are dispersed throughout *Being and Time*, only in §§25-27 does Heidegger take up the topic of Others directly. Some have, thus, gone as far as to claim that the discussion of *Mitsein* has no further function than that of a perfunctory addendum, a parenthetical nod to Other Dasein that serves as a mere intermission between the "more important" discussions of Dasein's condition of *In-der-Welt-sein* (Being-in-the-World) and Dasein's *Eigentlichkeit* (Authenticity), Dasein's Being-one's-Self. This will not be the contention held here.

Against this claim, we shall aim to highlight and defend the irreducibly constitutive nature of Heidegger's discussion of (the ontological condition of) *Mitsein* for properly understanding his treatment of Dasein and (its ontological as well as ontic relation to) Other Dasein. In so doing, we will be able to unpack the implications that the ontological condition of *Mitsein* has for our solicitude toward Others. And on the basis of this solicitude we shall draw out some implications for practical action, i.e., for praxis. Of particular interest to us, related to this last aim, will be an examination into what relation *Mitsein* might have to pedagogy and the teacher-student relationship. A comparison between Heidegger's account of solicitude and John Dewey's account of pedagogical methodologies shall structure this final discussion. It shall be shown here that Dewey offers us a way to put Heidegger's discussion of solicitous comportment toward others into practice.

MITSEIN

After having described the existential condition of Dasein as *always already* Being-in-the-world, and after defining the very possibility of any such description as one that always comes *after the fact* (since the possibility of ontic description is only possible because of the prior ontological condition of already Being-in-the-world), Heidegger explicitly draws out the ramifications this condition will have on the traditional understanding of the subject. On this account, one cannot feasibly defend the idea of “a bare subject without a world.... [It] never ‘is’ proximally, nor is it ever given. And so in the end an isolated “I” without Others is just as far from being proximally given.”¹ The connection being made here is between Being-in-the-world, the ontological condition of Dasein’s inseparable, primordial immersion in an environment of concern to it, and Other Dasein. Being-in-the-world, a condition neither surmountable nor voluntary, neither suspendable nor transcendable, is a *shared* condition and there is no sense to be made of speaking of Being-in-the-world alone. If there are other ‘entities’ who are also *being-there* (*Auch-da-sein*), if there are other ‘entities’ who are also *there* in the world (i.e., who are Being-in-the-world) then there are Other Daseins, and these ‘entities’ that count as Other Dasein are not entities at all – if by this we mean the present-at-hand or ready-to-hand – as is the case with those Things (*Dinge*) in Dasein’s workworld.

“Co-determined” as she is by Being-in-the-world(-with-Others),² Dasein, for the most part, only notices the existence of Others (and thereby her own proximal relation to Others) through what is closest to it, its “workworld” of equipment (i.e., the world of Things, the tools for the projects of Dasein’s concern). This is to say that Dasein notices Others as those who stand behind each material (non-Dasein) Thing; as Heidegger’s own example has it, we notice the farmer behind the field we approach, even in his absence.³ This *proximal noticing* is an existential discovery of Others rather than a categorical *addition* of Others to our experience⁴ for, insofar as we can only *be* (i.e., exist) as Being-in-the-world, we can only enter into a relation with Other Dasein on the basis of *already* being in a primordial relation of *Mitsein* (Being-with). The Dasein that is Being-in-the-world is not a “bare subject” for she shares “in advance” a world that is a With-world (*Mitwelt*). The sharing of a With-world thus implies that Being-in-the-world be Being(-in-the-world)-with-Other-Dasein.

1 Heidegger, (1967) p. 116; Heidegger (1962), 152.

2 Heidegger (1967), 110; Heidegger (1962), 144

3 Heidegger (1967), 118; Heidegger (1962), 153.

4 Heidegger (1967), 118; Heidegger (1962), 154.

The existential condition, or as Heidegger will call it, the “basic constitution,”⁵ of Dasein (and Other Dasein) is the condition of *Mitsein* (Being-with) in a With-world. But this “*mit*” (“with”) is more than a mere preposition that precedes a noun; it is ontologically a *pre-position*, a given condition upon which every factual or ontic relation, every explicit physical relation or social institution, is founded. Far from being peripheral to the Heideggerian project of fundamental ontology, *Mitsein* is nothing less than what Jean-Luc Nancy, not uncontroversially, calls the “first philosophy.”⁶ To ask the question of Being (*Seinsfrage*) is to ask the question of the Being of Dasein and so the question of Being that Dasein inquires into (or attempts to recover from its forgetfulness) is also the question of Being-with (*Mitseinfrage*). So not only is *Mitsein* a fundamental question for any ontological investigation (including Heidegger’s own in *Being and Time*) but it is also equiprimordial with the ontological question, the question of Being. *Mit*, it is clear, is not added onto *Sein* (Being) to ‘make’ *Mitsein*, but the Being of Dasein *is Mitsein*.

