



2010

Joy as Attunement and End in the Philosophies of Martin Heidegger and Henri Bergson

Justin Albert Harrison
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Harrison, Justin Albert, "Joy as Attunement and End in the Philosophies of Martin Heidegger and Henri Bergson" (2010). *Dissertations*. 203.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/203

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 2010 Justin Albert Harrison

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

JOY AS ATTUNEMENT AND END
IN THE PHILOSOPHIES OF
MARTIN HEIDEGGER AND HENRI BERGSON

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PROGRAM IN PHILOSOPHY

BY

JUSTIN ALBERT HARRISON

CHICAGO, IL

MAY 2010

Copyright by Justin A. Harrison, 2009
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of the people who made this dissertation possible, starting with my professors in the Philosophy Department at Loyola University Chicago. Dr. Andrew Cutrofello was an amazing dissertation committee chair. I am forever indebted to his critiques, analysis, support, and aid. I would also like to thank Loyola University Chicago for providing the funds with which I was able to complete my research and writing. An assistantship from the fall of 2005 to the spring of 2008, as well as a Fourth Year Fellowship during the 2008-2009 school year provided the funding and experience that I needed to complete this work. I am grateful to those who have contributed to Loyola and for Loyola's generosity in providing this funding.

Throughout this process I have had excellent teachers at Taylor University, the University of Toledo, and Loyola University. They are too numerous to name, but each has a special place in my heart and I am thankful to them all for their inspiration, care, and guidance. In addition to these professors, I am also thankful to my fellow students with whom I have developed deep bonds that I hope will last for life.

I would also like to thank my parents Drs. Albert and Pamela Harrison. Their unfailing love and support throughout my life has made me who I am. Not only have they given me insight into the process of dissertating, but their care for one another has taught me much more about the beauty of a life lived well.

Finally, I must thank my wife Carla Alegre. One can only write on something like joy if one has access to it. The name Alegre means joy. You have been my access to joy. You brought me back to life, and you opened the door to hidden joy. My heart is ever in your service.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER I: ATTUNEMENT IN THE THOUGHT OF MARTIN HEIDEGGER	1
Introduction	1
Heidegger's conception of attunement	4
CHAPTER II: BERGSON'S CRITIQUE OF THE INTELLECT	35
Development and attributes of the intellect	42
The outcomes of the intellect: Bergson's critique	63
The intellect and science	69
The intellect and desire	77
Conclusions	86
CHAPTER III: JOY AND BERGSONIAN PHILOSOPHY	92
Intuition	94
The foundations of reality and the goal of philosophical thought	112
The nothing	113
Change, movement, and creation	120
Life	134
Joy as the end of Bergsonian philosophy	139
CHAPTER IV: JOY AS FUNDAMENTAL ATTUNEMENT	164
Heideggerean joy	164
Conclusions about Heideggerean joy	190
The nothing and its place in the ontologies of Heidegger and Bergson	198
Creation and joy	221
The relationship between anxiety and joy	261
BIBLIOGRAPHY	291
VITA	298

ABSTRACT

Martin Heidegger claims that attunement is one of the primordial ways in which Dasein understands its world. He focuses on anxiety as the fundamental attunement in which Dasein can more authentically uncover its Being. However, it is necessary to ask if anxiety is the only attunement out of which one can most authentically appropriate Being. Heidegger seems to have an unexamined bias in favor of “negative” attunements (anxiety, boredom) and never undertakes an extended analysis of “positive” moods such as joy or happiness. This dissertation is an examination of joy as a fundamental attunement through the works of Henri Bergson and Martin Heidegger. We will focus attention on the common theme of “the nothing” and its place in the ontologies of both philosophers. We will argue that Heidegger’s focus on anxiety is the result of the place of the nothing in his ontology. In contrast, we will see that Bergson’s rejection of the nothing leads to his focus on what he calls the Life of the real. This focus leads to his constant return to joy and its relationship to philosophy and harmony with the real. Heidegger claims that authentic attunement in anxiety is the space in which Dasein can come into nearness with Being. Dasein is able to more authentically experience Being in two modes: meditative thinking and waiting. In order to attain joy, Dasein must first traverse through anxiety and the horror of confronting the abyss of Being. In contrast, Bergson’s account of joy does not make joy a derivative experience of humanity, but the

grounding attunement out of which humans act creatively and find themselves at home in the world. For Bergson, creation is the mode of being that allows humanity to coincide with that which pushes life forward against the natural forces of degradation and death on earth. Using Nietzsche's ideas about joy, return, and creativity, we link Bergson's ideas about creation and Heidegger's ideas about waiting to the emergence of joy. We show that it is not necessary that one await the emergence of joy after traversing through anxiety. Instead, we ultimately argue that in authentic, creative activity, humans experience a joy that is the foundation from which they have the desire for happiness and the ability to experience happiness.

CHAPTER I
ATTUNEMENT IN THE THOUGHT OF MARTIN HEIDEGGER

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is an examination of joy as *attunement* in the philosophy of Henri Bergson. The use of the word attunement points directly towards Martin Heidegger's analysis of attunement [*Befindlichkeit*] in *Being and Time*. I believe that Bergson is implicitly committed to a thesis about joy as fundamental attunement in Heidegger's understanding of this aspect of human existence. In order to analyze joy in Bergson's thought it is necessary that I first analyze Heidegger's conception of attunement and its relationship to the manner in which humans¹ find themselves in the world. Among the various primordial attunements, Heidegger lists anxiety, love, boredom, and joy. However, Heidegger dedicates his time to analyzing anxiety (*Being and Time, Introduction to Metaphysics*, and "What is Metaphysics?") and boredom (*The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*). In Heidegger's thought, attunement is one of the structures of disclosure of the world that is part of the fundamental constitution of the existence of Dasein. It is therefore necessary that we examine attunement and how attunement provides the view of the world through which Dasein comes to find itself

¹ Heidegger makes sure to distance himself from the idea of human being early in *Being and Time*. Rather than refer to humans as humans, he instead uses the term *Dasein* (literally being there) to refer to those beings that in their being are concerned about their being. We will explicate Heidegger's conception of Dasein at the beginning of the next section.

located in the world. After explicating the role of attunement in Heidegger's philosophy of existence, we will then focus on the ontic/ontological distinction that Heidegger elucidates in relation to fear and anxiety [*Angst*].¹ Ultimately, Heidegger concludes that anxiety is the primordial attunement that founds the ability of humans to experience fear, and also founds the manner in which humans find themselves in a world as such. "Being anxious discloses, primordially and directly, the world as world."² Paying special attention to this distinction is important because Bergson proposes a similar distinction in relation to the manner in which humans perceive the world. Heidegger's distinction between the ontic and the ontological provides a foundation from which we can adequately explicate Bergson's distinction between the mode of the intellect and the mode of intuition. This Bergsonian distinction is parallel to that of Heidegger as humans are given primarily in an ontic world environment. That is, they find themselves in relation to an actual world that can be observed and verified using various techniques. However, at the same time, humans seek the ontological foundations of the ontic reality. That means that humans seek the underlying structures that are not immediately present in order to explain the ontic reality. Similarly with Bergson, humans begin from a state of immediate perception that involves examining the world through the intellect. The intellect presents a picture of the world in its actual existence and the intellect also carves out objects in the world. Intuition is different from intellect for Bergson in that he believes that it reveals a more adequate picture of the actual structure of the reality

¹ Some such as Magda King (see note 12 below) have translated *Angst* as dread rather than anxiety.

² Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996), 187/175. All references to Heidegger's works will have the original page number from the works in German followed by the reference to the translated work.

constituted by the intellect.³ In this sense, intuition is that which provides for a view of the ontological grounding of what is immediately perceived through the lens of the intellect (the ontic understanding).

Having examined Heidegger's conception of attunement and juxtaposed it to Bergson's critique of the intellect, we will then attempt to show that joy is the end towards which Bergson continually returns as he explicates his philosophical method.⁴ We will see that joy is something that is open to all and that results from the reversal of the everyday mode of thought. Having shown that Bergson believed that joy could be the end of philosophy, we will then juxtapose conceptions of joy from Heidegger and Bergson in order to determine if joy is a fundamental grounding structure for human beings/Dasein. In conclusion, we will return back to the beginning of the dissertation in order to determine the relationship between joy and happiness. In addition, we will attempt to provide a foundation for joy and its relationship to creative activity on earth.

³ The distinction between the ontic and ontological will be further explicated in a later section of this introduction.

⁴ Heidegger only uses the German word for joy [*Freude*] twice in his *Being and Time*. In speaking about "anticipatory resoluteness," Heidegger says that it is only in this manner that one can be free for one's death and eliminate one's self-covering. Self-covering is that which occurs when one is entangled in every day being and does not live in such a manner that his or her being is unveiled in its most authentic form. Resoluteness is that mode of existence in which Dasein does not flee its possibility of death, but confronts it through the mood of anxiety and remains in it rather than distracting itself from it. However, this anxiety is accompanied by joy. "Together with the sober *Angst* that brings us before our individualized potentiality-of-being, goes the unshakable joy [*gerustete Freude*] in this possibility." (Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*. trans. Joan Stambaugh [Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996], 310). It is evident that in this passage Heidegger believed that joy could emerge alongside anxiety as one was freed from being distracted and encompassed by inauthentic possibility and was cast more fundamentally into the experience of one's finitude. Immediately following the sentence quoted above, Heidegger claims that it is beyond the scope of *Being and Time* to undertake the analysis of this fundamental mood.

HEIDEGGER'S CONCEPTION OF ATTUNEMENT

Preceding his analysis of attunement⁵ in *Being and Time*, Heidegger claims that Dasein is constituted as being the being that finds itself in a world. It is necessary that we briefly examine what Heidegger means by Dasein in order to set the foundation for understanding his ideas about attunement. For Heidegger, "Da-sein" is "ontically distinguished (from other beings) by the fact that in its being this being is concerned about its very being."⁶ Dasein is unique because it has an understanding of being that is pre-ontological, i.e., Dasein understands something like being before it even examines the fundamental structures of being. In simpler language, Dasein understands being in an original way in that it understands that other things in the world exist without having been taught that they exist or having to be convinced that they exist. Dasein immediately "understands" that objects in the world are. For example, humans move about in the world and recognize that other beings exist without having to examine that belief in order to verify it.

Because Dasein is the being that has a primordial understanding of being, Dasein is the foundation of the question of the meaning of being itself. Dasein is unique in that it is the creature that is able to stand outside of its immediate conditions of being and question the meaning of being. It is this capability that allows Dasein to recognize the importance of understanding the ontological foundations of being. However, Dasein

⁵ The term attunement has also been interpreted by the terms "affectedness" (See Hubert L. Dreyfus, *Being in the World* [Cambridge: MIT Press 1992], 168-174) and "finedness" (See Quentin Smith, "On Heidegger's Theory of Moods," *The Modern Schoolman* 58, [May 1981]: 212). In this dissertation, I am going to use the term attunement because I believe that the word attunement is more adequate in reflecting the primordially of the term and it is the term that has been used in the translations of *Being and Time* that I am using as well.

⁶Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 12/10.

does come to know being in a pre-ontological way, it does not explore the ontological foundations of reality before it experiences its immediate experiential environment. This means that Da-sein knows itself and its being in the world before it attempts to examine metaphysical questions and the foundations of being. However, just because Dasein understands its immediate presence in the world, this does not mean that Dasein comprehends the foundation of its being. “Dasein is ontically not only what is near or even nearest – we ourselves are it, each of us. Nevertheless, or precisely for this reason, it is ontologically what is furthest removed.”⁷ Heidegger undertakes the task of ontologically examining Dasein in order to provide a foundation from which Dasein can more authentically appropriate its possibilities as well as understand its place in the emergence of the world.

The being that Heidegger calls Dasein “is itself always its ‘there.’”⁸ What this means is that Dasein originally finds itself in a world. However, it is important to distinguish Heidegger’s understanding of world from common conceptions of the idea of the world. Heidegger claims that Dasein’s being in a world is rooted in the idea of being-in [*In-sein*]. This does not mean that Dasein finds itself in something as if it were an object in a container. Instead, to say that I am (being) is to say that one dwells near. Dasein dwells in the world in that it is familiar with something like “world.” However, Heidegger points out that there are numerous ways that “world” can be understood. World can represent “the totality of beings which can be objectively present within the

⁷ Ibid. 15/13.

⁸ Ibid. 132/125.

world.”⁹ The term can also be used to represent the being of the space in which reside the beings that constitute the totality of the objects that are encountered in the world. What this means is that world can be the region that encompasses the totality of actual beings. A third way in which Dasein uses the term world is to represent “that ‘*in which*’ a factual Dasein ‘*lives.*’”¹⁰ That is, the world can mean the place where Dasein finds itself or the place in which Dasein acts out its possibilities with others or by itself.

Although these three definitions of world are the way in which most humans think of world, these representations of the term “world” do not encompass the meaning that Heidegger gives it. Heidegger actually examines what he calls worldliness [*Weltlichkeit*] as a fundamental grounding structure of Dasein. In relation to a physical world in which Dasein finds all the actual beings, or a world in which it finds all the relations between beings (what Heidegger often calls nature), Heidegger claims that “*Neither the ontic description of innerworldly beings nor the ontological interpretation of the being of these beings gets as such at the phenomenon of ‘world’.*”¹¹ In contrast to these views, Heidegger proposes that it is in the worldliness of the world that Dasein can find the constitutive factor for its being in the world. Because Dasein has the primordial structure of being-in, it is able to encounter other beings “in-the-world.” As Magda King puts it, “The world is not a thing, but Da-sein himself is worldish. He is, at the bottom of his

⁹ Ibid. 64/60.

¹⁰ Ibid. 65/61.

¹¹ (Ibid. 64/60). For now, one can understand the term *ontic* as representing actually existing beings while the term *ontological* refers to the foundational structures that underlie the being of Dasein. This distinction is given much more analysis later in this chapter.

being, world-disclosing, world-forming.”¹² It is not that Dasein first encounters other beings and then recognizes the totality of them as the world. “On the contrary, if these perceptions did not take place in a previously disclosed whole, any coherent and intelligible experience would be impossible.”¹³ It is because Dasein is worldly that the beings in the world emerge in the form of a totality. Heidegger goes through an extended analysis of worldliness in sections 14-24 of Division I of *Being and Time*. He begins with the ontic world with which Dasein is familiar and seeks to examine how the constitutive character of worldliness leads to the spatiality that is necessary for Dasein to find itself in a “world.” However, we can only briefly outline Heidegger’s conception of Dasein being in the world as we must move on to “the there” in which Dasein finds itself in order to then encounter attunement.

Dasein is in a world in which it can locate a “here” and “over there.” “There” is a term that Heidegger uses to describe the original constitution of the being of Dasein. Dasein literally means in German “being there.” Only a being that has some sort of knowledge of a “there” is open to the world and not closed off into itself. “This being bears in its ownmost being the character of not being closed. The expression ‘there’ means this essential disclosedness.”¹⁴ Being there has a twofold meaning. First, Dasein finds itself thrown [*Geworfen*] into the world in such a manner that it cannot escape or bring about by its own power its being in the there. Dasein does not provide the foundation for its existence in its location. It always finds itself there (where it is).

¹² Magda King, *A Guide to Heidegger’s Being and Time*. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001), 53.

¹³ Ibid. 54.

¹⁴ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 132/125.

Dasein “is thrown in such a way that it is the there as being-in-the-world.”¹⁵ The “there” is also relevant in a second sense. Dasein not only finds itself located where it is thrown, but also finds that its relationship to the there is reliant on its ability to locate the beings of the world in space. Because Dasein is able to locate a there, Heidegger claims that it has the ontological structure of being a clearing for meaning to emerge. What this means is that Dasein is specific in that it is the being that in its being is open to a there in which other beings can emerge. “Only for a being thus cleared existentially do objectively present things become accessible in the light or concealed in darkness. By its nature, Dasein brings its there along with it.”¹⁶ In this second sense of the “there,” Dasein is that being that is able to take a position in relation to other beings and examine other beings in a space where the meaning of other beings is disclosed. It is in this way that Dasein is its “there” in two ways.

It was necessary to examine how Dasein is its there because Heidegger says that the “there” of Dasein is exposed in two ways: through attunement and understanding.¹⁷ Because we are analyzing attunement and attunement discloses the “there” of the being of Dasein, it was necessary to give a brief explanation of what Heidegger means by Dasein being its there. In addition to this explanation, a few initial remarks are needed about the ontological-existential [*ontologisch-existenzial*] ontic-existential [*ontisch-existenzial*] distinction in *Being and Time*. Heidegger says that he calls “the very being to which Da-sein can relate in one way or another, and somehow always does relate,

¹⁵ Ibid. 135/127.

¹⁶ Ibid. 133/125.

¹⁷ Ibid. 133/126.

existence [*Existenz*].”¹⁸ Dasein initially and for the most part understands itself in terms of its existence. One is in relation to existence either through chosen possibilities, through being thrown into certain possibilities, or because one has grown up within certain possibilities. However, it is only through existence (its relationship to beings and its own bodily constitution) that Dasein is able to confront the questions that appear as a result of the fact that it finds itself within existence.¹⁹ “We shall call *this* kind of understanding of itself *existentiell* understanding. The question of existence is an ontic ‘affair’ of Da-sein.”²⁰ Those attributes of existence that deal with the existence of things are ontic. The adjective ontic “characterizes beings, not their being... Approximations to *ontic* are *real, concrete, empirical, given in experience*.”²¹ The term *existentiell* is similar to ontic, but refers to “the understanding we each have of our concrete existence and of all that belongs to it.”²² The *existentiell* analyses of the understanding are not focused on the structures that underlie the constitution of the ontic, but merely the existence that is characterized by the ontic. Therefore, *existentiell* examinations involve concrete existence that is characterized by Heidegger as ontic.