Dasein, as *Mitsein*, is to be understood as a significant departure from the subject defined as an isolated individual essentially free from Others. Dasein “does not signify a *what*. This entity is not distinguished by its *what*, like a chair in contrast to a house. Rather, this designation in its own way expresses *the way to be*.”⁷ If Dasein were merely a ‘*what*,’ something to be understood in its categorical distinction from all other things (such as the chair in contrast to the house), then Dasein would only be “with” Others when it was within the physical proximity of Others. Given this understanding, Dasein would be “with” Other Dasein when in a crowd but would be “without” Other Dasein when in solitude, as in the case of the hermit. As was suggested above, in the case of seeing Others through Things in our physical proximity, this might be how we tend to ontically, explicitly, and for the most part acknowledge the existence of Others (e.g. the hermit might notice that the wood that structures his house was bought from another person and therefore, as the resident of the house, notice that he is still in some relation with Others). But this does not speak to how Dasein is ontologically, in its authentic spatiality or relationality (i.e., non-categorical, not merely physically locative spatiality).

To be “with” Other Dasein carries an “existential-ontological meaning” which confers the sense of Dasein as ontologically “with” Other Dasein even when factually alone. Aloneness is but a deficient mode of Being-with.⁸ This is to say that the absence of Other Dasein is merely an ontically deficient way in which Dasein is (always already) ontologically with Other Dasein. Dasein’s *way to be* is in relation, as ontologically *Mitsein*. But what, then, of *Jemeinigkeit* (Mineness)? Is

5 Heidegger, (1985), 152.

6 Nancy, (1996) 55. For a discussion of Nancy’s relation to Heidegger’s ontology see Raffoul (1999), 36-52.

7 Heidegger, (1985), 153.

8 Heidegger (1967), 120; Heidegger (1962), 156.

not this 'to-be' "in each instance mine?"⁹ Is this not where Dasein's ontological condition of *Mitsein*, Dasein's primordial relationality, becomes individuated and where, in the accusatory words of Karl Löwith, Heidegger's depiction of Dasein shows itself as nothing more than "egocentrism and atomistic individualism"?¹⁰ Is this not where Others are subjugated to a "solipsistic drive [that] characterizes being-in-the-world in terms of Dasein's mineness?"¹¹ Heidegger is none too happy to respond to this potential objection:

This relationship, as Being-with, is one which, with Dasein's Being, already is. Of course it is indisputable that a lively mutual acquaintanceship on the basis of Being-with, often depends upon how far *one's own Dasein has understood itself at the time*; but this means that it depends only upon how far one's essential Being with Others has made itself transparent and has not disguised itself. And *that is possible only if Dasein, as Being-in-the-world, already is with Others.*¹²

To come into one's own, that is, to understand one's own Being and to be free for Being-towards-oneself is to understand oneself as *Mitsein*. Dasein is in each case, at each time, its own but, as the passage above obviously demonstrates, this ownness (mineness, *Jemeinigkeit*) cannot be reduced to an egotistical individualism that assumes relationality as something added on *afterward*.

Later, in *Being and Time*, Heidegger will claim that resoluteness, i.e., Being-one's-self, understanding one's personal authentic way-to-be transparently, is in fact a realization of itself as *Mitsein*:

Resoluteness, as an authentic Being-one's self does not detach Dasein from its world, nor does it become a free-floating "I"...Resoluteness brings the self right into its own current concerned Being-alongside what is ready-to-hand, and pushes it into solicitous Being-with-others.¹³

To singularly (and thus authentically) understand oneself is to understand one's own Being as ontologically plural, as "with." Daseins' "Being-in-themselves within-the-world is Dasein-with (*Mitdasein*)"¹⁴ That being said, no longer can it be claimed

9 Heidegger (1985) 153.

10 Karl Löwith quoted in Dallmayr (1980), 236. My contention in this paper is one which runs contrary to the conclusions Löwith makes on the topic of *Mitsein* in Löwith (1928), 79-82.

11 Gratton (2004), 33. Gratton is referring here to what he takes to be the type of critique Levinas has waged against Heidegger.

12 Heidegger (1967), 125; Heidegger (1962), 162; my italics.

13 Heidegger (1967), 298; Heidegger (1962), 344.

14 Heidegger (1967), 118; Heidegger (1962), 155.

that *Being and Time* treats *Mitsein* cursorily or that a deep-rooted individualism overshadows the social and ethical (as well as political and institutional) significance of his account. The given, i.e., *a priori*, relationality of *Mitsein* makes the ability to even talk of Dasein's ability to authentically ask the question of its own Being possible. It is this relationality that also underlies all ontic relationships (for instance, political power-structures, teacher-student relations, etc.) between two or more "subjects" physically 'coming together' (or 'moving apart'). With Heidegger's discussion of *Mitsein*, of ontological Being-with, we see the necessary ground for any discussion of institutional or socio-political praxis.