In contrast to the ontic-*existentiell*, Heidegger also explicates the ontological-existential. Ontological analyses seek the structures of existence. “The question of structure aims at the analysis of what constitutes existence. We shall call the coherence

¹⁸ Ibid. 12/10.

¹⁹ Ibid. 12/10.

²⁰ Ibid. 12/10.

²¹ King, *A Guide to Heidegger's Being and Time*, 46.

²² Ibid. 46.

of these structures *existentiality*.”²³ Existentials are those fundamental structures of Dasein that are inseparable from and at the same time the ground for the existence of Dasein. “All the a priori constituents and characters of man’s being are given the general name of ‘existentials’ by Heidegger.”²⁴ Ontological research is that examination which attempts to adequately elucidate the question of being and refuses to settle for the answers that have been given to the question that fail to recognize the importance and seeming paradox of being. Dasein is distinguished from other beings in that concern about its being is integrally related to the primordial way in which it finds itself in the world.²⁵ This means that one of the ontological structures of Dasein is its ontological questioning itself. Dasein is ontological in that it cares about its existence and Dasein is unique in that it seeks to analyze the foundations of its existence. Dasein is not bound to a mere ontic relationship to the world. Instead, it can ontologically stand outside the emergence of being and examine the structures that found the ontic experience of existence.

Now that we have drawn the distinction between ontic and ontological examination in Heidegger, we can move on to attunement. It was important to outline the ontic/ontological distinction because of the relationship that Heidegger draws between mood and the different realms of the ontic and the ontological. Heidegger claims that the ontic manifestation of attunement is the occurrence of a mood. However, because all ontological analyses have their basis in an ontic understanding of existence, Heidegger

²³ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 12/10.

²⁴ King, *A Guide to Heidegger’s Being and Time*, 43.

²⁵ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 12/10.

claims that one must not think that attunement is merely the expression of a mood that shifts depending on the affects of Dasein. Rather, one must view attunement as “a fundamental existential and outline its structure.”²⁶ For Heidegger, a mood [*Stimmung*] must be distinguished from a fundamental mood [*Grundstimmung*]. Although Heidegger does refer to fundamental moods as *Stimmungen*, one must always think of ontological moods such as anxiety as *Grundstimmungen* even when they are lumped in with moods in general [*Stimmungen*]. This distinction is important because there are two notions of mood that come about in Heidegger’s analysis. First, there are what most would call the affective moods. “Fear, for example, is a *Stimmung* for Heidegger, but it is clearly an affect not a mood.”²⁷ There might be an error in Dreyfus’s statement here. Fear is a mood for Heidegger. It is an inauthentic mood. “Fear was characterized as inauthentic attunement.”²⁸ It is wrong to say that it is merely an affect. Inauthentic moods such as fear might be affective moods for Heidegger, but they still condition the way in which Dasein finds itself in the world. Therefore, they fundamentally reveal the world to Dasein. “It is true that it is the nature of every kind of attunement to disclose complete being-in-the-world in all its constitutive factors (world, being-in, self).”²⁹ This means that even fear and other affective, inauthentic moods do disclose complete being in the world for Heidegger. Fear will be examined later in this chapter in relation to its inauthenticity. At this point, it is enough to say that moodedness is fundamental in that it

²⁶ Ibid. 134/126.

²⁷ Dreyfus, *Being in the World*, 169.

²⁸ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 341/313

²⁹ Ibid. 190/178

conditions the manner in which Dasein finds itself in the world. We will refer to this attribute as the “primordial” aspect of moods. However, we will reserve for our own language in this work the term “fundamental” for those moods that have the ability to disclose the world to Dasein in a mode of authenticity. The primary example of fundamental mood in Heidegger is anxiety [*Angst*]. Heidegger says that, “in *Angst* there lies the possibility of a distinctive disclosure, since *Angst* individualizes...The fundamental possibilities of Dasein, which are always my own, show themselves in *Angst* as they are, undistorted by innerworldly beings to which Da-sein, initially and for the most part, clings.”³⁰ Heidegger notes that mood is a fundamental structure, and just as the ontic deals with existence and the ontological deals with the structures of existence, the ontic moods are the affective moods of Dasein while what we will call the fundamental moods are the structural moods that provide for “a distinctive disclosure.” These are the moods from which the inauthentic, affective moods can emerge.³¹ As we continue the analysis here, we will be examining the fundamental moods and any time that we use the word attunement or mood we will be speaking of the *Grundstimmung* unless otherwise noted.

In contrast to the affective moods, Heidegger claims that attunement is one of the ways in which Dasein finds the world and is thrown into the world. Dasein always finds itself in the world in a certain mood and even the lack of a mood does not mean that there

³⁰ Ibid. 191/178.

³¹ Heidegger uses the example of *Angst* to show that fear can only emerge because Dasein has is constituted more fundamentally by *Angst*. “And only because *Angst* always already latently determines being-in-the-world, can being-in-the-world, as being together with the ‘world’ taking care of things and attuned, be afraid.” (Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 189/177)

is no mood present.³² Unfortunately, Dasein does not often confront its moods in order to understand their function in relation to being in the world. “We emphasized the fact that whereas moods are ontically familiar, they are not cognized in their primordial and existential function. They are taken as fleeting experiences that ‘color’ one’s whole ‘psychical condition.’”³³ Heidegger seeks to undertake the analysis of the fundamental structures that are more than the mere colorings of existence. The fundamental moods “are not sensuous states that belong to the lower irrational and ‘appetitive’ faculty of the soul, and which often lead ‘rational man’ away from his calm intellectual contemplation and deliberate conduct.”³⁴ Although one uses the understanding and the will in order to analyze mood, this does not mean that they have priority over mood. In fact, Heidegger claims that mood is “a primordial kind of being of Da-sein in which it is disclosed to itself *before* all cognition and willing and *beyond* their scope of disclosure.”³⁵

Mood is primordial because it is inescapable. One can never control a mood or shift one’s mood without having to undertake a new mood. Heidegger says that the first ontological characteristic of attunement is that “*Attunement discloses Da-sein in its thrownness, initially and for the most part in the mode of an evasive turning away.*”³⁶ For Heidegger, the burden of being undergirds all moods. In general and for the most part, mood is that which causes Dasein to turn away from the burdensomeness of being in

³² Ibid. 134/127.

³³ Ibid. 340/313.

³⁴ Smith, “On Heidegger’s Theory of Moods,” 213.

³⁵ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 136/128.

³⁶ Ibid. 136/128.

the world. The ontological structure of attunement allows for affective moods that tend to turn Dasein away from the ontological burden of being by allowing it to focus on things-at-hand [*Vorhanden*] that can then contribute to strengthening the experience of the mood or changing the mood to a new mood. Heidegger uses the example of “bad moods” to show that mood turns away from the essential givenness of Dasein and closes off an understanding of the ontological.³⁷

The second characteristic of mood is that it “*has always already disclosed being-in-the-world as a whole and first makes possible directing oneself toward something.*”³⁸ Moods have the ontological structure of disclosure. That is, they allow for the emergence of being for Dasein. Perception “is grounded in the spontaneous activity of attunement, which throws Da-sein open and constantly keeps him open to whatever may approach from the world.”³⁹ It is through attunement that Dasein is opened up to the world and is able to experience the world. “It is because moods, along with the understanding, are *ontologically* disclosive, that the ontic disclosure of some being that is to-hand, at-hand, or Dasein-with is a possibility of each Dasein’s existence.”⁴⁰ It is not only through the understanding that Dasein is able to encounter other beings in the world. Attunement is also primordial in that it conditions the manner in which Dasein is as it experiences the world and this leads to the way in which Dasein reacts to that which it encounters.

³⁷ Ibid. 136/128-129.

³⁸ Ibid. 137/129.

³⁹ King, *A Guide to Heidegger’s Being and Time*, 57.

⁴⁰ Smith, “On Heidegger’s Theory of Moods,” 215.

The third characteristic of mood is that “the moodedness of attunement constitutes existentially the openness to world of Da-sein.”⁴¹ What Heidegger means here is that it is only in having an attunement that Dasein can be affected or moved by that which surrounds it. Things that Dasein encounters matter to it, and this mattering is the result of the ability to be touched by beings in the world.⁴² The ability to be touched is the result of Dasein finding itself in a mood, of having the ability to be affected. “*In attunement lies existentially a disclosive submission to world out of which things that matter to us can be encountered.*”⁴³ Dasein experiences the world as something threatening, hospitable, frightening, or insipid; these experiences are only possible because of the original moodedness of Dasein. One can only experience something as hospitable because one has the ontological possibility of comfort and harmony as attunement. Because mood is primordial, Dasein is open to experience the world. In fact, the manner in which Dasein expresses its experiences as threatening or welcoming is the outcome of having attunement as its ontological foundation. Being attuned to the world allows Dasein to be touched by that which shows itself from the world.

Although attunement allows Dasein to be touched by the world, it often follows that this occurs in an inauthentic manner.⁴⁴ Heidegger claims that “everyday circumspection goes wrong on account of attunement, which is primarily disclosive and

⁴¹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 137/129.

⁴² Ibid. 137/129.

⁴³ Ibid. 137-138/129-130.

⁴⁴ We will talk about the distinction between the authentic and inauthentic later, but for now one can read inadequate as synonymous with inauthentic.

is vastly subject to deception...”⁴⁵ Affective moods tend to present the world in a wavering manner that shifts from day to day. In addition, there is a certain publicness [*Öffentlichkeit*] to attunement. This means that not only are individual affective moods indecisive, they are also affected by a “being of the they” that has a certain moodedness that it has created, a sort of social range of moods that conditions the possibility for experiencing moods. However, one must not think that the public range of moods is constitutive of mood absolutely. “Distantiality, averageness, and leveling down, as ways of being of the they, constitute what we know as ‘publicness’...Publicness obscures everything, and then claims that what has been thus covered over is what is familiar and accessible to everybody.”⁴⁶ Now that we have introduced the concept of publicness in Heidegger, we must now focus on the distinction between authenticity [*Eigentlichkeit*] and inauthenticity [*Uneigentlichkeit*] in order to lead into a discussion of this distinction played out in Heidegger’s analysis of fear and anxiety.

It is in Heidegger’s discussion of the “they” [*das Man*] and the “they self” [*Man-selbst*] that one will be able to understand the difference between authentic and inauthentic existence. One of the characteristics of Dasein is that it finds itself in relation to others in the world. However, in being-with, “Dasein stands in *subservience* to the others. It itself is not; the others have taken its being away from it.”⁴⁷ Living in society with one another forces all individual Dasein to share in the same activities and to utilize the same sources of knowledge. In this manner, individual Dasein loses itself in the mass

⁴⁵ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 138/130.

⁴⁶ Ibid. 127/119.

⁴⁷ Ibid. 126/118.

of others. While losing itself in the totality of the others, Dasein also finds that it must experience its existence in relation to the conditions that govern the way in which *das Man* has structured society. “We enjoy ourselves and have fun the way *they* enjoy themselves. We read, see, and judge literature and art the way *they* see and judge...we find ‘shocking’ what *they* find shocking.”⁴⁸ In this way, “the they” creates a mode of being characterized by what Heidegger calls “everydayness” [*Alltäglichkeit*]. Everydayness has as its primary attribute “averageness” [*Durchschnittlichkeit*], and averageness is that tendency of “the they” to delimit the boundaries of what is acceptable and to level down all things that are possible to a mean that is accepted as the norm. In averageness “Every priority is noiselessly squashed. Overnight, everything primordial is flattened down as something long since known. Every mystery loses its power.”⁴⁹ The primary way in which common conceptions work is to take the details and importance of things away from objects and actions in the world. It replaces the mystery of the origin of the reality of the world and Dasein with everyday conceptions that masquerade as authentic understanding but that actually contribute to the fundamental understanding that Heidegger seeks.

The result of the inauthenticity established by “the they” constantly takes Dasein’s responsibility away from it. “Thus, the they *disburdens* Da-sein in its everydayness.”⁵⁰ In disburdening Dasein and releasing it from responsibility, everyday averageness perpetuates itself as Dasein settles for easy answers and seemingly

⁴⁸ Ibid. 126-127/119.

⁴⁹ Ibid. 127/119.

⁵⁰ Ibid. 127/119.

undemanding living. When one exists in the modes of averageness, leveling down, and publicness, “One is in the manner of dependency and inauthenticity.”⁵¹ However, Heidegger does claim that “the they” is a primordial existential that characterizes the existence of Dasein. “The they” is not negated when one is examining Dasein. Instead, being with “the they” and living in relation to the they-self is the way in which Dasein experiences itself as located in the world of others.

In contrast to the everyday they-self, the authentic self is “the self which has explicitly grasped itself.”⁵² In general, Dasein initially finds itself as it has been given in the possibilities of “the they.” However, in living in this mode, Dasein is not itself but a “self” that is manifest through the conditions that are perpetuated by “the they.” In order to disclose an authentic self and relate to the world through the mode of authenticity, Dasein must break through the average givenness of the world and possibilities. The process of the authentication of Dasein “always comes about by clearing away coverings and obscurities, by breaking up the disguises with which Da-sein cuts itself off from itself.”⁵³ However, one must not think that authenticity is a state of existence that goes beyond the realm of existence of everydayness. It is not a state detached from the they, “*but is an existentiell modification of the they as an essential existential.*”⁵⁴ It seems that Heidegger is saying that authenticity always occurs in relation to the ontic givenness of the world in its conditioned possibilities given by “the they.” Authenticity is the

⁵¹ Ibid. 128/120.

⁵² Ibid. 129/121.

⁵³ Ibid. 129/121.

⁵⁴ Ibid. 130/122.

modification of the average givenness that occurs in the ontic realm in such a manner that Dasein takes up its possibilities for itself and reconstitutes its relation to the world. In that way, even though the averageness of the they-self is an “essential existential,” it is viewed from an absolutely new perspective that recognizes its tendencies to take away Dasein’s responsibility and to promote ease in life and thought.

Having briefly outlined the distinction between the authentic and the inauthentic, we will now turn our attention to how this distinction plays out in the realm of attunement in Heidegger’s analysis of the moods of fear [*Furcht*] and anxiety/dread [*Angst*]. We will begin our analysis with fear as attunement. The first aspect of the attunement of fear is that the thing that one fears is always encountered in the world.⁵⁵ That which is feared is a certain sort of being in the world. The experience of being in relation to the fearsome has the “character of being threatening.”⁵⁶ That which threatens approaches from a specific region, and it is located in a certain nearness [*Nähe*] to Dasein. It approaches Dasein and as it gets closer, the fear of Dasein grows as Dasein comes to experience the thing as more fearsome than before. Fear exhibits the world in an attunement of fearfulness where Dasein experiences the world and objects in the world as threatening.

In addition to the fact that fear is fear about the threatening being or object and that fear discloses spatiality as the fearsome approaches from a region, fear also has the character of being about Dasein itself.⁵⁷ This means that Dasein, as the fearful being, is afraid about its own being. Dasein’s own being is important to it, and when it fears, it

⁵⁵ Ibid. 140/131-132.

⁵⁶ Ibid. 140/132.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 141/132.

fears for its own being, usually in reference to something that can take existence away from Dasein. However, rather than merely focusing on the fear of losing one's life, Dreyfus points out that fear "can threaten Dasein's self-interpretation by threatening its projects."⁵⁸ Magda King also notes that the "threat to his ability-to-be makes manifest to Da-sein his deliverance over to himself."⁵⁹ Therefore, it is not only that Dasein finds itself in relation to that which is threatening, but that Dasein finds itself as a "self" in that it is concerned about its own being. Dasein finds that it is concerned about its being and is therefore brought before its own existence as something important and yet fragile. Fear generally discloses the world in a privative manner. That is, when one fears, one focuses one's attention on that which is threatening to the detriment of other inner-worldly beings. Once that which is threatening is no longer a threat, "Da-sein has to first find its way about again" before it is able to find itself situated in a new mood that will disclose the world in a different manner.⁶⁰

Although one could argue for a certain kind of authentic fear, we are going to agree with Heidegger that fear is too intertwined with everyday existence, and that in general and for the most part it expresses itself inauthentically. That which threatens Dasein approaches from a specific place and approaches in nearness to what Dasein holds dear. Fear does not allow Dasein to more adequately grasp its responsibilities and the importance of understanding itself. Instead, it forces Dasein to forget its possibilities and focus on a being or relation in the world. It actually forces Dasein to take its eyes off

⁵⁸ Dreyfus, *Being in the World*, 176.

⁵⁹ King, *A Guide to Heidegger's Being and Time*, 58.

⁶⁰ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 141/133.

itself, and this is why fear is inauthentic. The most important aspect of authenticity is that it allows Dasein to more adequately take responsibility for itself and it casts Dasein back upon itself and demands a response. This response courts difficulty. However, in fear, one is focused on a specific existent being in the world and the rest of the “world” and the possibilities for Dasein to become itself fall away in the experience of fear.

Living in relation to and being thrown into the world in relation to Dasein’s possibilities in the context in which it finds itself reflect what Heidegger would call “falling prey” [*Verfallen*]. Heidegger characterizes falling-prey as “being absorbed in being-with-one-another as it is guided by idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity.”⁶¹ This mode of existence is the inauthentic. Therefore, inauthenticity is a kind of being “which

⁶¹ (Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 175/164) It is necessary here to briefly explain what Heidegger means by idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity. Idle talk [*Gerede*] is a groundless discourse that spreads itself throughout “the they.” It is communication that is taken for truth and does not have to continually search for better ways of expressing concepts. In that sense, it levels the distinctions between objects and the truth that is expressed by those objects. “Idle talk is the possibility of understanding everything without any previous appropriation of the matter...Idle talk, which everyone can snatch up, not only divests us of the task of genuine understanding, but develops an indifferent intelligibility for which nothing is closed off any longer.” (Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 169/158) Idle talk is inauthentic because it keeps Dasein “cut off from the primary and primordially genuine relations of being toward the world, toward *Mitda-sein*, toward being-in-itself.” (Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 170/159)

Curiosity [*Neugier*] is another aspect of the world to which Dasein can fall prey. Curiosity is the mode of Dasein that is distracted by possibilities and which does not allow Dasein to remain in relation to its place in the world. “When curiosity has become free, it takes care to see not in order to understand what it sees, that is, to come to a being toward it, but *only* in order to see. It seeks novelty only to leap from it again to another novelty. The care of seeing is not concerned with comprehending and knowingly being in the truth, but with possibilities of abandoning itself to the world.” (Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 172/161) Curiosity is a mode of being in which Dasein merely wants to see the newest object or some sort of spectacle. There is no desire for more adequate knowledge of that which Dasein views. Instead, Dasein is curious to take in the sight and then move on to the next or newest object that replaces the spectacle that was just viewed.