DEFICIENT OR INDIFFERENT SOLICITUDE

Let us turn now to the way Heidegger conceives of these relations between Dasein and Other Dasein, relations he will call relations of solicitude. Solicitude [*Fürsorge*], like the concern [*Besorge*] we have for the ready-to-hand equipment in our world, is a comportment of Dasein towards the entities it encounters (including encountering them by taking notice of their physical absence). Likewise, it is through solicitude that Dasein can be encountered by the comportment of Other Dasein. Like our concern for equipment, it is an *existenziale*, a given constitutive condition of our Being-in-the-world. Just as there does not exist the possibility of Dasein being unconcerned (*unbesorgt*) with her environment (even if this concern is not explicit), so too must Dasein be understood as being in constant solicitude with Others.¹⁵ This commonality (along with the common root to both terms, *Sorge*, i.e., Care) should not be overlooked, but note must also be taken of the differences between solicitude and the concern for Things. Solicitude, as the comportment of Dasein to Other Dasein, carries the sense of caring-for (*für*) someone rather than the care one has about something.

The intimacy of this (caring-for) relationality is founded upon Dasein's ontological Being-with-Others. But this does not prevent Dasein from often and for the most part failing to embrace the intimacy of this situation. Instead, Dasein usually ignores its comportment and, when the occasion arises that it does attempt to understand its relation to Others, the ontological nature of this relation is usually obscured. When the hermit is aloof to the civilians of the nearby village, when he hides away, he usually does not understand himself to be in a relationship with Other Dasein that is much more intimate, albeit *deficiently* or *indifferently*, than the one he has with his tools.

Aloofness [*Zurückhaltung*] and hiding away [*Sichverstecken*]¹⁶ are but two of the many possible modes of indifferently and deficiently comporting oneself toward others, each one carrying with it a similar sense of ignoring the *Mitsein* that makes

¹⁵ Heidegger (1967), 121; Heidegger (1962), 157-158.

¹⁶ Heidegger (1967), 124; Heidegger (1962), 161.

it even possible to pass another by. Having the reality of our comportment toward Others disguised in this manner, we reject (or, if rejection carries too active a sense, we might say that this rejection is implicit in apathetically ignoring) our solicitude. Deficient solicitude is not acknowledged by the Dasein who is deficiently solicitous because deficient solicitude is characterized by a lack of recognition (a “passing by”) of its own solicitude as solicitude – and one cannot understand the deficiency of a comportment they do not recognize. It is obvious that if this everyday, deficient mode of solicitude were ignored by Dasein, then, so too would Dasein extend the same indifference to the very condition of its possibility, the condition of *Mitsein*.

Because of our indifference to both our solicitous comportment and the condition of solicitude’s possibility, we are mistakenly inclined to exclude *Mitsein* from our understanding of our relation to Others. Of course, I, as Dasein, will be *Mitsein* “whether I know about it or not, whether I have lost myself [i.e., an understanding of myself as *Mitsein*]...or not,”¹⁷ but this indifference and deficiency, nevertheless, form the basis for many mistaken analyses of subjectivity and intersubjectivity. On such a basis (or, precisely because of the lack of an understanding of our true ontological basis), we have offered up theories of the self and its relation to Others, its relation to society, that exclude any account of given, ontological relationality altogether. With this exclusion the ontic conditions that encourage authentic solicitude (i.e., those that lead to emancipation through leaping-ahead, which we will address below) are diminished. Without an account of *Mitsein*, such theories most often characterize humans¹⁸ as isolated, self-sufficient selves, free of any necessary relationships. Any relationships between selves, on this account, are *voluntarily entered into* and are thereby optional. This atomistic account of our relations with one another carries with it some serious political consequences when institutions are shaped to reflect this naïve view.¹⁹ We will address the connection being made between deficient solicitude and misdirected institutional practices (specifically, how they effect pedagogical theories and practices) shortly.

LEAPING-IN

Before discussing the practical consequences of deficient solicitude let us turn to Heidegger’s account of solicitude’s positive modes. Heidegger identifies two modes of positive solicitude, leaping-in [*eineinspringen*] and leaping-ahead [*vorausspringen*].²⁰ When Dasein leaps-in for another, she (Dasein) takes care of

17 Heidegger (1985), 153.

18 Using Heidegger’s term ‘Dasein’ would not fit with these theories as all sense of ‘there’ [*da*] is lost when one attempts to abstract from the condition of Being-in-the(-with)-world.