Finally, ambiguity [*Zwiedeutigkeit*] is what occurs when “in everyday being with one another, we encounter things that are accessible to everybody and about which everybody can say everything, we can no longer decide what is disclosed in genuine understanding and what is not.” (Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 173/162) Those things that appear to be grasped through understanding in an adequate manner generally are not, and this is a result of the ambiguity with which Dasein confronts its reality. Because of this ambiguity, one is unable to determine what is authentic and inauthentic, and this mode of existence also tends to lead to a state in which Dasein levels down the truths that have been achieved through difficult effort. Ambiguity leads to a state of being in which Dasein guesses at what will occur in the future; this guessing leads to more idle talk and is directly related to curiosity. Therefore, all three aspects of falling prey work together to reinforce one another and perpetuate the they self.

is completely taken in by the world and the *Mitda-sein* of the others in the they.”⁶² When Dasein finds itself in the world, it is entangled in falling-prey to society as an ontological constitutive factor of its being. In the case of fear, Dasein finds itself in relation to the possibility of losing some aspect of what it thought was a full and genuine life. However, this “full and genuine life” is merely the result of what Heidegger characterizes as the tranquillization of “the they.”⁶³ The tranquillization of Dasein occurs when Dasein finds itself situated and comfortable in relation to the possibilities presented to it by “the they.” In this state, Dasein finds that its life, its finances, and its familial relations are all in “the best order.”⁶⁴ One would think that this would lead to a sort of peacefulness of Dasein. However, this tranquillization actually has the reverse effect of driving “one to uninhibited busyness.”⁶⁵ It is evident that in fear Dasein is truly entangled in relation to its possibilities for obtaining a “full” and “happy” life. These possibilities are in relation to society and many times the fear itself is about something that society has glorified in importance. Fear does not disclose Dasein more adequately in itself and one is not cast more upon one’s own responsibility in the mood of fear. Therefore, fear is an inauthentic attunement. We will now turn our attention to anxiety [*Angst*] and Heidegger’s characterization of authentic anxiety.

Heidegger claims that in order for the existential analytic to maintain its function, “it must search for one of the *most far-reaching* and *most primordial* possibilities of

⁶² Ibid. 176/164.

⁶³ Ibid. 177-178/166.

⁶⁴ Ibid. 177/166.

⁶⁵ Ibid. 178/166.

disclosure which lie in Da-sein itself for mastering its preliminary task, that of setting forth the being of Da-sein.”⁶⁶ It is in *Angst* that Heidegger believes one can find an attunement that reveals the totality of the being of Dasein.⁶⁷ In order to do this, Heidegger begins with entangled Dasein. As we have mentioned earlier, inauthentic moods and aspects of Dasein’s being in the world are reflected by a movement away from itself and towards leveled possibilities given by others. Heidegger calls this way of existing flight [*Flucht*] as Dasein moves away from itself. In contrast to fear, the movement of Dasein as flight away from itself is not in relation to inner-worldly beings. Fear is always in relation to inner-worldly beings that approach from some region. The flight from oneself is not fear because it is a movement away from the being that is able to fear: Dasein. It is a movement of Dasein away from itself and a flight towards entangled being. Because one is turning away from oneself, this movement cannot be called fear.

The difference between *Angst* (often translated as anxiety) and fear is that *Angst* is not about an inner-worldly being. “What *Angst* is about is completely indefinite.”⁶⁸ This means that Dasein is unable to determine the whence of *Angst*. At the same time, when Dasein experiences *Angst*, the importance and focus on inner-worldly beings fades. “The totality of relevance discovered within the world of things at hand and objectively present is completely without importance. It collapses. The world has the character of complete

⁶⁶ Ibid. 182/170.

⁶⁷ Ibid. 182/171.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 186/174.

insignificance.”⁶⁹ Because the realm of beings fades, Dasein cannot determine where that which is causing *Angst* is located. That which threatens has no place. “The fact that what is threatening is *nowhere* characterizes what *Angst* is about.”⁷⁰ However, this nowhere is not nothing. Instead, as the significance of inner-worldly beings fades, Dasein is presented with the being of the world. The world “is all that obtrudes itself in its worldliness.”⁷¹ Dreyfus calls this talk of the world in its worldliness the “ontological-existential sense.”⁷² In this passage, Heidegger is not talking about the ontic world in which Dasein finds itself and can act on other inner-worldly beings. The world of which Heidegger speaks here is one that is more primordial than the world of ontic beings. It is the whole from which individuals emerge. In speaking about the worldliness of the world, King claims that “Only from the disclosed *whole* of things can any single thing stand out and show that it stands in itself as the thing it is.”⁷³ Because Dasein finds itself in relation to the worldliness of the world, it finds itself located in a whole in which it is able to find itself among other beings. What *Angst* reveals is the possibility of things. The nothing that emerges in *Angst* “is based on the primordial ‘something,’ on the *world*.”⁷⁴ Dasein is being as being in the world. Therefore, *Angst* is essentially related to the being of Dasein. Therefore, “if what *Angst* is about exposes nothing, that is, the

⁶⁹ Ibid. 186/174.

⁷⁰ Ibid. 186/174.

⁷¹ Ibid. 187/175.

⁷² Dreyfus, *Being in the World*, 91.

⁷³ King, *A Guide to Heidegger's Being and Time*, 94.

⁷⁴ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 187/175.

world as such, this means that *that about which Angst is anxious is being-in-the-world itself.*⁷⁵

In addition to the fact that *Angst* is about being in the world, Heidegger also claims that in *Angst*, Dasein is anxious for “its authentic potentiality-for-being-in-the-world.”⁷⁶ *Angst* takes away the possibility of Dasein finding solace in the publicness of falling prey. Therefore, *Angst* individuates Dasein in a more absolute fashion and allows Dasein to see that it is a being that has possibilities that extend beyond the realm of *das Man*. In *Angst*, Dasein comes to understand that it has the potential of “*being free* for the freedom of choosing and grasping itself.”⁷⁷ Heidegger is able to say this because as the meanings of the things in the world tend to fade in the experience of *Angst*, Dasein is left in relation to the being of the world and its own self free from the constructions of average everydayness. In this experience, the meanings and the things that are of importance to society also fade. “The ‘world’ can offer nothing more, nor can the *Mitdasein* of others.”⁷⁸ Left to itself, Dasein must face its own potential for choosing from possibilities that lie outside the givenness of its entangled being with others. Therefore, Dasein finds itself in a more authentic relation in which it finds that it is responsible for choosing its possibilities. In addition, Dasein finds itself in a place where it must learn how to re-interpret and re-create the possibilities that are offered to it through “the they.” It is not by standing outside all possibilities given by the average everydayness of society

⁷⁵ Ibid. 187/175.

⁷⁶ Ibid. 187/175.

⁷⁷ Ibid. 188/176.

⁷⁸ Ibid. 187/175.

that Dasein becomes authentic, but by re-appropriating those possibilities.⁷⁹ Dasein finds itself in a place where it is cut off from the usual significations and meanings given to it by society. From this vantage point it is able to see its fallenness as a constitutive mode of existence. However, at the same time, Dasein is able to evaluate this fallenness in relation to its given possibilities and then authentically appropriate or re-craft those possibilities in order to more authentically grasp its own responsibility and its potential for more radically becoming itself apart from conditioned fallenness.

As Dasein finds itself in the experience of *Angst*, it finds itself in a feeling that Heidegger calls “the uncanny” [*unheimlich*]. Because the threat that emerges in *Angst* comes from nowhere (in particular), and Dasein is cast upon its potentiality for choosing its possibilities outside of the usual view of the conditions provided by “the they,” Dasein finds that it is no longer at home in the world. “But uncanniness means at the same time not-being-at-home.”⁸⁰ It is in the experience of the uncanny that the “usually taken for granted at-homeness comes into the existential mode of a not-at-home.”⁸¹ It is now evident that the flight of which Heidegger spoke earlier is not a flight away from the beings in the world, but a flight towards them. This flight is flight away from the uncanniness that Dasein experiences when it is not at home in the world. “The everyday way in which Da-sein understands uncanniness is the entangled turning away which ‘phases out’ not-being-at-home.”⁸² It is not that Dasein first finds itself located at home

⁷⁹ Ibid. 130/122.

⁸⁰ Ibid. 188/176.

⁸¹ King, *A Guide to Heidegger's Being and Time*, 96.

⁸² Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 189/177.

in the world and then experiences the uncanny. Instead, the fact that Dasein can experience being at home in the world is only because its ontological fundamental being finds itself initially entangled in “the they.” What Dasein finds in the uncanniness of *Angst* is the primordial structure from which it has been fleeing its entire life. Therefore, “*Not-being-at-home must be conceived existentially and ontologically as the more primordial phenomenon.*”⁸³ *Angst* then becomes the fundamental structure from which Dasein can experience *unheimlichkeit* and move away from the entangled vision of reality that has guided its investigation and understanding of the world up to that point.

We have examined *Angst* in order to determine the way in which it provides a world for Dasein and how it leads to the recognition of authenticity and an experience of the uncanny. However, it is important to examine how *Angst* arises through Heidegger’s supreme example of being towards death in order to show the relationship between *Angst* and authenticity. Death is the major example that Heidegger uses to talk about *Angst* and authenticity in *Being and Time*. Therefore, we will briefly outline death as possibility for Heidegger and how one can authentically appropriate being towards death.

In sections 50-52 of Division II of *Being and Time*, Heidegger outlines his conception of death and comes to the conclusion that “The full existential and ontological concept of death can now be defined as follows: *As the end of Da-sein, death is the ownmost nonrelational, certain, and, as such, indefinite and not to be bypassed possibility of Da-sein.*”⁸⁴ What does this mean? First, when Heidegger claims that death is Dasein’s “ownmost, non-relational” possibility, he means that it cannot be taken from

⁸³ Ibid. 189/177.

⁸⁴ Ibid. 258-259/239.

Dasein or substituted by something or someone else. Of all the possibilities that Dasein has, death is its ownmost because it is the thing that no other person can experience for it. There is no one who can say anything about a specific Dasein's death that would in any way indicate an experience of that Dasein's death. All other possibilities at Dasein's disposal can be experienced by other Dasein. However, only each individual Dasein can die its death. In addition, once Dasein has died its death, it is unable to relate that experience back to other Dasein. Even those who claim to have died and come back to life still have not died. True death is the end of Dasein. Therefore, these accounts relate a sort of "almost death," not true death. Therefore, death is the ownmost, nonrelational possibility.

When Heidegger says that death is "certain," he means that there is no other possibility of which Dasein is more certain than the possibility that it will die. Dasein knows that it will undertake this possibility. Being certain characterizes the authentic mode of being towards death as Dasein reminds itself of its possible end of possibility and does not flee or take flight from the recognition that being toward death is its ultimate possibility. Dasein knows that its possibilities will end, and that the possibility of death is something that always accompanies Dasein with every breath it takes. Being certain is maintaining this possibility in anticipation. When Heidegger says that this possibility is "indefinite" he is merely referring to the fact that no Dasein knows when it will undertake this possibility. There is an indetermination that is central in the possibility of death as no human knows the hour when its life will end. In addition to its indeterminate nature, the possibility of death is "not to be bypassed." This means that death is not something that one can move past or outmaneuver. There is no way that Dasein will be able to

substitute another for its place in death, and there is no object or mode of existence that will relieve Dasein of having to undertake this possibility.

In authentic being toward death, Dasein must not evade its end or flee to the common relationship to death. Instead, the possibility of being toward death “must not be weakened, it must be understood *as possibility*, cultivated *as possibility*, and *endured as possibility* in our relation to it.”⁸⁵ Heidegger calls anticipation that mode of existence that is characterized by cultivating the possibility of death. When one lives in anticipation, the possibility of death reveals itself “*as the possibility of the impossibility of existence in general.*”⁸⁶ Being toward death is Dasein’s most extreme possibility. We must remember that authenticity for Heidegger is that state of being in which Dasein more radically recognizes its responsibility in the face of its possibilities for becoming itself. In authentic actions, Dasein comes to know more about itself as it re-appropriates the possibilities given to it through *das Man*. It is death that provides the ownmost possibility of Dasein. There is no other possibility that is as encompassing and individual as being towards one’s own death. Therefore, this experience (as ownmost) is the experience *par excellence* that is able to allow Dasein to take hold of itself and decide how it is going to respond in relation to its own finitude. Inauthenticity is based in the alleviation of Dasein’s responsibility. It is impossible to relieve Dasein of its responsibility in being towards its own death, and therefore, anxiety in the face of one’s finitude the one of the most originary aspects of Dasein’s existence in that it can free Dasein from its entangledness in its being in the world.

⁸⁵ Ibid. 261/241.

⁸⁶ Ibid. 262/242.

If death is the end of possibility for Dasein, then being toward death is the ultimate possibility of Dasein because it marks the end of all other possibilities. Therefore, it is the most pressing possibility. At some point, Dasein will have to give up its existence. “But anticipation does not evade the impossibility of bypassing death, as does inauthentic being-toward-death, but *frees* itself *for* it.”⁸⁷ In focusing on one’s end in anticipation, Dasein is thereby negating the influence of the possibilities afforded it by “the they.” Dasein chooses to understand that it must be free for the possibility of giving up what is important to it (its life that it has created). “Anticipation discloses to existence that its extreme inmost possibility lies in giving itself up and thus shatters all one’s clinging to whatever existence one has reached.”⁸⁸ When one authentically anticipates one’s end, Dasein recognizes that it has created its reality in relation to the possibilities provided by *das Man*. It realizes that its life has been a flight from the fact that its ownmost possibility is its death. If Dasein is able to anticipate this possibility and recognize that most of what it has created has been created in response to what “they” think is important, Dasein is then free from being shackled to existence and the objects that Dasein has kept near in order to eliminate the manifestation of the uncanny and experience a being at home in the world.

As we mentioned earlier, death is indefinite. We do not know when or how it will occur. In anticipation, Dasein maintains itself in the indefiniteness of its potentiality of death. As it does this, it comes to recognize that death can come from anywhere. Not only is the hour of the end unknown, but the location of the death cause is also unknown

⁸⁷ Ibid. 264/243.

⁸⁸ Ibid. 264/244.

and this is threatening to Dasein. It would be inauthentic for Dasein to attempt to shrug off this experience and flee to the comfort of entangled being-with. Instead, Dasein must hold itself in the threat of the end of possibility. Heidegger says that the attunement “*which is able to hold open the constant and absolute threat to itself arising from the ownmost individualized being of Da-sein is Angst*. In *Angst*, Da-sein finds itself faced with the nothingness of the possible impossibility of its existence.”⁸⁹ Just as *Angst* arose in response to the slipping away and indefiniteness of inner-worldly objects, it also arises in response to the nullity that comes with the possibility of death. The possible negation of possibility creates a mode of being that is characterized by the meanings of possibilities slipping away from Dasein. Heidegger claims that “Being-toward-death is essentially *Angst*.”⁹⁰ Rather than fleeing back to everyday tranquility, the Dasein living in authentic being toward death holds itself in the *Angst* it experiences in relation to the unknown time and origin of its death.

If being toward death is *Angst*, then *Angst* is the fundamental attunement that reveals the ownmost potentiality of being of Dasein. In recognizing its finitude, Dasein comes to the point where it is able to authentically appropriate a possibility that is untouchable by other Dasein. The manner in which Dasein can respond to this possibility is conditioned by *das Man*, but the actual experience of being toward one’s own end is only experienced by the individual Dasein. Therefore, in this experience Dasein is more radically individuated. When one anticipates one’s death, one begins to recognize that he

⁸⁹ Ibid. 265-266/245.

⁹⁰ Ibid. 266/245.

or she is lost in the they-self.⁹¹ This recognition displays the manner in which Dasein has attempted to flee its ownmost possibility by creating a homely world through its busyness and its focus on situating objects and relationships in such a way that the world loses its un-homely character. When Dasein recognizes its entanglement in “the they”, it is then able to see how it has responded to its possibility of death up to that point. It is at this moment that Dasein experiences the freedom that comes from being able to undertake its possibility itself without influence by *das Man*.⁹² Dasein is authentic when it chooses to undertake its most radical possibility in order to assure itself of its individuality. In order to do this, we also see that Dasein must remain in *Angst*. Therefore, *Angst* is the attunement in which Dasein is able to authentically find its ownmost possibility and react in anticipation to this possibility rather than flee to the “tranquility” that tends to turn its attention away from the fact that all possibility will end when death occurs. Dasein then finds itself free for its death and free from being fused to the objects in the world that have concerned it to this point. It is from this foundation that Dasein is then able to re-appropriate additional conditioned possibilities and instantiate new relationships with objects in the world. It is also in this experience that being is uncovered in an originary way as Dasein does not give in to the ease of simple answers and leveled possibilities.

We have undergone an examination of authentic and inauthentic attunement in order to provide an introduction that examines how Heidegger’s conception of mood differs from a concept that relates mood absolutely to affect or characterizes it as the result of some influence on the perceiver. For Heidegger, mood or attunement is one of

⁹¹ Ibid. 266/245.