19 Contrast Heidegger’s account of *Mitsein*, for example, with the idea of an atomistic self *entering into* relation with Others that is at the core of social contract theories.

20 The designation of the term ‘positive’ is at first puzzling, for the two modes of positive

the Other's concern. This requires Dasein to usurp the position of the Other in order to take on her tasks, whatever they might be, and become the one-caring: caring-for (*Fürsorge*) by becoming the one-caring. The original one-caring is then left without tasks (or at least without the tasks that pertain to those concerns that are taken over). The original proprietor of the concern might have this concern returned to her after it has been resolved (as a child might hand in and sign his name to an assignment that was, nevertheless, completed by someone else) or she might wash her hands of the concern altogether, completely giving it over to the one leaping-in.²¹

The motivation for this leaping-in need not be malicious nor even self-centered. In fact, oftentimes motivation to leap-in for another comes from a source of kindness, a genuine effort to help by disburdening the Other. In order to illustrate what is meant here by leaping-in, we could use as an example the case of someone, say an anthropologist, earnestly wishing to understand certain cultural customs that are not her own. Any given practitioner of this custom might have reason(s) to fear the anthropologist's attempt to understand her custom. This fear could arise from the anticipation of losing some exclusive claim on this custom (e.g. an influential book might push the custom to wider exposure and popularity and have it taken up by others), or having it be misunderstood, or for many other possible reasons.

The main point here is that the anthropologist might attempt to disburden the Other from the object of the Other's concern (the concern here is a concern with another attempting to understand one's practices) through attempts to assuage the Other's fears and denying claims of difference. In this manner, the anthropologist will have denied the Other the task of dealing with her own concerns in her own way. Surely, this could be tied to a desire to perfunctorily address the topic, write a book, and live a comfortable life without much care for the accuracy or comprehensiveness of the interpretation and thereby without much sensitivity to the Other's desires and well-being. But just as likely, and probably (at least if we are to be optimistic) in most cases, it is the case that many anthropologists wish to be sensitive in their treatments of another's custom, wish to open up an avenue of peaceful dialogue, and perhaps do a service for the Other (e.g., help her better understand her own practices, help her practices gain greater exposure in order to facilitate peace and respect, etc.).

solicitude are quite different and, after assessing the respective results of each mode, one cannot fail to see the preferability of leaping-ahead to leaping-in. 'Positive' is not, then, to be seen merely as a value judgement but is intended to indicate some degree of awareness of relationality. Deficient or indifferent solicitude does not recognize relationality, whereas leaping-in, while not properly understanding the ontological conditions of relationality and thereby misdirecting its comportment exclusively to the concerns of the Other, at least recognizes some degree of relationality.

21 Heidegger (1967), 122; Heidegger (1962), 158.

This is simply to say that it is often the case that one leaps-in for another with the best of intentions and to counter the negative ethical implications of deficient solicitude (e.g., passing the Other by, being inconsiderate, being reserved, etc). But leaping-in leads one toward the opposite extremity, the overhasty identification of oneself with another's concern. For precisely these reasons it is often the case that the one leaping-in for another does not realize that they are actually depriving the Other of her concerns and leaving the Other dependent upon the one leaping-in. As a dependent or as a victim of oppression, however subtle the form, the one 'helped' becomes dominated – this is nothing less than 'help' as a subtle form of colonization. The terms of the Other's concern often are changed so significantly through the intervention that, if given the chance to take up her former concerns again, the Other is partially or fully dependent on further intervention (help with adapting, training, etc.). Leaping-in becomes what Fred Dallmayr calls "managerial solicitude;" the Other becomes managed and not genuinely helped.²² It matters 'who' deals with the concern and not just that it gets dealt with and this is precisely what is lost when the Other is managed in this fashion. A great deal has been written on the domination and dependence that comes as a result of well-intentioned leaping in – take for example the ever-expanding critical literature on the topic of Orientalism, on the idea of a "White Man's Burden," on the attempt to introduce liberalism through interventionist wars, and so on and so on.

Not all domination, or management, of this kind is explicit or recognized, by either the Dasein who is leaping-in or the Other Dasein who has been leapt-in for. A similar case, but of a more generalized variety²³ is when the public, the "They" – who is no one in particular and, therefore, precisely anyone, any One [*das Man*], meant in the way we say "one could do that," meaning nobody in particular – leaps-in for Dasein and hands her a pre-interpreted (impersonal) interpretation. Here, Dasein is disburdened of the need to take on the task of interpretation, to come to her own conclusions and understands herself no further than as a "They"-self. Conformity takes the place of a personalized, authentic understanding. In such cases, Dasein is often tricked into believing herself to have arrived at this dominant interpretation on her own, having worked through her task by herself, having taken up her own questions and concerns.

22 Dallmayr (1980), 242.

23 Since the "They" cannot be identified as a particular Dasein or a particular group or, in fact, anything particular – since their name itself, *Das Man* (the One), carries a neutral, unspecific meaning – this example is a generalized account of leaping-in meant to draw out the effects leaping-in can have. That is to say that, unlike our discussion of Dasein leaping-in for another, we are not here suggesting that the "They" can have a mode of solicitude (as if it could be individuated in such a manner), but rather that being leapt-in for makes one vulnerable to dominance, including the dominance of the "They" (i.e., it prevents authentic *existentiell* modifications of the They). For Heidegger's account of the "They" in relation to authenticity see §27 of *Being and Time*.

Dasein is prevented from taking on her concerns on her own because leaping-in overlooks what is best for Dasein; leaping-in overlooks the Other's existence and the other's freedom to take up concerns on her own. Though the one leaping-in believes herself to be an aid, the act of leaping-in focuses on the concerns of the Other at the expense of any focus on the Other herself, her possibilities, and her ability to resolve her concerns. Leaping-in concerns itself with 'what' the concern is about, those things ready-to-hand, and not 'who' has the concern, i.e., Other Dasein. So, although different than deficient or indifferent solicitude, leaping-in, in a way, also bypasses Other Dasein by directing its comportment toward the concern of the Other. This bypassing is not as extreme as it is in the case of deficient solicitude but it still misses the mark of authentically Being-with-Others.

LEAPING-AHEAD

Instead of taking over the concern of the Other, leaping-ahead, as the other mode of positive solicitude, is a comportment of Dasein toward another in such a way that will facilitate the Other in the taking up of their concern by themselves. This is the same as saying that Dasein, through leaping-ahead, considers the conditions necessary for the taking up of one's concern²⁴ and, without directing all attention to the task itself, does what is possible to give the Other the freedom to do so authentically. Although the issue of authenticity and its relation to the "They" concerns §27 more than it does §26, the focus of our discussion, it will suffice for our purposes to suggest that authenticity is a coming into one's own, an embracing of the freedom to take up one's concerns. But this is an equally a freedom that results in an awareness that in the midst of such concerns one is not radically isolated (as deficient solicitude had imagined it) but is ontologically *Mitsein*. This recognition of oneself as *Mitsein* is what it means to understand the Being of Dasein, to become transparent to oneself.²⁵

This authenticity is the result of Dasein dealing with her concerns on her own and the greatest of these is the concern for her own Being.²⁶ Ontologically, Dasein's Being is *Mitsein*, so to take up the freedom to become authentic, to take up one's concerns, is, for Dasein, inseparable from taking up the question of one's own Being, recognizing and inquiring into the question of one's *Mitsein*. So, this inquiring into our condition, this attempt at recovering the question of our own Being, shows Dasein's authentic individuality to be one always already related to Others. To come into one's own singularly is to recognize oneself as related in a

24 Relating this to education, Kant makes a similar point in Kant (2003), 19, where he emphasizes *discretion* in education (the necessary discretion of the teacher, the one leaping-ahead, for the purpose of teaching students the *discretion* necessary to personally choose the ends which are good).

25 Heidegger (1967), 125; Heidegger (1962), 162.

26 Heidegger (1967), 122; Heidegger (1962), 159.

plurality, in a primordial relationality. Emancipation, freedom, empowerment – whatever term we might use to describe the ability to take up the question of our Being –, when conceived authentically, is not a freedom *from* Others and vastly differs from deficient solicitude’s conception of what it might mean to be free. The freedom given by leaping-ahead for another is reconceived, apart from any voluntaristic sense, as emancipation from the misunderstanding of Dasein’s Being. This freedom is a breaking out of the enslavement that came with the ignorance and radical atomism of deficient solicitude and the enslavement that came with the dominance of leaping-in.

To have the question of my Being recovered from forgetfulness, and to be freed to inquire into it, often requires one leap-ahead of you; it often requires someone with an understanding of the ontological condition of *Mitsein* to actively enable you to inquire into the question of your own Being. As Miguel de Beistegui puts it, “to have the appropriate relation to the other is to comport oneself in such a way that the existence of the other becomes an issue for the other.”²⁷ If one has asked the question of one’s own Being, has attempted to understand Dasein as *Mitsein*, then one is better prepared to consider the conditions necessary for the Other understanding her own Being. Or, in Heidegger’s words, “he who truly knows what is, knows what he wills in the midst of what is.”²⁸ An understanding of our ontological situation aids the possibility of comprehensive, ethical comportment. To know one’s place in the world, what one is to will “in the midst of what is,” is to know how to act appropriately and respond to the demands of the situation (in this case, how to facilitate another’s understanding of her own Being). Both deficient solicitude and leaping-in were insufficient in this sense due to their improper orientation to our ontological condition.