⁹² Ibid. 266/245.

the constitutive ontological structures that provides for the foundation from which Dasein is able to find a world and also place itself in the world. However, this has not been our only, nor most important goal. In addition to providing an explication that allows for the understanding of attunement that we will use throughout this dissertation, Heidegger's analysis also has some distinct parallels with Henri Bergson's thought in relation to the way in which humans/Dasein find themselves in the world. We will move on to show how Bergson explicates how humans begin from a state of coveredness. However, Bergson does not begin from humans as being with others and subject to averageness. Instead, Bergson attacks this problem as being one of the outcomes of a primordial structuring of the human mind that arises because of the manner in which humanity developed. Just as Heidegger outlines the manner in which Dasein can become authentic in relation to its possibilities as it learns more about itself and reformulates inauthentic potentialities, Bergson will show us how humans can shift their modes of thought in order to unlock those aspects of the mind that have been covered over by the overuse of what he calls the intellect. It is in intuition that Bergson finds the development of "authenticity." We will show that it is through the release from the intellect and its manner of perception and ideas such as negation and possibility that one will free oneself for the attunement of joy.

Heidegger recognized joy as fundamental attunement. However, he never spent time adequately considering joy. We seek to analyze joy as attunement through the work of Henri Bergson. In doing this, we will mirror Heidegger's explication of *Angst* and its relationship to fear. We will juxtapose the authentic attunement of joy to the affective attunement (inauthentic) of happiness, claiming that joy reveals human being in its

totality while happiness merely fragments inner-worldly beings with the hope of attaining them. It is only because joy is primordial that one can experience happiness. However, happiness is inauthentic in that it is entangled in societal conceptions of happiness from which humans must free themselves in order to authentically appropriate joy. We will see that these societal views are founded in the structure of the human mind. However, this structure is not so solid that humans cannot break free or unlock another aspect of mind that is dormant when compared to the intellect. For Bergson, this occurs when one thinks through philosophy intuitively as well as attempts to perceive the world in terms of intuition and duration rather than through the fragmentation of the intellect. However, before we reach our goals for the analysis of joy, it is necessary to examine the way in which Bergson believes that humanity is “covered over.” We will turn our attention to Bergson’s analysis of the intellect in the hope that the analysis of the intellect will display the mode of inauthenticity in Bergson’s philosophy. This will provide the foundation from which we will be able to examine how one can move out of this mode of existence and into the primordial attunement of joy, re-appropriating it authentically and understanding how joy provides the foundation from which the world is able to display itself in a homely manner that is not merely the result of fleeing from ontological being to a false ontic comfort.

CHAPTER II

BERGSON'S CRITIQUE OF THE INTELLECT

In his analysis of the emergence of the human intellect¹ in *Creative Evolution*, Bergson begins with humanity in a state of being covered over. One could call this Bergson's analysis of the "state of nature" of humanity. This does not resemble the state of nature of Rousseau or Hobbes where humans are battling over resources and are in conflict with one another because they have not started communities. Rather, Bergson's state of nature is one in which humans are already living in community. Bergson is not worried with human economic and social relations as he examines his idea of the primordial state of humankind. Instead, Bergson focuses on the state of primordial human consciousness. He wants to begin from a state of nature in which human consciousness was not as it is today. His state of nature is more an archaeology of the way in which human consciousness developed throughout the course of evolution. For Bergson, human consciousness is the highest level of consciousness and it is also what allows humans to make tools and stand outside of the immediate flow of life that binds all other creatures to their immediate temporal surroundings. As Bergson says, "A species which claims the entire earth for its domain is truly a dominating and consequently superior species. Such is the human species, which represents the culminating point of

¹ The word that Bergson uses [*intelligence*] is rendered as both intellect and intelligence throughout *Creative Evolution* and his other works. Whenever Bergson uses this term, he means that mode of thought that has developed in order to deal with practical problems and situations.

the evolution of the vertebrates.”¹ It is in relation to intelligence that humankind displays the highest level of development. In addition to the intellect, Bergson also examines the development of instinct through the course of evolution. He believes that the hymenoptera (bees, ants, wasps) are the culmination of the development of instinct in the realm of life. As he states later, “The evolution of the arthropods reaches its culminating point in the insect, and in particular in the hymenoptera, as that of the vertebrates in man.”² The disjunction that pervades *Creative Evolution* and portions of Bergson’s other works is based around the evolutionary tendency that diverged towards intellect and the other that moved into the realm of instinct.

Although Bergson does place the human brain at the apex of evolutionary consciousness, he does not go as far as many who would praise human reason and its ability to speculate.³ When Bergson speaks of human reasoning as being the pinnacle of evolutionary consciousness, he definitely does not mean that nature was aiming at some creative goal. “It would be futile to try to assign to life an end, in the human sense of the word. To speak of an end is to think of a pre-existing model which has only to be realized.”⁴ Human consciousness is merely the highest form of consciousness because it has the highest level of indetermination (freedom). The enterprise of the movement of

¹ Henri Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, trans. Arthur Mitchell (New York : Henry Holt, 1911), 608/109. In a similar fashion to the citations for Heidegger’s works, all citations to Bergson will list the citation from the french first followed by the english edition. All citations from the original texts come from Henri Berson, *Oeuvres* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1970).

² Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 609/110.

³ This is the rendering of the word that Bergson uses when speaking of thinking in a philosophical manner [*spéculation*]. Speculative thought in Bergson’s writings means philosophical thought or the ability to think in a philosophical manner.

⁴ Ibid. 538/42.

life was “to create with matter, which is necessity itself, an instrument of freedom, to make a machine which should triumph over mechanism, and to use the determinism of nature to pass through the meshes of the net which this very determinism has spread.”⁵ Freedom is the characteristic on which Bergson focuses when he speaks of humanity. Humans are different from other creatures in that they respond in the world with a multiplicity of possibilities (indeterminations) while other forms of creatures must immediately react to their surroundings in response to stimuli. “It is this freedom that the human form registers. Everywhere but in man, consciousness has had to come to a stand; in man alone it has kept on its way.”⁶ The human brain, human language, and human society have all worked together to free mankind from the reactionary nature of other creatures.

One might be wary of claiming that the enterprise of life was to create a being that was free in the midst of beings that are forced to react to situations according to instinctual and genetic “knowledge.” First, in making this statement, one might question what “life” is, perhaps thinking that Bergson is bringing in some mysterious force that he is calling life. In addition, the use of the word enterprise implies that this force had some teleological aim or goal that was satisfied when humans emerged. However, this teleological aim directly contradicts what Bergson said about the futility of assigning an end to the movement of life and evolution, as if it were aiming at something. Therefore, we need to say a few words in relation to these two issues before we move on.

⁵ Ibid. 719/217.

⁶ Ibid. 720/219.

In relation to the term “life,” we can say that Bergson is not referring to any mysterious force or principle. Instead, he is merely calling life the totality of living organisms (plants, insects, animals, etc.). The movement of life is merely the movement of evolution and the various divergent lines that have occurred along its course. One can easily speak of life moving without speaking of supernatural powers. If one examines living creatures and thinks about the development of different species, one sees that various organisms arose from earlier ancestors. The latest arrivals on the evolutionary scene tend to be those that display the highest levels of consciousness. Therefore, there is nothing wrong with saying that life brought about organisms that display higher levels of freedom in relation to actions. However, one must also remember that freedom here is indetermination. What Bergson means by the term indetermination is that humans are those creatures that are able to stop themselves and think about the options they have for action. One could think of it as the difference between response and reaction. When an animal receives a stimulus, it reacts. It immediately takes up a certain disposition or movement in relation to the stimuli, and this movement or reaction is often stimulated by what most would call instinct. Humans are different in that they are able to respond in addition to their ability to react. The reason why I use the word response is because it seems to me to have more relational, thoughtful shading to it than does that of reaction. I want this meaning to come to the fore when one thinks of the responses of humans in relation to stimuli. Humans can respond because they can hesitate before they act. Response to a situation involves taking the time to think through possibilities and outcomes of the actions that one can take in relation to the stimuli. Humans can choose

from various possibilities and this indetermination in relation to action is what Bergson means by freedom.

In relation to the second claim about the enterprise of life, one can defend Bergson in two ways. First, one could claim that Bergson's language is the attempt to adequately represent what happened over the course of the development of humanity, and this representation must abide by certain acceptable modes of expression that necessarily indicate a level of purpose. This leads to his words representing a sort of teleological end to the process of evolution when really he does not intend that to be the case. However, there is another defense. Because humans have been the most recent outcomes of the movement of species differentiation, one can say that as life has moved over time, it has "sought" to bring about beings that have a higher level of freedom. However, this language is also too teleological. Let us say that for Bergson, saying that life created with matter a being that was free is merely to say that there exist beings that display higher levels of freedom in regard to their actions than other beings on earth. These beings are the most recent outcomes of the process of evolution. It was through evolution that these organisms came into being. Therefore, they were brought into existence (created) by this process, and because they were the most recent results of evolution, one can say that (so far) they are the ends of this process. Not end as pre-ordained end, but end as the most recent outcome. Bergson does believe that humans would change and continue to adapt to become different in the manner that they think and act. In fact, Bergson actually argues that humans must continue to change and will perhaps one day reach a state where they think in radically different ways. If Bergson were there to see that day, he would say that that form of human or creature was the enterprise of the movement of life as it

would be the most recent outcome. Therefore, we can see that Bergson's statements do not contradict his claims about teleological ends, and we have also shown that when Bergson speaks of life, he is merely accounting for the manner in which the totality of organisms appears to have developed and adapted.

It would seem that because Bergson privileges human consciousness over all other types of consciousness, he would fall into line with those philosophers such as Plato, Kant, and Hegel who praise human reason, its laws, and its powers. However, this is not the case. For Bergson, the intellect is a purely practical construct of evolution. Its purpose is to keep humans alive, to distinguish, and to separate by providing outlines and boundaries to the swirling mass of atoms that surrounds the perceiver. Speculation⁷ is a wholly different, but related capacity that emerges alongside the intellect. However, the intellect often commandeers the speculative (philosophical) function of the human mind, and this leads to endless dead ends and traps that induce false problems and deception in philosophical thought.

In order to understand the role of the intellect in Bergson's writings, one must first undertake an analysis of how Bergson believes the intellect functions in humans. Bergson begins from a position that focuses on humans as the most highly advanced intellectual outcome of the process of evolution. He claims that "adaptation is the necessary condition of evolution...It is quite evident that a species would disappear, should it fail to bend to the conditions of existence which are imposed on it."⁸ The intellect is the culmination of the development of the cerebral system throughout the

⁷ Philosophical thought: See note 8 above.

⁸ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 581/83.

course of evolution, and it is the capacity of the human mind that allows humans to adapt most readily to harsh and radically changing conditions that threaten to destroy them.

The analysis of the manner in which Bergson believes the intellect functions in humanity will set the foundation from which one will be able to more adequately understand what the intellect is as its development is integrally related to its function. For Bergson, intellectual capacities developed in order to deal with problems and to allow organisms to survive. After examining the intellect and its primary role as problem solver, I will then examine Bergson's critique of the intellect as it oversteps its bounds into the realm of philosophy. As one uses the intellect in the realm of speculation, he or she finds unsolvable problems and difficulties. At the end of the chapter, I will outline Bergson's views about the proper realm and mode of inquiry for the intellect. This chapter is important in the overall scheme of the dissertation in that it lays the groundwork for the emergence of joy in the realm of perception through an analysis of the inconsistencies and inadequacies of the intellect. The relationship between the intellect and attunement is important because we will see that the intellect, as it functions in general and for the most part, suppresses the joy that can emerge by busying the mind with distinctions and problems that cover over the emergence of joy as attunement. Bergson's critique of the intellect is not the attempt to invalidate the use of the intellect. How could one argue for that anyway? Instead, it is the attempt to delimit the boundaries of intellectual thought in order to differentiate between the functions of the intellect and the functions of philosophical thought. Ultimately, Bergson's critique of the intellect aims at showing that the intellect developed not in order to philosophize, but to satisfy the demands of existence and practical life. I hope to show that Bergson's analysis of the

intellect is his attempt to bring to light the lack that is inherent in the manner in which he believes people perceive and experience the world when they limit themselves to only an intellectual view. The intellect locks people into a mode of existence in which they are unable to experience joy as attunement because of the fragmentation and the view from utility that found intellectual perception. Bergson critiques the intellect in order to propose another form of thought that would promote the function of intuition as another integral aspect of human thought. This mode of thought leads to a sort of relaxation of the tendency to fragment as well as the movement away from the view from utility. Relaxation of the intellect then leads to a new form of perception and interaction with reality from which joy as attunement is able to emerge. However, first we must begin with the development of the intellect and the origins of the lack that is inherent in human thought and perception.

DEVELOPMENT AND ATTRIBUTES OF THE INTELLECT

In the beginning of his analysis of the emergence of human intellect in the world, Bergson seeks to explicate the differences between tendencies that have arisen throughout the emergence of life on earth. He believes that it is only in this way that one can talk about differences between different types of organisms such as plants and animals.⁹ Bergson claims that “no definite characteristic distinguishes the plant from the

⁹ Ibid. 585/87.

animal. Attempts to define the two kingdoms strictly have always come to naught.”¹⁰ This is because there is not a characteristic that is part of one kingdom that cannot be found, at least in some degree, in the other. Instead, there is merely a difference in proportion. For example, one might say that animals are different from plants in that animals can move about on the earth. One could then counter this statement by saying that Venus flytraps move when they catch prey, or that certain plants literally move their leaves in response to touch (e.g., *Mimosa pudica*). In focusing on the proportion of certain characteristics, Bergson believes that he can make statements about the differences between organisms and overcome the counterexamples that will always occur in sharp definitions. “In a word, *the group must not be defined by the possession of certain characters, but by its tendency to emphasize them.*”¹¹ One can think of this distinction as the tendency of an organism to *display* a sort of characteristic as opposed to *possessing* a characteristic. For example, Bergson examines the manner in which animals and plants procure nourishment. Plants differ from animals in that they are able to create their own nourishment from elemental sources such as the air, soil, and light from the sun. Animals are forced to ingest other plants or animals that already have these minerals, sugars, fats, and proteins in their makeup. Then they digest these organisms and use what they can from them for nourishment.

According to Bergson, the mode of alimentation in animals is directly related to the tendency towards movement in animals and towards stasis in plants. Because animals are forced to find their nourishment due to their inability to spontaneously produce it,

¹⁰ Ibid. 585/86.

¹¹ Ibid. 585/87.

they must be mobile. As Bergson says, “animal life is characterized, in its general direction, by mobility in space.”¹² Although some plants exhibit types of movement, in general and for the most part, these sorts of movements do not display the variety and frequency of those found even in the simplest animals. There is a tendency in animals to continual movement, while there is a tendency in plants to a sedentary existence.

In a similar vein, Bergson links consciousness to the tendency that corresponds to mobility. That is, Bergson finds the tendency to display consciousness linked more to those organisms that have a tendency towards mobility. As one moves up the chain of consciousness to those organisms that display central nervous systems, one finds more specialized forms of movement. In general, there is a relation to the amount of movement an organism can perform and its level of consciousness. “The more the central nervous system develops, the more numerous and more precise become the movements among which it can choose; the clearer, also, is the consciousness that accompanies them.”¹³ However, the question arises as to whether consciousness is the effect or the cause of the tendency towards mobility. Bergson answers yes to both distinctions. First, it is in a sense the cause, “since it has to direct locomotion.”¹⁴ However, consciousness is also the effect of locomotion in a certain sense in that it seems to have emerged in more differentiated fashions as animals tended to have to move more to exploit their environments in the search for food. Plants are able to manufacture their own food, and this has resulted in less movement and less consciousness, whereas

¹² Ibid. 587/89.

¹³ Ibid. 588/90.

¹⁴ Ibid. 589/91.

animals that have to move long distances to find food have tended to develop physiologies that are movement oriented and nervous systems that display high levels of consciousness. Bergson distinguishes the development towards movement and fixity using the terms “conscious” and “unconscious” organisms. Again, this is not *always* the case, but in general, consciousness is manifest in those organisms that have more complex capabilities of movement. It is important to note here that consciousness, as Bergson uses it, refers to the ability to move in one’s surroundings, which implies that one is able to perceive the surroundings in some manner. Therefore, consciousness refers to an organism’s ability to perceive and move about in its environment. For Bergson, the higher the level of consciousness, the more ample and varied are the perceptions and feelings that the organism undergoes as it moves about in the world. We notice in Bergson’s talk about tendencies that animals have a tendency towards movement and consciousness while plants have a tendency towards immobility and unconsciousness. It is now important to focus on the animal realm and the relationship between intelligence and instinct that is “both opposite and complementary.”¹⁵ This analysis will give us a more focused image of Bergson’s idea of the intellect and the role of the intellect in human thought.

It is important to remember Bergson’s ideas about tendency to display characteristics when speaking of the intellect and instinct. It is often the case that humans take the view that the intellect emerged from an instinctual being as a sort of overcoming of the “deficiencies” of the instincts. However, Bergson claims that both intellect and instinct emerged from a common origin, and both are found in different degrees

¹⁵ Ibid. 610/110.

intermingling in different organisms. It is not that the intellect was a development that began in the instinct, ultimately overcoming instinct and instantiating itself in a higher animal. Rather, instinct and intellect are two divergent modes of interacting with a being's environment, and they represent two forms of knowledge. "Neither is ever found in a pure state...There is no intelligence in which some traces of instinct are not to be discovered, more especially no instinct that is not surrounded with a fringe of intelligence."¹⁶ However, as was mentioned, it is often the case that humans take the intellect to be a more developed instinct. However, Bergson claims that they are complementary, and that their complementary character is the result of the fact that they are different.¹⁷

It is important to determine what Bergson means when he uses the terms instinct and intelligence. Both instinct and intellect have developed in order to solve what Bergson believes is the major problem of life. "Now the life manifested by an organism is, in our view, a certain effort to obtain certain things from the material world."¹⁸ Instinct and intelligence have allowed organisms to solve this problem in different ways. Bergson begins from intellect and the attribute that characterizes intellectual thought. He finds that manufacture is the attribute that characterizes the human intellect.¹⁹ In support of this argument, he cites the examples of the apes and elephants as having the highest cognitive capacity in the animal realm, and these animals are the ones that are able to use

¹⁶ Ibid. 610/110-111.

¹⁷ Ibid. 610/111.

¹⁸ Ibid. 611/111).

¹⁹ Ibid. 611-612/112.

some sort of instrument. It is towards invention that “the intelligence of animals tends as towards an ideal.”²⁰ Bergson goes on to claim that it has not been adequately noted that the essential feature of human intelligence is mechanical invention and that “even today our social life gravitates around the manufacture and use of artificial instruments” and that “the inventions which strew the road of progress have also traced its direction.”²¹

When we look at past civilizations, we tend to focus on the productions of those civilizations – weapons, architecture, and art. “In short, *intelligence, considered in what seems to be its original feature, is the faculty of manufacturing artificial objects, especially tools to make tools, and of indefinitely varying the manufacture.*”²² It is for this reason that Bergson claims that *Homo sapiens* should be called *Homo faber*.

Bergson asserts that it is not just intelligent animals that have machines and tools. However, for unintelligent creatures, the tools are part of their physiological structures, and instinct is that ability of being able to use the tools that are provided for in the organism itself. Bergson calls tools that emerge because of physiological structure or genetic content “organized instruments” [*instruments organizes*].²³ That is, these “tools” have been given beforehand in an organized manner. They have been given in their totality and do not require any more construction on the part of the organism. “Instinct finds the appropriate instrument at hand: this instrument, which makes and repairs itself...does at once, when required, what it is called upon to do, without difficulty and

²⁰ Ibid. 612/113.

²¹ Ibid. 612/113.

²² Ibid. 613/113.

²³ Ibid. 614/114.

with a perfection that is often wonderful.”²⁴ Bergson finds the highest form of instinct in the *hymenoptera* (bees, ants, wasps). One example of an organized instrument in bees is the stinger. Bees have been given a tool of self defense that is part of their physiological makeup and they use it without having to be taught its function. Different examples of organized instruments are wings, mouthparts, hands, thumbs, feet and hair. In any case, animals use these instruments in order to obtain certain things from the world. However, the intellectual function is also an aspect of many organisms (to different extents) that complements instinct.²⁵

Bergson draws a sharp distinction here in order to bring out the attributes of instinct and intelligence. This leads him to make the generalization (that represents the two in their separate function) that “*instinct perfected is a faculty of using and even of constructing organized instruments; intelligence perfected is the faculty of making and using unorganized instruments.*”²⁶ When Bergson says that the intellect makes and uses “unorganized instruments” he is claiming that the intellect is able to take things that are not in relation to one another and then create something by bringing them into a relation with one another. In other words, the instrument is not given anatomically or genetically and therefore it is unorganized before it takes on organization after the human manipulates it and creates with it.

²⁴ Ibid. 614/114-115.

²⁵ It is important to remember that these two (intellect and instinct) are not mutually exclusive, but intertwine in all organisms in different degrees. Humans are not completely intellectual as we have been given anatomical structures that we can use from before we are conscious of ourselves. In addition, acts such as breast-feeding indicate the presence of instinct in humanity.

²⁶ Ibid. 614/114.

For Bergson, there are two types of innate knowledge that separate instinct and intelligence further. Using the example of the Sitaris beetle, Bergson shows that it appears that the larva has innate “knowledge” as it jumps onto a male wasp, transfers itself to the female, then leaps to one of the wasp’s eggs in order to feed on the wasp larva, and finally grows on the nectar provided for the wasp larva. The insect “knows” these things without having learned them. In the case of intelligence, the intellect displays a different sort of innate knowledge. Although a human baby is not as autonomous as the wasp larva, when it comes to a certain age, it will “hear an epithet being applied to a substantive” and immediately know what that means.²⁷ Intelligence naturally “makes use of relations of like with like, of content to container, of cause to effect, etc., which are implied in every phrase in which there is a subject, an attribute and a verb, expressed and understood.”²⁸ Therefore, this leads Bergson to further divide instinct and intellect by their forms of innate knowledge. Instinct is knowledge of things (objects in the world and where they will be) while intellect is knowledge of relations. In order to further hone his definition, Bergson goes on to explain that there are certain categories in which experience is deposited. There is a form of intellectual experience and this form can become the object of investigation. Therefore, he goes further to say that, “*Intelligence, in so far as it is innate, is the knowledge of a form; instinct implies the knowledge of a matter.*”²⁹ The distinction between the two forms of knowledge and the outcomes of these two forms demands further explication.

²⁷ Ibid. 620/121.

²⁸ Ibid. 620/121.

²⁹ Ibid. 621/122.

Because of the distinction he draws between intellect and instinct, Bergson claims that there are two types of knowledge. The first (instinctual) “gets at definite objects immediately, in their materiality itself.”³⁰ This type of knowledge is the categorical. The second kind of knowledge is “a natural power of relating an object to an object, or a part to a part, or an aspect to an aspect – in short, of drawing conclusions when in possession of the premises, of proceeding from what has been learnt to what is still unknown.”³¹ This sort of knowledge is the hypothetical form, and it is also more powerful than the instinctual form because it provides a framework in which it can insert an infinite number of objects and then interact with those objects in the most practical manner. This leads Bergson to claim that, “The essential function of intelligence is therefore to see the way out of a difficulty in any circumstances whatever, to find what is most suitable, what answers best the question asked.”³² The formal knowledge of the intellect emerged with a view towards practical utility. However, it was then able to extend beyond the practical because of its form. “An intelligent being bears within himself the means to transcend his own nature.”³³ It is the formal knowledge of the intellect that allows the being to step outside of immediacy and to stand outside of a mode in which it must immediately react to perceptions without hesitation or thought about possible responses. The intellect is able to transcend its nature, step outside the body of the organism, and also examine itself and its own function.

³⁰ Ibid. 621/122.

³¹ Ibid. 621/122.

³² Ibid. 622/123.

³³ Ibid. 623/123.

Having outlined some of the differences between intellectual and instinctual knowledge, let us now turn our attention to some attributes that Bergson finds in the intellect. It is important to note that for Bergson, the intellect is not something that is absolute or that “fell from heaven” into the minds of each individual human. In addition, it is not that aspect of the human thought that is responsible for philosophical thought (what Bergson calls speculation). In contrast Bergson regards “the human intellect...as relative to the needs of human action.”³⁴ If one posits action, then one is able to elucidate the form of the intellect, and this is where Bergson begins. He claims that intellect is first of all focused on constructing. However, this construction is not in the realm of ideas and perceptions, e.g. constructing a world. Instead, it is in the realm of manual construction. The intellect seeks to construct things in the world. “*Our intelligence, as it leaves the hands of nature, has for its chief object the unorganized solid.*”³⁵ Humans are most at home when they are acting on unorganized things and either combining them or breaking them down into parts. Extended objects in the world lend themselves well to manipulation, and the intellect is that aspect of knowledge which forms tools from unorganized solids. In order to act on solids, the intellect must also have the ability to separate objects. Without the ability to separate, there would be no solids in the world, but merely the interpenetration of fluid states or swirling balls of atoms. Because of its function of fragmentation, Bergson claims that any continuity that is posited by the

³⁴ Ibid. 624/125.

³⁵ Ibid. 625/126.

human intellect would be a false continuity as it would merely be the juxtaposition of solids.³⁶

The fact that humans must fracture in order to think of continuity leads him to state another aspect of the intellect. “*Of the discontinuous alone does the intellect form a clear idea.*”³⁷ Even when one is analyzing movement, it is often the case that one is attempting to decipher where the movement is going or where the object is located in space. We are not interested in the “*progress* by which it passes from one position to another, progress which is the movement itself.”³⁸ This mode of perception translates itself into human action as well. It is not the interval but the goal that is the important aspect of human action. All mantras encouraging humans to “live for the moment” and “seize the day” are attempts to combat the innate tendency of humans to focus on the totality to the detriment of the process. They are efforts to remind humans to try to fight against their propensity to focus on the plan of their actions and the accomplishment of that plan. It is difficult to live in the moment because it is natural for the intellect to seek the end of action, and that is why most humans think in terms of the future and the goals of their lives. For example, every day that I sit down to type my dissertation, I at some point think about the day when I will step out of my defense with my PhD. I think about how good it is going to feel and the freedom I will experience. I often turn a blind eye to

³⁶ However, there is one continuity that humans experience that is an actual continuity: their inner-selves. This continuity is also not known through the intellect, but through the intuition of one’s inner states. Even calling the flow of one’s being “states” displays that one is thinking the inner duration of one’s life through the mode of the intellect. The intellect then even turns the one knowable continuity into a solidified form as it juxtaposes states in order to recreate the durational flow of one’s personality.

³⁷ (Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 627/127) “*Notre intelligence ne se représente clairement que l’immobilité.*” The term “clear idea” is the rendering of “*se représente clairement.*”

³⁸ *Ibid.* 626/126.

the fact that it is not then that I will become a philosopher, but in the days of reading, writing, and revising that I am undergoing as I write these exact words. It is here that I am learning what it is to be a philosopher, but I cannot help but always look to the day when I will be finished with this project. I am lost in my intellect and unless I take the extremely difficult steps of turning against this mode of thought, I do not think about the good that comes from the effort and difficulty of writing something meaningful that I attempt every day as I work on this project.

The focus on the schema and the end indicate that the intellect does not comprehend the mobility that occurs between these two endpoints. This leads Bergson to claim that when the intellect thinks mobility, “it does so by constructing movement out of immobilities put together.”³⁹ Unable to focus its attention on the actual movement, the intellect splits up the movement into numerous immobile snapshots. The mobility that is grasped through the intellect is, for Bergson, the juxtaposition of solidified instants. Because the intellect is constantly turned towards manufacturing and manipulating objects, it never stops at the things as they are. Instead, it sees in their given form the ability to be changed or altered to bring about a potential form. The intellect presents the extended objects in the world as alterable and as things that can be portioned. The distinction between given form and potential form is important here. Rather than examine and attempt to come to know the given form, the intellect is often distracted by the potential forms that it finds possible in the given form. In addition, if the intellect does not think of the potential form, it thinks of relations of the given form to other forms. It tends to find what it desires to find even when it is staring at a different given.

³⁹ Ibid. 626/127.

For example, when one is searching for a piece of furniture, there is a sort of form that one has for the perfect piece in one's mind. Those given forms that do not match with this ideal form are passed over or thought about only in relation to the ideal form. For example, "this chair is too tall," "I do not like that color," etc. The positive attributes one can tease out of these statements are, "I want a chair that is 4 feet tall," or "I like blue." Even without knowing exactly the form for which we are searching, there is some underlying idea waiting to be unlocked when one confronts the piece for which one is searching. Humans tend to express themselves in terms of the ideal form by making negative comments about the given form of that which they do not desire.

In the same way, as I pour over Bergson's texts, I search for passages that speak about the intellect (ideal forms). Passages that examine other aspects of the mind or human being are left behind. I pay attention to them but move quickly past them. What is more, I often find that I try to make passages fit the ideal form for which I am searching. I constantly battle against the desire to twist words to support the claims that I will be making about Bergson's conception of the intellect. I try to form the given into the ideal because it is the ideal in which I am interested. The passages that do not deal primarily with the intellect have a potential form that could work in my project, but I must leave them behind if I am to be faithful to the words of Bergson. It is important to note that the intellect sees potential where there are givens. It tends to shape the givens into the potential or ideal forms in which it is interested, while the actual knowledge of the given is neglected.

The distinction between the given and the potential (ideal) is outlined in Bergson's claims about the idea of space and the power of division that is inherent in the

intellect. Space is “never perceived; it is only conceived.”⁴⁰ Space is an idea that is infinitely divisible and it is a medium in which objects present themselves as divisible. That which is actually perceived “is extension colored, resistant, divided according to the lines which mark out the boundaries of real bodies or of their real elements.”⁴¹ That which is perceived is then conceived as having a sort of underlying space as its ground, and this results in the actions that humans can then take in relation to those objects. This leads to Bergson saying that “*the intellect is characterized by the unlimited power of decomposing according to any law and of recomposing into any system.*”⁴² What this means is that depending on the need or the desire, humans can fragment (decompose) according to any law or unit that they need. After they have fragmented according to unit or law, they can then use those fragments to recompose something else. However, the ability to fragment lies in the ideal of space. The fact that the intellect perceives objects spatially has led humans to carry this process to the limit by positing space underlying all objects. This ideal form fits perfectly with the manner of perception of the intellect and becomes a kind of divisible substrate. The idea of pure division of an underlying space then founds the belief that the given forms of real beings in the world are also divisible according to the same standards. It is then to the potential for pure division that the intellect aspires when it thinks the division of the given forms of objects in reality.

Having outlined some of the attributes of the intellect, it is important to note that in addition to the singular intellect, Bergson also examines the relationships of multiple

⁴⁰ Ibid. 628/128.

⁴¹ Ibid. 628/128.

⁴² Ibid. 628/128.

intellects. Inherent in Bergson's analysis of the social is an analysis of language and its relationship to human being and also the human intellect. In order to communicate with one another, different species have different signs. Unlike other societies of organisms, humans are not bound to undertake certain roles in society according to their physiological structures. For example, ants and bees exhibit varying body types depending on their functions within the society. "In human society, on the contrary, fabrication and action are of variable form, and, moreover, each individual must learn his part, because he is not preordained to it by his structure."⁴³ It is necessary in such a society that humans have signs that are not infinite in number but that can refer to an infinite number of things. "This tendency of the sign to transfer itself from one object to another is characteristic of human language."⁴⁴ The signs of human language are extremely pliable and can readily bounce from one object to another.

In addition to its ability to move between objects, human language is also used to analyze and express the internal states and ideas of humans themselves. Humans are unique in that the signs they use to interpret objects outside of them can also be used to express the states of being that are occurring inside of them. It is only in this way that humans are able to transcend themselves and their immediate perceptions. "Without language, intelligence would probably have remained riveted to the material objects which it was interested in considering...Language has greatly contributed to its liberation."⁴⁵ If the intellect did not have language, it would not seek those things that lie

⁴³ Ibid. 629/129.

⁴⁴ Ibid. 629/129.

⁴⁵ Ibid. 630/130.

outside the practical realm. However, once the intellect discovers language, it then discovers itself as creator of ideas. “From the moment that the intellect, reflecting upon its own doings, perceives itself as a creator of ideas, as a faculty of representation in general, there is no object of which it may not wish to have the idea, even though that object be without direct relation to practical action.”⁴⁶ When the intellect makes this move outside of the practical, it seeks to theorize about everything that it can – being human, life, and nature.

Once the intellect acquired the tool of language, it was then able to analyze itself and bring this analysis out into the social realm through the use of language (conceptual symbols). However, this analysis was not a pure representation of the inner states of humans as it had to make the continuity of inner life discontinuous in order to express it and think it. It is in this way that the intellect thinks itself clearly and distinctly [*à la distinction et à la claret*].⁴⁷ It is through concepts assigned to objects that the intellect is able to “know” and express its experience of the world. However, for Bergson, concepts are outside each other like objects in space. Concepts together with the objects they represent “constitute an ‘intelligible world’ that resembles the world of solids in its essential characters, but whose elements are lighter, more diaphanous, easier for the intellect to deal with than the image of concrete things: they are not, indeed, the perception itself of things, but the representation of the act by which the intellect is fixed

⁴⁶ Ibid. 630/131.

⁴⁷ (Ibid. 631/131) Here Bergson is making an unmarked reference to Descartes’s conception of clear and distinct ideas from his *Meditations on First Philosophy*.

on them.”⁴⁸ The concepts of things are then not actual representations, but symbols. The inner-workings of the conceptual intellect are best displayed in those most symbolic pursuits of humankind: geometry and logic. However, outside of the realm where symbol is necessary, Bergson believes that the intellect cannot move with the ease with which humans feel it is allowed to act.⁴⁹

It is the intellect then that uses the material world as a sort of appendage. From the objects in the world, it is able to create any tool that it needs in order to provide for its own stability. It is the proper function of the intellect to act in this manner of constructing tools in order to safeguard the survival of humanity. However, the ability of the intellect to construct things is rooted in its capacity to break things into units, to take what is needed, and to use portions with other portions in order to create something new. It relies on fragmentation in order to constitute reality.

In order to work with reality and reconstitute it according to its desires, the intellect perceives in a mode of division. However, it is necessary to examine the relationship between intellect and matter. It is here that we see the symbiotic relationship that nature has with the intellect. “Intellectuality and materiality have been constituted, in detail, by reciprocal adaptation.”⁵⁰ Bergson goes on to claim that this statement is extremely bold as most metaphysical analyses have taken the intellect as given rather than attempting to engender “it in its form and in its matter.”⁵¹ The same process that

⁴⁸ Ibid. 631/131-132.

⁴⁹ Ibid. 632/132.

⁵⁰ Ibid. 653/153-154.

⁵¹ Ibid. 654/154.

brings the mind to the formation of the intellect that contains distinct concepts is the same process that breaks matter up into objects. “*The more consciousness is intellectualized, the more is matter spatialized.*”⁵² Metaphysical analyses such as those of Kant and Fichte have sought to deduce the categories of thought in order to define intelligence and then examine how it presents or gives humans the reality that they perceive. However, these analyses also take the intellect in its given state without analyzing how it came about in the first place. This is because the requirement is not to decipher how the intellect emerged, but how it presents reality, whether that reality is material or idea, or whether one can know that reality or must remain a skeptic in relation to that presented reality.