Leaping-in can be seen as a failed attempt to leap ahead. The failure of this attempt originates from a failure to understand the ramifications and possibilities of Dasein as *Mitsein*, of sharing a With-world with Other Dasein. By improperly understanding these possibilities, leaping-in targets the actual conditions without considering Other Dasein’s possibilities (i.e., the possibility to understand herself as *Mitsein*, the possibility to leap-ahead of Others, etc.), thereby preventing Other Dasein the possibility of potential authenticity. Given the possibility of authentically having one’s condition become transparent to oneself, it would follow that Dasein would be led to take up leaping-ahead in her own solicitude toward Others. As Heidegger says, “In letting entities be involved so that they are freed for a totality of involvements, one must have disclosed already that for which [*woraufhin*] they have been freed.”²⁹ The success of any ontic action or practical resolution will depend on how far we have come in attempting to recover the ontological

27 De Beistegui (1990) 147, as quoted in Shapiro (1994), 407.

28 Heidegger (1951), 55.

29 Heidegger (1967), 85; Heidegger (1962), 118.

question, how far we have attempted to understand the question of our very existence.

As the possibility of leaping-ahead demonstrates, we are not forced to choose between what John Dewey calls "Either-Or philosophies,"³⁰ between relationality that is necessarily inauthentic on the one hand or authenticity that is individualistic, on the other. We interpreted the solicitude of leaping-in as leaving the Other socially anonymous, dependent, dominated, and vulnerable to the inauthentic conformity of the "They." Our understanding of relationality or community is inauthentic under these conditions. We read deficient or indifferent solicitude as the attempt to overcome or bypass all types of relationality or community and assert oneself on one's own as independent of Others. Against some commentators, who have made use of this wrongheaded dichotomy for the purposes of depicting Heidegger as either a radical individualist, an autocrat, or as offering a contradictory account of solicitude, we have tried to account for leaping-ahead as an alternative, as an authentic way of enabling another to take up her own concerns and thereby recognize her own ontological condition as *Mitsein*.

Insofar as leaping-ahead involves a consideration of the conditions that would enable one to take up her own concern and become authentic, these conditions, these "prevailing factual social arrangements,"³¹ play a role in the prevention or facilitation of leaping-ahead and thereby prevent or facilitate an understanding of our ontological condition. Many factual social arrangements, for example, enforce the reduction of ourselves and others to our objects of concern or treat us as if we were only optionally related to one another. Those arrangements that direct themselves toward Dasein's concerns rather than with Dasein herself often tend to enforce the bureaucratization, commodification, and uniformization of social life.³² Those arrangements that treat our relations as optional or insignificant tend to enforce radical divisions of labour, compartmentalism, and the erosion of the very idea of social life. Thus, the conditions that leaping-ahead must consider and maneuver its way between are often political and institutional. There is often a material aspect to solicitude, as is apparent in Heidegger's own discussion of solicitude sometimes taking the form of offering food, clothing, and medicine.³³ So, how might we recognize what is needed, including material needs? What type of social institution would facilitate this type of leaping-ahead? To address this concern, we turn to a consideration of one of these institutions, the institution of education and the relation between solicitude and pedagogy.

30 Dewey (1997), 20.

31 Heidegger (1967), 121; Heidegger (1962), 158.

32 A discussion of these types of arrangements can be found in Shapiro (1994), 414.

33 Heidegger (1967), 121; Heidegger (1962), 158.

EDUCATION

In Dewey's book *Experience and Education* we are given an analysis of two different models of American education with drastically different methodologies. Both approaches are rooted in a particular understanding of how the student might benefit from teaching practices and, therefore, both assume what is best for the student by appealing to some understanding of who the student is. This is to say, in a Heideggerian fashion, that the methodologies applied to educational practices assume some understanding of Dasein and the pertinence of their practices are thereby going to depend on the degree to which they properly understand the conditions of Dasein's Being. Both of these models, it shall be argued, are guilty of misunderstanding or ignoring those ontological conditions that determine who Dasein is and thereby lead to inauthentic pedagogical relationships.