Although philosophers have attempted to explicate the relationship between the intellect and reality, one is left with a singular vision of the whole that “is to be taken or left.”⁵³ Bergson believes that his attempt to outline the workings of the mind is much more modest than previous accounts of the intellect. For Bergson, this is because he does not believe that the intellect is something that is meant to comprehend the absolute. Instead, the function of the intellect is to “act and to know that we are acting, to come into touch with reality and even to live it, but only in the measure in which it concerns the work that is being accomplished and the furrow that is being plowed...”⁵⁴ It is for this reason that the intellect finds itself most at home in the realm of positive science. There is a natural logic that is released when the intellect works on inert matter. However,

⁵² Ibid. 656/156.

⁵³ Ibid. 657/157.

⁵⁴ Ibid. 657/157.

when one uses the intellect in the realm of the living, one also tends to use the same methods to examine the living as well. “Now, when the intellect undertakes the study of life, it necessarily treats the living like the inert, applying the same forms to this new object...”⁵⁵ However, this leads to a truth that is relative in that it fixes that which is living into a frame of stability and loses the movement that is characteristic of life itself for Bergson.

The manner in which the intellect appears to represent reality⁵⁶ is not merely the result of an idea of space that somehow represents objects, nor is it because objects have spatiality (extension) as an ultimate attribute that absolutely separates all objects and even the atoms that make up those objects. It is neither that the intellect determines matter, nor that matter creates the form of intellect. In addition, there is not some strange coincidence between the two that must be explained by some mysterious force or power of harmonizing both. Instead, “intellect and matter have progressively adapted themselves one to the other in order to attain at last a common form. *This adaptation has, moreover, been brought about quite naturally, because it is the same inversion of the same movement which creates at once the intellectuality of mind and materiality of things.*” One must remember that for Bergson, the intellect emerged from a primordial state of consciousness in which the intellect was not totally manifest. However, without the intellect as Bergson presents it, the perception of such a creature would be one of duration both in terms of time and space. There would be no objects in space because

⁵⁵ Ibid. 661/161.

⁵⁶ Bergson refers to “the real” [*le réel*] whenever he is speaking about the world and the totality of objects and relations in the world. The real is that which is opposed to the fragmentation of the intellect. Absolute knowledge for Bergson would be total knowledge of the real. For an example see *Creative Evolution*, 625/125.

there would be no sharp edges and fragmented perceptions. In addition, the sense of time would be the sense of a unity, a flowing totality in which moments would not exist as they would be part of a nebulous whole.

In contrast to a primordial mind that lacked the power to differentiate reality in the same manner as humans, the intellect emerges from “a latent geometry, immanent in our idea of space, which is the main spring of our intellect and the cause of its working.”⁵⁷ He claims that the two essential functions of the intellect are deduction and induction, and he seeks to show this guiding force of the intellect through an analysis of these two capabilities of consciousness. While the primordial form of mind was characterized by its inability to step outside the flow of its perception, the intellect is able to fragment those perceptions one from another and actually move out of a relationship of immediate perception to reality.

Because of the intellect’s tendency to fragment, Bergson claims that immobility is that alone of which it forms a “clear idea.”⁵⁸ The mobility of most objects and organisms on earth creates numerous problems for humans. In order to deal with the problem of movement, humans tend to focus on where the object is going and when it will arrive at its destination. Leaving what occurs in the interval behind, humans center attention on the ends and goals of their actions (movements). In order to constitute mobility, they tend to juxtapose immobile portions of time next to one another. For Bergson, the intellect functions for the sake of action, not for speculative thought. In order to deal with movement, it must chop up the movement into distinct parts and focus on the end of

⁵⁷ Ibid. 674/173.

⁵⁸ Ibid. 627/127.

the movements. This is the case because, “Intelligence, in its natural state, aims at a practically useful end...to the stable and unchangeable our intellect is attached by virtue of its natural disposition.”⁵⁹ Human actions are most expedient when they are focused on specific points, “fixity is therefore, what our intelligence seeks.”⁶⁰ Because of its view from utility, the intellect breaks up the mobility of reality for a juxtaposition of immobilities.

For Bergson, perception is an inadequate mode of experience as it emerges in general and for the most part. He writes that “distinct perception is merely cut, for the purpose of practical existence, out of a wider canvas.”⁶¹ The facts of existence show that the intellect actually turns away from perceiving that with which it has no interest. Philosophical thought suffers because the intellect is first of all geared towards life. “Before philosophizing, one must live; and life demands that we put on blinders, that we look neither to the right, nor to the left nor behind us, but straight ahead in the direction we have to go.”⁶² The human brain seems to have been constructed with the ability to select images from the swirling flux of reality. “Image and perception constitute a cut into the continuous flow, an arrest of movement.”⁶³ The intellect focuses human attention on those objects in the world with which it must immediately interact, and it tends to “forget” the remainder as it becomes absorbed in specific objects in space.

⁵⁹ Ibid. 627/127.

⁶⁰ Henri Bergson, *An Introduction to Metaphysics: The Creative Mind*. trans. Mabelle L. Andison. (Helix Books, 1983), 1275/15.

⁶¹ Ibid. 1372/136-137.

⁶² Ibid. 1372/137.

⁶³ Lazzarato, Maurizio. “Machines to Crystallize Time: Bergson,” *Theory Culture Society* 24, no. 6 (2007): 112.

Perception itself isolates specific things in the world, “it shows us less the things themselves than the use we can make of them.”⁶⁴ The intellectual focus on immobility and fragmentation lead to a mode of perception that is inadequate for Bergson and that is what we seek to elucidate in the next section.

THE OUTCOMES OF THE INTELLECT: BERGSON’S CRITIQUE

Bergson’s analysis of the intellect pervades all his works, and takes on various forms. I have been examining his analysis of the practical bent of the intellect. However, Bergson’s critique also extends to the manner in which humans use concepts to represent reality. In his essay “Introduction to Metaphysics,” he states that humans “do not, in general, aim at knowing for the sake of knowing, but at knowing in order to take a stand, gain a profit, in fact to satisfy an interest.”⁶⁵ As one perceives through the intellect, he or she is constantly combining concepts in the attempt to represent that which is perceived. Having reconstituted the object using these concepts, one is then able to relate the object to others, to manipulate it, or to quantify it according to certain characteristics and corresponding categories. In short, one is then open to numerous possibilities for action in relation to the object. However, these actions cannot be called disinterested. Locking objects into concepts is not the mode of perception that attempts to view the thing as it is in its being. As A.D. Lindsay says in his analysis of the intellect in Bergson, mankind “is concerned with things, not as individuals, but as displaying identity. They take on for him the likeness of his tools, are measured by fixed standards, and resolved into varying

⁶⁴ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1373/138.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 1410/177.

complexes of standardized parts.”⁶⁶ This mode of thought fastens the object into the categories of the intellect in order to work with the object in a more adept manner. Concepts provide “stable visions of the instability of the real.”⁶⁷ In the same way that the intellect fragments the movement of reality, the intellect also fragments the movement (qualitative change) of the object.

It is important to note here that Bergson does not critique in order to destroy. Instead, he claims that this mode of study (using concepts in order to quantify and create a common language) is the most legitimate “as long as it is only a question of practical knowledge.”⁶⁸ Intellectual perception then is used to determine the relations of the object towards the perceiver, as well as the attitudes the perceiver can take in relation to the object. This means that the perceiver automatically locks objects, through recognition, into specific concepts in order to take up a position in space where he or she will be able to interact with the object in whatever manner is most suitable for the situation. Concepts allow one to strengthen the perceptual focus by giving something a name, and through recognition, then act or react to the movements or existence of the object.

Although one is bound to use concepts in order to quantify reality and work with others in society in order to create a common ground from which all will be able to communicate about objects in the world, Bergson believes that it is necessary that this form of thought does not extend to what he calls “knowledge of the real.”⁶⁹

⁶⁶ A.D. Lindsay, *The Philosophy of Bergson*. (New York: Kennikat Press, 1911), 220.

⁶⁷ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1415/183.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* 1415/183.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 1324/84.

“Consciousness, goaded by an insatiable desire to separate, substitutes the symbol for the reality, or perceives the reality only through the symbol.”⁷⁰ It is only in extremely practical social matters that Bergson believes one can substitute concepts for the things themselves. Concepts allow the members of a society to solve problems and to have a common understanding about that which they are talking. Bergson calls the substitution of concepts for things “the socialization of the truth.”⁷¹ However, this form of knowledge “has no business in the domain of pure knowledge, science or philosophy.”⁷² Each concept represents numerous objects, but in a manner that must eliminate the details of those individual objects and group them according to common characteristics. Therefore, one is unable to grasp objects as they are in their individuality when one attempts to replace them with concepts.

In addition to eliminating key attributes of specific individuals, concepts also tend to distort the very attributes that they use to group specific individuals under a common form. The concept “more or less distorts this property by the extension it gives to it.”⁷³ The very properties that humans focus on in order to create concepts of groups of individuals then become concepts that extend beyond the individuals and lose touch with the objects which exude these properties. Therefore, there is a two way distortion in the use of concepts. First, concepts tend to eliminate specific attributes of individuals by focusing on common characteristics between members of a group. At the same time,

⁷⁰ Henri Bergson, *Time and Free Will*, trans. F.L. Pogson (New York: Dover, 2001), 85/128.

⁷¹ (Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1327/87.

⁷² Ibid. 1328/87.

⁷³ Ibid. 1401/167.

because these characteristics are used for numerous individuals, the characteristics themselves are distorted as the individuals display varying shades and proportions of the concepts that are used to classify them.

As philosophers have abstracted from the existence and being of the world, they have replaced given forms with concepts. This mode of thought has then led to an analysis that seeks the foundations of reality in some general, simple concept. Positing a specific concept (being, nothing, water, flux, the good) as the foundation or end of life then leads to counter concepts that come from other philosophers. The battle back and forth between contrary concepts is the single most prevalent characteristic of the history of philosophy for Bergson. “There is scarcely any concrete reality upon which one cannot take two opposing views at the same time and which is consequently not subsumed under the two antagonistic concepts.”⁷⁴ Bergson believes that this philosophical method will never attain knowledge of things in the world. Because Bergson believes that the philosophical method needs to return to objects and beings in the world themselves, he refuses to promote the conceptual positing characteristic of so many philosophers. He does not deny that concepts are important and useful for metaphysics. One could not express oneself at all without recourse to conceptual language. However, he does believe that philosophy should replace this method with one that goes back to the objects in the world, a method that would cut out singular concepts for individuals rather than entire groups.⁷⁵

⁷⁴ Ibid. 1409/176.

⁷⁵ The idea of singular concepts will receive much more explication in the next chapter as we outline Bergson’s response to those who believe that the intellect (as Bergson describes it) has its rightful place in the realm of philosophy.

The human mind must imagine certain states and specific things. It is natural for the intellect to do this when it is working in terms of practicality. “*Our intelligence, when it follows its natural inclination, proceeds by solid perceptions on the one hand, and by stable conceptions on the other.*”⁷⁶ As long as the goal of knowledge is practical, this mode of thought does not upset Bergson. However, when one extends the concept net to the world and begins fragmenting reality in the attempt to plumb the metaphysical depths of reality, he or she is bound to find “the impossibility of satisfactorily getting the real into the ready-made garments of our ready-made concepts...”⁷⁷ In doing so, one lets the object itself escape and replaces the real with a depiction that no longer contains all the characteristics of the original.

For Bergson, the goal of philosophical thought is to probe the metaphysical depths of reality. His critique of the intellect and conceptual thought is actually a critique of the manner in which philosophers have gone about philosophizing. He goes so far as to say that the problems and antinomies of metaphysical thought are the direct result of using the practical mode of knowledge in the realm of the speculative. The tendency of reality towards movement and change can never be caught in the concepts and perceptions that immobilize it in order to work with it and act on it. Bergson believes that “*fixed concepts can be extracted by our thought from the mobile reality; but there is no means whatever of reconstituting with the fixity of concepts the mobility of the real.*”⁷⁸ However, this does not mean that all knowledge is doomed to be relative.

⁷⁶ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1420/188-189.

⁷⁷ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 535-536/39-40.

⁷⁸ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1421/189.

The idea of the relativity of knowledge itself comes from the very same mode of thought that immobilizes and portions reality. Those who propose the relativity of knowledge fall into the trap that would claim that in order to have metaphysical knowledge, one would have to be able to represent that knowledge using fixed concepts. There is nothing more natural to thought than to think that one must be able to adequately explain his or her concepts in their most foundational aspects in order to attain knowledge of the totality. However, in representing the totality using concepts, one perceives in a mode that is antithetical to the movement that Bergson believes “undergirds” the real.⁷⁹ With concepts, one is able to represent a world, but it is a world that is fragmented and fractured. Using concepts to represent the world is necessary for existence. However, in doing so, one can never come to an adequate knowledge of the real for Bergson. This is the case because concepts fail to encapsulate the weight of the “concrete” individuals with their multitudinous attributes. Instead, concepts substitute something that is easier to work with, but which necessarily eliminates integral aspects of the totality.

Bergson critiques concepts in relation to the intellect because he finds that they are integrally related. One could say that concepts can only survive as an outcome of the intellect, while the intellect becomes external only because of concepts. The rigidity and outlines of the perceived world are a direct result of the manner in which the intellect presents the world to consciousness. Because concepts are generally static things that have the ability to encompass movement and ingest billions of varying individuals in a frame, they reflect the attributes of the intellect. Therefore, one can say that they emanate

⁷⁹ The analysis of movement and its role in Bergson’s metaphysic is one of the main lines of analysis in the following chapter.

from the capacity of the intellect. However, an intellect without concepts is one that is internal. Remember that for Bergson, human concepts are manifest in words that are able to capture and categorize individuals. It is only with the emergence of concepts that the intellect is able to express itself in the world outside of its immediately perceived reality. In speaking, the intellect externalizes itself and language results in a further fragmentation of reality, a fragmentation that can occur even when there is no object that is immediately perceived. One can speak of an object that is not immediately present. Concepts allow the intellect to move outside of the human body as it posits its perception of matter into a social space in which others can respond and verify or contradict those statements. In this way, concepts liberate the intellect from its primordial silence in organisms without the capacity for language. This not only allows it to extend its categorization and fragmentation to the external world, but also provides the foundation from which the intellect can fragment its own inner states and express these states external to its body.

The Intellect and Science

Bergson's critique of the intellect leads to an examination of science and its proper sphere of inquiry. Bergson claims that "Positive science is, in fact, a work of pure intellect."⁸⁰ Just as Bergson never claims that we ought to do away with concepts altogether, his critique of science is not one that would seek to display the inadequacies of science in order to create a sense of relativity in the realm of scientific study. Instead, his goal in examining the realm of science and the scientific method is to delimit the

⁸⁰ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 661/161.

boundaries of scientific reflection in contrast to philosophical reflection. In studying and relating information about the natural world, the scientist is correct in using the intellect and its concept net in order to relay information. However, this mode of thought is not adequate when one attempts to think philosophically.

The division of matter and the work of the intellect naturally lead to a science that requires a certain mode of investigation. The ideal of scientific analysis is to reach a frame of understanding, or to create a model or equation that could represent the totality of the universe in a simple form. This would lead to a completion of the process of analysis. A fully completed science would be one that could embrace the totality of objects and organisms and place them in the correct relational network. Unfortunately, the mode of scientific investigation must focus on singular problems and precise relations between small numbers of organisms and compounds. For this reason, Bergson believes that any idea of a completed science is impossible because there is no intellect that can foresee and compute all the factors that would go into creating a mode by which one could understand what would occur next in the universe.

Science must set before itself very specific questions, and it must constantly refine its answers to these questions. Those working in a scientific mode must focus attention on the material world and manipulate objects within the world in a manner that fixes their positions and allows for specific outcomes. Bergson is not making a critique of this solidification in order to destroy the foundations for a science. He believes that the study of science and its prolongation is necessary for the revelation of reality. However, he does want to put boundaries in place between science and reality. The realm of science is the inert and disjointed. "This is, in fact, quite natural: the role of

science is to foresee. It extracts and retains from the material world that which can be repeated and calculated, and consequently, that which is not in a state of flow. Thus it does nothing but lean in the direction of common sense, which is the beginning of science...”⁸¹ It is at the juncture where those who practice it believe they can examine the realm of the mobile that Bergson is quick to step in and criticize their attempts. His goal is to make a clear distinction between metaphysics and science in order to eliminate what he considers false problems and dead ends. However, Bergson does not lower one form of knowledge in relation to the other. In fact, Bergson claims that “we attribute an equal value to both. I believe that they can both touch the bottom of reality.”⁸²

For Bergson, intellectual analysis results in fixing objects and creatures in immobility. The previous discussion displayed how Bergson believed that it is of immobility alone that the intellect forms a clear and distinct idea. It is natural for the intellect to translate its mode of analyzing the inert into its mode of examining the living. However, in doing this, it must translate the living into the inert. This results in a “*symbolic* verity.”⁸³ It is at the junction between the inert and the living that Bergson sees the need for a disjunction between science and philosophy. “If science is to extend our action on things, and if we can only act with inert matter for instrument, science can and must continue to treat the living as it has treated the inert.”⁸⁴ However, the more that science penetrates life in this manner, the more one must recognize the symbolic nature

⁸¹ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1255/13.

⁸² *Ibid.* 1278/37.