Dewey names the two approaches the "traditional" school and the "progressive" school.³⁴ The traditional school directs its attention to the subject-matter of education, which it for the most part views as particular information and skills that have been worked out in the past and been turned into effective, transmittable rules and habits.³⁵ As Louis Althusser writes, this traditional "function of teaching is to transmit a determinate knowledge to subjects who do not possess this knowledge. The teaching situation thus rests on the absolute condition of an inequality between a knowledge and a nonknowledge."³⁶ The teacher, believing the student to be lacking knowledge and therefore incapable of having a significant part in dealing with her own concern (to educate themselves), leaps-in for the student by handing them a commodified package of knowledge to be memorized. Because the nature of this knowledge is claimed to be static, students are often discouraged from personalizing their understanding of the material and are prevented from going further than merely adopting an interpretation handed to them by a bureaucratic board of education informed by the traditions of the public (*viz.* the dictatorship of the "They"). Receptivity, docility, and obedience are stressed³⁷ over any personal inquiry into the conditions of one's own (educational) experience. Dewey, following the American Transcendentalists, believes this "Lockean "sensualism" that [depicts] persons as surfaces on which an educator might imprint a world" to be insufficient.³⁸ But, as we saw with the subtle forms of colonialism present in the leaping-in of anthropologists, so, too, will "good teachers...use devices of

34 Dewey is careful to note that the term "progressive" is not meant to imply a superior standing between the two schools in Dewey (1997), 17.

35 *Ibid.*.

36 Althusser (1964), 152, translated in Rancière (1991), xvi.

37 Dewey (1997), 18.

38 Anderson (2006), 170.

art to cover up the imposition so as to relieve it of obviously brutal features."³⁹ Overbearing paternalism often legitimizes itself under the rhetoric of aid, protection, and rigour.

Traditional education's strength lies in its acknowledgement of what Dewey calls the "objective conditions" of experience,⁴⁰ those social relations which contribute to a student's education, such as a teacher's instruction. But the relationality that it does recognize is insufficiently robust insofar as this relationality is one propped by imposition. Dewey warns against the implementation of certain teaching tactics (those involving coercion, dependency, etc.) that prevent the experiences necessary for a student to grow, to develop, to come to his own understanding. Such tactics often overlook what Dewey calls the "subjective" component of a student's concerns;⁴¹ they overlook Dasein for her concerns. The victims of interventionism often seek refuge in some form of isolationism, something evident in the rise of the progressive school.

There is a danger, as Dewey notes, in only developing principles in reaction to another school,⁴² as in the case with the progressive school, which might be better defined as the "anti-traditional" school. A mere "departure from the old solves no problems."⁴³ To tie this approach to our discussion of solicitude, we might note that deficient solicitude, insofar as it does not recognize solicitude with Others, rejects the interventionism of leaping-in. Deficient solicitude, of course, depends on a primordial "with" just as progressive education depends on the social significance of history, tradition, community, etc. However, unaware of the debt to this "with," unaware of the social embeddedness that underscores its very existence, progressive education stresses only what it takes to be the radically individualistic desires and impulses of a subject. Without an account of the subject's (or Dasein's) Being-in-the(-with)-World, it sees the apparent spontaneity of these impulses as completely free of "objective conditions." In terms of solicitude, excessive individualism ignores both ontic solicitude and its ontological conditions (*Mitsein*), taking each "subject" to be nothing more than a 'what' categorically distinguished from another 'what.'

Progressive education's goal is to provide students a certain freedom, but this freedom is negatively construed as freedom *from* social bonds, freedom from Others. This is a deceptive freedom⁴⁴ and models based on this deception can become as dogmatic as those based on top-down autocratic models of relationality

39 Dewey (1997), 19.

40 Ibid., 45.

41 Ibid., 38.

42 Ibid., 20.

43 Ibid., 25.

44 Ibid., 10.

(i.e., traditional education).⁴⁵ Freedom understood in this limited way characterizes all social bonds as optional and modes of infringement. But, as Dewey writes, the experience necessary for education, for a sense of personal freedom, “does not occur in a vacuum,”⁴⁶ a fact which would become evident if progressive education were to examine the conditions of its very existence, its underlying “principles.”⁴⁷ It is the responsibility of the educator to inquire into these underlying conditions to assess the educational tools and methods she will use in teaching. Such an inquiry will include an examination into the Being of the teacher and her students, into the Being of Dasein and thus into *Mitsein*. Such an investigation will open up the possibilities of inquiring into the role of the teacher, into the role of texts, into “freedom [and what it will] mean and [into] the conditions under which it is capable of realization.”⁴⁸ Under such an investigation it will become apparent that the freedom of “enduring importance is...freedom of observation and of judgement”⁴⁹ which, under a Heideggerian reading, we can interpret as the personal freedom to inquire into one’s own ontological constitution, one’s own Being as *Mitsein*.

We find in Dewey’s “directed freedom,”⁵⁰ a notion of freedom that mirrors Heidegger’s account of emancipatory solicitude (leaping-ahead), both the necessity of personal freedom *and* an understanding of our relation to Others. Leaping-ahead recognizes that the conditions that foster another to wrestle with her concerns, that foster an education, must neither be imposed, unenjoyable, repetitive rehearsals, nor shall they be, in the fashion of libertarian accounts of freedom, dismissed altogether.⁵¹ “Education can only exist in this struggle of offering something on the one hand, but keeping [Dasein’s] possibilities open on the other.”⁵² The educator must carefully assess our proximal, ontic conditions for their experiential possibilities, their place on what Dewey calls the “experiential continuum,”⁵³ in order to assess their fittingness not just for experience and freedom, but for the proper types of experience and freedom. The proper experiences, the proper types of freedom, will be those which take Dasein herself, not just Dasein’s concerns, into account. “Under these conditions,” the educator must ask, “will my students realize on their own that their personal experiences are, in fact, social?”

45 Ibid., 22.

46 Ibid., 40.

47 Ibid., 22.

48 Ibid., 22.

49 Ibid., 61.

50 Anderson (2006), 171.

51 Dewey (1997), 27.

52 Smeyers (2002), 97.

53 Dewey (1997), 33.

It is imperative that the teacher who leaps-ahead continually look for opportunities that will provide experiences that accomplish this and this is a task that is rarely obvious or risk-free for, unlike traditional education, leaping-ahead has no preset form to disperse to each student.⁵⁴ When the teacher undertakes this risk and is no longer preoccupied with preset standards of instrumental transmission (with leaping-in to take away the students concerns), she no longer acts in the manner of a dictator. The teacher-student relationship, based on this leaping-ahead, is able to offer an authentic freedom to “retrieve a way of relating to things which is fundamental to human consciousness as a whole.... An initiation into what it is to be human in some founding sense.”⁵⁵ Based on leaping-ahead, the teacher-student relationship is, contra leaping-in, no longer a managerial tool but, contra deficient solicitude, still recognizes itself as a relationship.

The combination of Dewey’s account of how we might overcome the shortcomings of both traditional and progressive education with Heidegger’s account of emancipatory solicitude has shed light on “how we become what we are.”⁵⁶ We have attempted to account for the irreducibly central position *Mitsein* plays in understanding both the ontological conditions and ontic possibilities of Dasein. On this basis, a description of the possible modes of Dasein’s solicitude and their implications for how we understand our relationships with Others has been possible. Finally, having suggested that each mode of solicitude has as its institutional counterpart a certain model of the teacher-student relationship, we were able to offer the grounds to practically assess certain pedagogical practices. In suggesting that pedagogical practice move toward the aims of leaping-ahead we can conclude that a mature approach to education will strive to take up the task of freeing students for authentically making sense of their own existential-ontological condition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Althusser, Louis: “Problèmes étudiants” in *La Nouvelle Critique*, (Jan. 1964).

Anderson, Douglas R.: *Philosophy Americana*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2006.

Bonnet, Michael: “Education as a Form of the Poetic” in Peters, Michael A. (ed.): *Heidegger, Education and Modernity*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.

⁵⁴ On the risk involved in educating others Anderson (2006), especially Ch. 11.

⁵⁵ Bonnet (2002), 239.

⁵⁶ This elucidatory phrase comes from a chapter named “Heidegger’s Mature Vision of Ontological Education, or How We Become What We Are” in Thomson (2005), 141.

Dallmayr, Fred: "Heidegger on Intersubjectivity" in *Human Studies*, Vol. 3 (1980), 221-246.

De Beistegui, Miguel: *Heidegger and the Question of the Political*. Loyola University, 1990 (Doctoral Dissertation).

Dewey, John: *Experience and Education*. New York: Touchstone, 1997.

Gratton, Peter: "Mitsein and Sharing: Heidegger & Nancy on the Political Community" in *Review Journal of Political Philosophy*, Vol. 2, Issue 1-2 (2004), 33-59.

Heidegger, Martin: *Being and Time*. New York: HarperCollins, 1962.

Heidegger, Martin: *History of the Concept of Time*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Heidegger, Martin: *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Klosterman, 1951.

Heidegger, Martin: *Sein und Zeit*. Tübingen: Neomarius Verlag, 1967 (seventh ed.)

Kant, Immanuel: *On Education*. Mineola, NY: Dover, 2003.

Löwith, Karl: *Das Individuum in der Rolle des Mitmenschen*. Munich: 1928.

Nancy, Jean-Luc: *Etre Singulier Pluriel*. Paris: Galilée, 1996.

Raffoul, Francois: "The Logic of the With: On Nancy's *Etre Singulier Pluriel*" in *Studies in Practical Philosophy*, Vol. 1, Issue 1 (1999), 36-52

Rancière, Jacques: *The Ignorant Schoolmaster*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991).

Shapiro, Joel B. "Heidegger's Virtue is Knowledge" in *Philosophy Today*, Vol 38, No. 4 (Winter, 1994), 400-418.

Smeyers, Paul: "The Origin: Education, Philosophy, and a Work of Art" in Peters, Michael A. (ed.): *Heidegger, Education and Modernity*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.

Thomson, Iain: *Heidegger on Ontotheology*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.