⁸³ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 661/161.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 664/163.

of its knowledge and its underlying shading towards utility. It has been the fault of philosophers to turn a blind eye to the distinction between the inert and the living. This has led philosophers to begin their analyses from the endpoint of scientific investigation. The scientists hope that their analyses will lead to an elucidation of nature and the laws that govern the universe. If the philosopher begins where the scientist ends, he will either agree with the scientist and attempt to explicate the unity of the laws of nature, or he will disagree and attempt to show that the methods of science are artificial and therefore the findings of science are tenuous in their truth value. “So philosophy swings to and fro between the doctrine that regards absolute reality as unknowable and that which, in the idea it gives us of this reality, says nothing more than science has said.”⁸⁵

It might be said that Bergson polarizes the situation too much, and therefore his argument does not take into account other modes of thought that are not represented here. However, Bergson often polarizes situations beyond their actuality in order to bring things to light that would have been unclear had he not drawn such sharp distinctions. If we give Bergson the benefit of the doubt and try to analyze why this distinction is significant, we will see that there are important outcomes for the philosopher. First, we must realize that Bergson is examining metaphysics. For Bergson, *Creative Evolution* (where he does most of his work on the emergence of the intellect) is his attempt to provide an account for the givenness of reality to human consciousness. We will outline Bergson’s metaphysic in the next chapter, but let us say now that it is characterized by life, creative vitality, creation, mobility, duration and heterogeneity. Thus, it is imperative that he shows how one could conceive of the world as static and the actions in

⁸⁵ Ibid. 662/162.

the world as predictable from certain conditions. If the intellect is the seat of immobility and fixity, if it creates a mode of perception that leaves out a portion and sees what things could be rather than what they are, then this mode of existence must be examined in detail to show its inadequacies. For Bergson, the outcome of the intellect is positive science. Therefore, positive science is that means of examining the world that runs antithetically to his metaphysic. However, Bergson does not see in it a relative mode of knowledge, but a fragmented manner of understanding.

Another integral aspect of Bergson's philosophy that one must understand is that he never critiques in order to destroy. He is a positive philosopher, not in an affective sense, but in the sense that he constantly seeks to build up and to move forward rather than to name things through negations or to critique for the sake of destruction. It would be easy for Bergson to critique science in the attempt to shake its foundations, and probably no other philosopher of the day would have been as qualified for or adequate to the task. However, this would be to begin where science ends and would fall into line with all the philosophers who had attempted to display the relativity of scientific knowledge. It is at the juncture of the inert and the living that Bergson finds the relationship he needs to build the beginning of philosophy as well as strengthen the position of science itself.

Instead of taking that which science has given and attempting to manufacture his metaphysic or his epistemology on how the human mind coincides with reality, Bergson moves back into the realm of science to show that it has moved too far without critiquing itself. Bergson finds that the mode of the intellect is exceptional in its analysis of inert matter. However, when it examines the living, it must automatically turn the vital into

the inert in order to understand it. Dissection is perhaps the ultimate example of how the intellect must function. In order to understand the anatomy, structure and aspects of the physiology of organisms, we often kill them and cut them into pieces. In live dissections, the animals are often “killed” while their vital functions continue on. Even the living analysis often ends in death or must begin with death in order for scientific understanding. We turn the living into the inert, into the dead.

Bergson believes that it is necessary for the intellect to transform the living in this manner, but he claims that we must regard the information that this mode of investigation provides as more and more symbolic the further it attempts to understand life. It is at this point that he believes philosophy must take its stand and recognize that its function is to view the living from a different mode of perception. “We shall find that the inert enters naturally into the frames of the intellect, but that the living is adapted to these frames only artificially, so that we must adopt a special attitude towards it and examine it with other eyes than those of positive science.”⁸⁶ What constitutes these “other eyes” is the primary focus of the next chapter. However, it is in this way that philosophy “invades the domain of experience,” not beginning from the totality of scientific knowledge but directly into the analysis of the real, alongside science, with a view towards the elucidation of the living.

When intellectual analysis is turned towards the world of existing beings and substances, theories abound and provide humans with trustworthy laws and equations they can use to harness reality and predict outcomes. We can trust the intellect in the realm of analysis because it has proven that it can forecast patterns and cycles on the

⁸⁶ Ibid. 663/163.

earth. For Bergson, it “is impossible to consider the mechanism of our intellect and the progress of our science without arriving at the conclusion that between intellect and matter there is, in fact, symmetry, concord and agreement.”⁸⁷ Bergson goes so far as to claim that he believes that science can reach an absolute.⁸⁸ It rests on those who claim that our knowledge is relative to prove that it is relative. Until that has been accomplished, Bergson believes that humans can trust their intellectual analysis of the world.

The intellect does not fashion the object or fail to transmit a proper perception that one could then call relative. The inadequacy of the intellect is that it must freeze the swirling movement of perception into images on which it is able to take focus. The inadequacy lies in the articulations and solidifications that it must focus on in order to recognize objects and act in the world in relation to those objects. Focusing on specific parts, the intellect leaves out the remainder and the relations that do not interest it. One could say that the intellect is forgetful. It does not realize what is going on in the interval. It pays no attention to the shoes when it wants to see the face. It seeks the time on the clock and misses the humans walking around underneath. Intellectual knowledge is not relative, it is fragmented. Turn attention to the shoes and one is given an image that is just as truthful as the face for which one was previously searching. We are not forced to view the world from a relative position, but from a splintered position. This is the weakness of the intellect and also the weakness of the science that comes from this mode of perception.

⁸⁷ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1279/39.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 1280/40.

In his analysis of science, Bergson seeks to delimit its boundaries. In probing the material world and objects in space, humans must use the intellect and trust their perceptions. However, when humans seek to know themselves, their emotions and internal experience of the world, there is another form and method of thought that is required. Philosophical thought is unique in that it stands outside the intellect, yet remains internal to the human and springs forth from the questions that arise internally as humans confront their places in reality. Bergson calls for boundary-making in relation to thought. He wants to draw the line between intellectual and speculative thought. For Bergson, a proper metaphysics is one that incorporates knowledge of the world through perception and the intellect as well as intuitional knowledge of one's inner durational experience of reality. He does not call for the elimination of either realm, but the proper mode of thought in both. The inadequacy of the intellect is its inability to adequately deal with the totality. The knowledge that it gives of the particulars is trustworthy and it can probe the depths of the natural world. However, it constantly focuses and refocuses on that with which it is interested. The intellect attains its knowledge through focusing attention and delimiting the boundaries of objects in the world: through a fragmentation. This is adequate for Bergson as long as one remains outside of the realm of philosophy. In spite of the fact that the intellect is able to examine the heterogeneity of the world, it remains "unable to attain to the true transformation and radical creation that truly constitute life, thought and becoming."⁸⁹ It is not enough to know the world through the intellect because it is always influenced by its interests. The problem with using the intellectual mode in philosophical thinking is that it immobilizes the mobility that

⁸⁹ (Lazzarato, "Machines," 115)

Bergson believes exists as the foundation of the material world. In addition, it represents only one of the two capacities of thought that are part of the constitution of humanity. There is another form of thinking that is needed, and this is proper philosophical reflection. Chapter three will analyze Bergson's view of what philosophy is as well as the end of proper philosophical thought, but for now we must move on to an implicit critique that emerges from Bergson's analysis of the intellect: a critique of desire.

The Intellect and Desire

Bergson explicitly critiques concepts, the scientific method, and the relation between the two throughout his works. However, there is also a critique of desire embedded in his discussion of the intellect. The analysis of desire is important, as we will see later, because desire is an important aspect of human existence that hinders the attainment of a truly joyful, philosophical life. Because our goal is to outline the attainment of joy and its emergence as a primordial mode of revelation of the world, it is necessary that we show how desire is related to the intellect. In this section, we seek only to outline how we believe the intellect is related to desire. How one emerges from desire into an openness for joy will be the major thrust of our next chapter.

As Bergson has outlined it, the intellect constantly deals with various problems that present themselves to humans. When it has solved these problems, it naturally seeks other pressing difficulties. However, it often compounds difficulties in its desire for more. The intellect is that power of humankind that has led it to investigate the far reaches of space and the minute particles that found materiality. It has led to cures for illnesses and easier forms of transportation. However, in its search for the solutions to

more and more problems, the intellect has also had a devastating impact on the earth. In addition to technologies of destruction, there are technologies of absurdity. Unable to find solutions to problems of destruction, the intellect is content with solving problems of marketing and consumerism, promoting the development of products that serve the microscopic needs of a tiny fraction of society. There is no end to the progress of technology, no matter how absurd its goal. However, in its search for solutions, the intellect gets caught in a sort of endless wheel spinning.

Practical utility has been the cornerstone of most of the technologies of various societies throughout history. However, today we have access to and can harvest numerous raw materials and we are able to fashion tools that allow us to push the realms of practical knowledge further than they have ever gone before. Throughout history philosophers have confronted the problem of technology. However, Bergson provides a foundation for the critique of technology. If technological advancements are the result of the manner in which the intellect works on matter, then humans should be able to step back and out of the absurdity to which these advancements often lead. Identifying that the intellect will never find satisfaction in any new advancement, people can recognize that their insatiable desire can be countered by another mode of thought. However, what one finds is that the intellectual tendency to desire more is so entrenched in the mind that it blinds the reflective capacities of a majority of individuals in society.

At the base of the constant impulse for more is the desire for the new. Bergson's critique of the intellect also provides an explanation for the desire for the new. The desire for the new is not merely the result of the attempt to maintain a similar lifestyle to those that one believes are in a similar class. It is also not totally an attempt to impress

others. Rather, the desire for the new stems from the desire to attain new concepts. Even those who cannot afford the latest expensive technologies are interested in seeing and learning about new computers, tools that play music and videos, and phones that are multimedia centers. This desire is not merely in relation to electronic technologies. People enjoy seeing newly discovered organisms and images of objects that have never been seen before.

Humans celebrate new concepts. People are rewarded for creating new concepts and bringing them into existence. Scientists who develop new, effective methods of analysis are rewarded with grants. Imaginative inventors are rewarded with millions of people demanding their products. Even those who develop new forms of music, literature, and art are praised. The desire for the new in part is a desire to create new concepts for the emerging technologies. Bergson critiques the human capacity of concept formation in that its concepts are too broad to allow for the emergence of the details of individuals. However, it is not merely an innate capability of humans to form concepts for things they have not seen before; it is an enjoyable activity. The satisfaction of obtaining new concepts underlies the desire for more and the desire for the new. However, once something has been established with a specific concept, it is often left as one quickly moves to the next thing that requires identification.

I have examined Bergson's critique of the intellect because I believe that the intellect is integral in keeping the attunement of joy at bay. In fact, if it functions as Bergson proposes, it is also that which keeps anxiety at bay. Remember from the first chapter that Heidegger claims that anxiety only arises when one loses sight of objects in the world and experiences the objectivity of being in the world as such. Having lost sight

of individual objects in the world, Dasein is left in relationship to the overwhelmingness of being. It is when Dasein loses sight of individual objects that it is overcome by its own existence in the world and its minute place within the totality. Anxiety arises in this situation, and Heidegger directly states that when one examines specific objects in the world, one is not located within the mode of anxiety. When Dasein experiences fear, Dasein is not located in anxiety. Fear is an inauthentic mode of anxiety in that it focuses on specific individuals that are approaching from a specific location. Anxiety is the experience of a Dasein that cannot find the location from which that which is threatening is coming. This is because one finds oneself absolutely surrounded by that which is threatening.

For Bergson, the intellect is that which allows one to focus on individuals and generalize about the relations that occur in the world. If one were to examine Heidegger's account of anxiety through a Bergsonian lens, one could say that it is the intellect that keeps humans in a state of fear in general and for the most part. In focusing on the individuals and conceptualizing them under general categories, humans situate themselves in relation to other objects and organisms. This keeps them from experiencing the anxiety that is necessary in Heidegger's account of authenticity. One could then say that the underlying aspect of everydayness and being caught up in the possibilities of a given society is the mode of the intellect. I believe that Bergson would agree with Heidegger that humanity begins in a state of being covered over. However, it appears that in *Being and Time*, Heidegger provides an analysis of this state in its givenness. Dasein finds itself in a world in numerous senses. One aspect of this world is that Dasein is in the world with others and that it begins from an entangled state of

fallenness in relation to its possibilities. That is, it must act and think within the framework of the mode of thought that is proscribed by society.

This is the junction where Bergson and Heidegger split from one another. Actually, one might say that Bergson is still behind attempting to find the foundation for Dasein's being in the way that it is. Heidegger examines Dasein in relation to the way that it finds itself located in a world with others. He examines its given mode of existence. However, Bergson would claim that the reason for Dasein being blind, in general and for the most part, to its ownmost possibility (*Angst* in relation to being towards death) for authenticity is a result of the mode in which the intellect fragments and fixes objects in the world. The reason why *Angst* occurs so rarely is because one must lose sight of the objects in the world. The intellect is the function of mind that is the arch enemy of this occurrence. When objects start to fade and Dasein begins questioning the meanings it has up to that point attributed to objects and others, the intellect is there to reconstitute reality and to remind Dasein of the meanings of the concepts. To let oneself go in the experience of *Angst* is actually to do violence to the everyday mode of thought. We find similar passages about this violence in both Heidegger and Bergson in relation to the mode of authentic philosophical thought. We see it from Heidegger as he speaks about the method of ontological analysis.

Dasein's *kind of Being* thus *demand*s that any ontological Interpretation which sets itself the goal of exhibiting the phenomena in their primordially, *should capture the being of this entity, in spite of this entity's own tendency to cover things up*. Existential analysis, therefore, constantly has the character of *doing violence* [*Gewaltsamkeit*], whether to the claims of the everyday interpretation, or to its complacency and its tranquilized obviousness.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 311/288.

Bergson also talks about the violence of philosophical thought in his *Creative Evolution*. In the following quote, Bergson is writing about how one can come into contact with the irreducible and irreversible. He is attempting to examine how one can move away from the fragmentation of the intellect and its manifestation in scientific thought in order to come into direct contact with reality. He says:

To get an idea of this irreducibility and this irreversibility, we must break with scientific habits which are adapted to the fundamental requirements of thought, we must do violence to the mind, go counter to the natural bent of the intellect. But that is just the function of philosophy.⁹¹

In addition, Bergson speaks of violence when examining thought that goes against the mode of the intellect. Unless the intellect does violence to itself, says Bergson, it will always think the base of reality in immobility and movement in juxtaposed instants.⁹² It seems then that both Heidegger and Bergson have an account of human entanglement (to use a term from Heidegger that Bergson does not use), and that they both believe that there is an everyday mode of thought and another mode of thought that runs counter to the everyday mode. However, in acting, the counter mode of thought does violence to the natural bent of the intellect.

In a manner similar to the way in which the intellect keeps anxiety at bay, we argue that the intellect is that which keeps joy as attunement from emerging. The intellect constantly seeks solutions to problems. Its satisfaction is fleeting. Its desire for more leaves humans in a state of absence as they continually strive for that which is beyond what they have. Living in a mode of striving does not allow them to rest and

⁹¹ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 519/24.

⁹² Ibid. 663/163.

experience satisfaction with their given situations. Lack of satisfaction is one of the primary attributes of the intellect. Unable to pull themselves out of their desire, humans toil for more and rarely stop to rest and examine what they have. Constantly looking to the future, they cast the past into a darkness from which harmony cannot emerge. The intellect is never satisfied, and the human caught up in the mode of the intellect finds him or herself overcome by desire.

Bergson's analysis of the intellect leads to an analysis of desire as the outcome of the unending drive of the intellect to answer questions and solve problems. These problems can be as simple as moving out of the way of someone who is not paying attention and about to bump into you or as complex as creating programs for laser guided rockets. The intellect is the power of fragmenting and delineating boundaries in the world with a view to action. It is always for the sake of action that the intellect works to harness the real. What this means is that the intellect does not think for the sake of thought, but for the sake of acting on the things that it finds most relevant to its immediate moment. It delimits boundaries so that we can take the action of manipulating the keys on the keyboard. It allows us to exist in a world that is not chaotic and imperceptible. It gives us confidence (often unconscious) when we cross the street or greet someone by name after we recognize her face. For Bergson, the intellect functions with action as its goal. Because of the intellect, humans are able to adopt positions that allow them to act and react in the most appropriate ways.

The problem with this mode of perception is that it cannot help but overstep the realm of inert objects. It moves into the realm of being with other creatures and other humans. It is not our desires that motivate the intellect to pursue a specific course; it is

the intellect that creates the conditions for the desires to emerge. The intellect emerged as that function of the mind that allowed for the human being to promote its safety and well-being. This was and still continues to be the primary desire. However, as societies advanced they were progressively more adept at solving problems that dealt with productivity. For example, the hundreds of hours a year it once took people (and still takes in many places around the world) to gather or chop wood for their heating supply is now time that can be spent doing something else. The same can be said for the attainment of food. Not only are we free from hunting for or growing our own food, if we so desire, we can even buy it plucked, peeled and chopped in a matter of minutes. These outcomes are the result of the intellectual ability to solve problems. The primary desire (safety and well-being) is often times not in the fore-front of many of our minds as we follow our daily paths. Because the intellect is limited in its focus to that with which it is directly interested, it now finds itself free to bring other things into its gaze. Because the primary desire has been supplanted in many developed nations, it has become almost totally unconscious unless one's life is threatened in some drastic manner. Remaining alive is not in the forefront of most people's minds as they confront their daily activities. Instead, this primary desire has been satisfied to such a great extent that the intellect immediately jumps to other things with which it is interested. It is allowed to do so more than ever today because of how developed societies have taken measures to provide for people's immediate needs. When the primary desire falls out of direct consciousness, the intellect provides the necessary conditions for the emergence of other objects to which we can take up certain positions of action and manipulate those objects to our advantage. We focus our attention, separate some specific object out from the rest, and then our

desire builds as we come into contact with or harness the desired object. Human well-being extends beyond the realm of the primary desire and new objects are grafted into the main branch.

In this way, desire grows and extends its boundaries to the edge of the realm of that which is grasped by the intellect. For Bergson, one who lives in the mode of the intellect will constantly feel the insatiability of desire. This chapter has been a presentation of the mode of the intellect because it represents an obstacle to the attainment of the joy Bergson promotes through philosophy and harmony with the real. The individual who desires constantly is the one who is constantly turned outward to the view of the intellect. However, for Bergson, the joy of life emerges when one is able to turn inward and leave the fragmentation brought about by the intellect behind. In Bergson's view, it is impossible to properly pursue knowledge of the real and philosophy when one views all relations from the perspective of action and desire. We will see in the next chapter that one must release desire and attempt to exclude it in order to attain to knowledge of the real. It is impossible for one who desires in the mode of the intellect to reach the peace that is necessary for the emergence of joy. The intellect constantly leaves one in a state of dissatisfaction with what has been attained as it allows for the manifestation and extension of desire. Joy is not something that is experienced in a state of dissatisfaction and desire. Release from the intellect allows for the recollection of intuition and the turn inward that is characteristic of proper philosophical reflection. I will argue that this is the outcome of Bergson's ideas about philosophical reflection, and hence, the foundation from which joy can emerge.

CONCLUSIONS

As we mentioned earlier, for Bergson the problem with previous philosophical conceptions of the intellect is that they tended to find the seat of philosophical investigation located within its boundaries. They gave too much power to the intellect and extended its domain too far. However, this is not merely the fault of previous philosophers. It is the outcome of the power of the intellect itself. The intellect developed in order to bring an element of spatiality to the perception of organisms. Its original function was to define limits to inert objects and other beings in the world in order that humans could survive and use their surroundings for their own benefit. As the intellect developed, the primordial organism found itself in more control of its surroundings, finally able to manipulate objects to create tools that manufacture tools as humans emerged. However, at the same time that the intellect became ruler of the inert, it found that it was also able to turn itself inward and examine the flow of inner life that humans experience and characterize as their being or existence. It had now become ruler of both the external and the internal. The problem lay in the fact that the original function of the intellect was to spatialize and fragment. It brought this mode of interaction with inert matter into the realm of the living (and speculative thought) and believed it was allowed to work with the same principles on the internal as it does with the inert. It is this inversion of function, this turning inward, that Bergson believes leads to philosophical errors and false problems.

In addition to its function of fragmenting, the intellect is also characterized by powers of representation and generalization. Symbols function as representatives of the

given forms of objects and organisms located in the real [*le réel*], and the intellect readily extends these symbols to represent thousands of individuals under the heading of various genera. In using the intellect to examine the intricacies of inner human life and outer reality, one will have to symbolize on a greater scale in order to represent what is actually occurring. “Our perception, whose role it is to hold up a light to our actions, works a dividing up of matter that is always too sharply defined, always subordinated to practical needs, consequently always requiring revision.”⁹³ However, rather than revising its stance or attempting to see objects as they are rather than as what they could be, the intellect continues to move according to its needs and the desires of the individual.

Bergson’s philosophy constantly focuses on the vital order. The vital order is the emergence of reality and the movement of organisms and relations on the earth. It is perception itself that cuts matter into objects. Because of the propensity of the intellect to cut up the flow of matter, the “vital order” is brought under the subjection of geometrical and law-like concepts that cannot adopt the flow of matter, and we are forced to view those portions of the material world that interest us. Bergson claims that “the greatest philosophical difficulties arise...from the fact that the forms of human action venture outside their proper sphere. We are made in order to act as much as, and more than, in order to think – or rather, when we follow the bent of our nature, it is in order to act that we think.”⁹⁴ The intellect is necessary in that it is that which provides for the ability to interact with and function in the world in which we find ourselves. However, when it

⁹³ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 670/170.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 746/244-245.

tries to impose its geometrical order on the realm of the vital, something essential is lost in the representations that are given.

The problem with philosophy for Bergson occurs when philosophers put *ideas* at the base of all thought. These ideas are unshakeable and represent the stability that underlies what appears to be movement and change that constantly occur around the perceiver. Because of the manner in which the intellect perceives the world, humans are left with juxtaposed snapshots taken from reality (the cinematographical mechanism of thought).⁹⁵ “They indicate the vision that a systematic intellect obtains of the universal becoming when regarding it by means of snapshots, taken at intervals, of its flowing.”⁹⁶ Instead of starting from movement, evolution, and becoming and then moving to the stable, the evolved, and the form; humans posit an immutability that for some reason must lie underneath all that they perceive. However, Bergson does not believe that one can make change spring from the immutable as foundation of reality.

In addition to the inability to admit change, the way in which the intellect takes immobile snapshots of reality also leads to the destruction of duration as the individual pictures (moments) lose that which subsists through them. It is the philosophy of Forms and Ideas that springs from letting the intellect rule one’s philosophical thought. Duration and becoming (the foundations of Bergson’s philosophy) are then only degradations of the immobile Ideas that are thought to represent true reality. However,

⁹⁵ The cinematographical mode of thought is the topic of the fourth chapter of *Creative Evolution*. Bergson believes that the manner in which the intellect presents the flow of reality is exactly the same as the way in which a film produces movement: frame by frame. This action does not present movement as it is in itself, but merely juxtaposed frames that give the appearance of movement when run off at a certain speed.

⁹⁶ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 761-762/260.

the forms are not perceptions; they are concepts that are transposed to be the foundations of reality. Bergson claims that “the Forms must be stationed outside space as well as above time.”⁹⁷ It is in this way that the sensible becomes the shadow of itself. The materiality of matter is a sort of void that negates the truthfulness of that which is perceived, and the ancients had to posit immutable Ideas in order to found a realm of truth to which the mind could aspire. It is evident here that Bergson is arguing for a philosophy that would go back to the materiality of the real. He desires to move away from immutable ideas and plunge back into existence and the being of the world.⁹⁸

The Greeks brought forth a philosophy that Bergson believed was “the natural metaphysic of the human intellect.”⁹⁹ The intellect fractures the flow of evolutionary change into a million bits and then lines the pieces up one after another. It substitutes forms and concepts for the things that it finds before it in the world. At the same time, it finds impurity and imperfection in those things that are not stable. This results in a movement towards defining the physical in terms of the logical.¹⁰⁰ Thinking cinematographically, humans create a science that coordinates solid concepts and signs that are supposed to represent actually existing entities and relationships. In this way, humans find a science that precedes nature as they transpose the categories of the intellect into a system for studying the world. Finally, with their finely tuned *a priori* method, they are able to found the mobility of the universe in the stability of ideas and concepts.

⁹⁷ Ibid. 764/262.

⁹⁸ Bergson’s ideas about materiality and his philosophy of reality will be one of the major themes of the next chapter as we present his philosophy in contrast to that form of philosophy presented here.

⁹⁹ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 770/268.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. 772/270.

“It is always then, in short, practical utility that science has in view.”¹⁰¹ Scientists must work with signs rather than the moving reality, and science itself is obligated to study only juxtaposed instants rather than the durational flow of its objects.

Analyzing Bergson’s critique of the intellect sets the foundation for the manner in which humans have developed their capacity to live and move in the world in relation to other objects and beings. The intellect provides humans with the ability to designate boundaries to objects and select those images in which they are interested. In addition, the intellect translates its perceptual activity into the realm of language. Not only are humans able to internally section reality, they can express this partitioning using concepts that can be applied to myriad objects that share similar characteristics. The intellect is absolutely necessary for humans in that it allows for survival as humans are able to adopt positions from which they can most adequately interact with the world.

Although the intellect is integral for survival, we outlined the inadequacies of the manner in which humans use concepts to identify and categorize specific objects in the world. For Bergson, individual concepts tend to round off the corners of reality. He compares concepts to large nets in which one can snare a multitude of objects and creatures. Bergson thinks that this ability is highly useful. However, his problem with concepts is that the intervals are excluded for the sake of the details with which humans have interest. The remainder is passed over, and this is in a certain sense, a violation of adequate knowledge. At the same time, Bergson’s analysis shows the weaknesses of the intellect when it moves outside of the realm of what he calls the inert. We have shown that Bergson’s analysis of the intellect leads to a demand that humans put limits on their

¹⁰¹ Ibid. 773/271.

sciences and philosophies. Science oversteps its bounds when it attempts to reconstitute the flow of reality with immobilities and then extends into the internal realm of the human. Bergson calls for specific limits for the knowledge realm of science.

Finally, we analyzed the experience of desire, arguing that the intellect was the foundation for the possibility of human desire. The desire of the intellect to solve problems and find new concepts leads humans to a primary state of dissatisfaction. It also creates a base from which humans view the world as a series of problems needing solutions, or objects that must be obtained. The practical bent of the intellect then tends to systematize relationships in terms of utility, thereby eliminating other integral aspects necessary to proper knowledge in a Bergsonian sense.

Our analysis of the intellect naturally leads us to Bergson's philosophical response to the problems we have posed in this chapter. In contrast to the pseudo-scientific method of many philosophers, Bergson will show us his foundation for proper philosophical reflection. He will examine the use of concepts and call for a new form of conceptual thought founded in singularity and duration. In addition, Bergson will lead us away from the practical bent of the intellect to a realm of openness towards the real that seeks to know in order to know rather than to know in order to dominate. In our examination of Bergson's responses to all these questions and critiques, we will find that he founds his pursuit of philosophy on the idea of harmony with the real and with the hope that the end of philosophical reflection is an attunement of joy. Therefore, our analysis will not only explicate Bergson's philosophical responses, but also illuminate specific attributes of the human being caught up in the attunement of joy.

CHAPTER III

JOY AND BERGSONIAN PHILOSOPHY

But suppose that instead of trying to rise above our perception of things we were to plunge into it for the purpose of deepening and widening it.

Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*

In the previous chapter of this dissertation, we sought to bring out Bergson's analysis of the intellect. The goal of this critique was to lay a foundation from which we could venture out into what Bergson would consider proper philosophical thought. We undertake this task because Bergson's explications of proper philosophy are integrally united to his conceptions of joy. In fact, we will argue that joy is the outcome that Bergson believes will emerge in one who pursues proper philosophical reflection. Analyzing Bergson's ideas about the philosophical method will directly transport us into the realm of a joy that emerges when one turns away from intellectual grasping and towards an intuitional relationship with objects in the world. In this way, the "cold world" is radically altered when one is caught up in the joy of a perception brought back to an understanding of intuition and duration. Bergson finds that joy can emerge from the view from utility as one recognizes the inadequacies of the intellect and attempts to adopt a view that is engulfed in the movement of the emergence of the reality that continually unfurls in the present.

Bergsonian metaphysics is focused on the role and method of philosophical inquiry in relation to the real. For Bergson, it is not the role of metaphysics to strive towards a highest goal or unified theory that would encapsulate all reality. Instead, if metaphysics is the analysis of the real, then it must descend (or ascend depending on how one looks at it) to a level that existed before the intellect. The goal of metaphysics is not to understand the world as it is presented through the intellect, but to “remember” that state from which the intellect emerged. It is to retrieve the existence of the being from which the intellect emerged. For Bergson, the intellect is merely one way of knowing reality that is accompanied by intuition. Bergson believes that these two modes of thought emerged from a primordial organism that held both in equal measure. However, it appears that those organisms that are successful evolutionarily are those that have either gone in the direction of intelligence or instinct, not both at the same time.

For Bergson, humanity has traversed the path of intelligence. This has led to the emergence of philosophical thought. However, philosophy “has not yet become completely conscious of itself.”¹ We will see that for Bergson, the role of metaphysics is to go back up the plane that science has descended as it solidifies all reality into concepts and laws. It is to reach back to the primordial state of mind in which intellect and intuition were one. It is in this way that Bergson is able to promote intuition and duration as adequate in relation to metaphysics because they are those experiences that go back to the primordial “mind” from which the intellect emerged. If metaphysics is the study of the foundations of reality, and reality is given through the mind, metaphysics must then be a retrieval of the primordial manner of “perception” that brought forth both instinctual

¹ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 671/171.

and intellectual thought. It is a diminution of positive reality that brings forth space and the order that math finds there.² The goal of metaphysics must then be to go back to the “original movement” that was unencumbered by the intellect and its mode of spatiality in relation to reality.

INTUITION

In order to begin an analysis of Bergson’s philosophy and its outcomes, one must necessarily confront his ideas about intuition and the role of intuition in philosophical thought and more generally in the lives of all humans. For Bergson, intuition is not a method in the usual sense of method. It is a faculty of the mind that has been covered over by the dominance of the intellect. The method of intuition is the attempt to allow for the re-emergence of a faculty that Bergson hopes can supplement and perhaps expand intellectual knowledge. It is only through intuition that Bergson believes one will be able to properly experience the duration of reality and supplement the inadequacies of intellectual thought. However, the subject of intuition involves a dearth of research articles and portions of books. One could write an entire dissertation on intuition alone. Therefore, we will limit our discussion to an outline of the major attributes of Bergsonian intuition.

In order to understand Bergson’s metaphysics, one must first begin from his distinction between analysis and intuition as modes of study. Bergson claims that it is only through intuition that one can understand something absolutely. As we have mentioned earlier, intellectual knowledge always tends to harness the object in categories

² Ibid. 674/173.

that do not allow for the totality of the object to emerge. Analysis is the intellectual ability to reduce an object to the parts that it has in common with other similar objects. The examination of the intellect in the previous chapter was the elucidation of the manner in which analysis emerged in the world through human thought. For Bergson, to understand something absolutely is to have an adequate knowledge of the totality of an object and its relationships with other objects in the world. It is to have an intellectual intuition of the foundations of the object. In contrast to intellect, intuition is “the *sympathy* by which one is transported into the interior of an object in order to coincide with what there is unique and consequently inexpressible in it.”³ In a similar manner, Bergson claims in *Creative Evolution* that the metaphysical elucidation of reality does not occur in the direction of intelligence, “but in that of ‘sympathy’.”⁴

In contrast to intuition, analysis is the mode of study that reduces reality to symbols. In the attempt to increase his or her knowledge, the analyst increases *ad infinitum* the positions from which he or she studies the object to create a more complete picture. However, this picture can always be refined in some way or another. There is always another position in which the observer can position himself. Analysis is undertaken with a goal in mind in relation to the object. Therefore, it is expedient to reduce the characteristics of the object to those that are necessary in order to work with the object and relay the key information that is necessary in order to elucidate the object to one’s intended audience. However, Bergson believes that metaphysics is that mode of study which seeks to see the object in itself rather than for something else. Bergson calls

³ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1395/161.

⁴ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 644/144.

metaphysics the attempt to do away with the symbolic and to gain access to objects as they are in themselves. “*Metaphysics is therefore the science which claims to dispense with symbols.*”⁵ No matter how many vantage points one takes in relation to an object, analytical knowledge must always symbolize what is occurring in the real. Metaphysics is thus characterized as a mode in which one attempts to eliminate the symbolic in order to allow for intricacies of beings in the world to shine forth.

Some would definitely respond to Bergson’s claims about a sort of inner knowledge with extreme skepticism. His claim that one must dispense with symbols and coincide with an object is provocative and some might claim that it is impossible to coincide with objects. Bergson might actually agree. However, Bergson would counter this response by claiming that we all have direct intuitional knowledge of one thing: our own selves which endure. We are all able to perfectly coincide with ourselves and the knowledge that we have of ourselves is direct, given immediately, and our own being emerges through this givenness. As one examines his or her perceptions of the world, he or she will notice the objectification and delimitation that constantly intrudes into experience. However, when one turns one’s attention inward, he will find that the inner state is a flowing that is unlike any other perception. This flow is characterized by a movement of state into state that can only be juxtaposed after one has lived through a specific amount of time and then turns one’s attention back towards the internal states that emerged, one from the other.

Bergson believes that this experience of internal duration has led to the various philosophical schools and their primary concepts. All these schools have attempted to

⁵ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1396/162.

most adequately represent that which is given through internal duration. Depending on which concept they find to be most adequate (being, the one, multiplicity, etc) each school then uses these concepts in order to create a starting point from which they will be able to move out and quantify reality and existence. However, Bergson does not believe that metaphysics is merely a conceptualization that goes back and forth between ideas and schools. Instead, if metaphysics “is a serious occupation of the mind, it must transcend concepts to arrive at intuition.”⁶ That at which Bergson is aiming with metaphysics is knowledge of reality in which one plunges into that reality more adequately and fully. Remember from the previous chapter that concepts tend to round off the corners and details of existing objects and beings, and therefore Bergson claims that one must eliminate concepts (as they are generally recognized) in order to attain to an intuitional knowledge. It is in concepts that the individuals are lost in a mass of similar individuals. In his book *Bergsonism*, Gilles Deleuze expresses this idea as a focus on differences of intensities, or differences of the “more or less.” “In short, each time that we think in terms of more or less, we have already disregarded the differences in kind between the two orders, or between beings, between existents.”⁷ What Deleuze is saying here is that thinking in relations of intensities (through concepts) tends to fail to recognize the differences that actually exist between individuals. This failure to recognize the individuals as a result of focusing on gradations is unacceptable to Bergson.

Bergson distinguishes between his understanding of what conceptual thought ought to be and the manner of conceptual thought posited by the intellect. Metaphysics

⁶ Ibid. 1401-1402/168.

⁷ Gilles Deleuze, *Bergsonism* (New York: Zone Books, 1998), 20.

relies on conceptual thought because all other realms of knowledge rely on conceptual thought. However, metaphysics is “itself only when it goes beyond the concept, or at least when it frees itself of the inflexible and ready-made concepts and creates others very different from those we usually handle, I mean flexible, mobile, almost fluid representations, always ready to mold themselves on the fleeting forms of intuition.”⁸ Bergson believes that internal duration can be given in intuition, but that it is impossible to adequately harness that intuition in conceptual thought as it is understood in our critique from chapter two. Instead, he proposes that humans go about formulating their concepts differently, focusing on individuals rather than grouping under genera.

Bergson says that “a true empiricism is the one which purposes to keep as close to the original itself as possible, to probe more deeply into its life, and by a kind of spiritual *auscultation*, to feel its soul palpitate; and this true empiricism is the real metaphysics.”⁹ With these statements, Bergson is calling those who pursue metaphysics to go beyond the everyday concepts used to quantify things. The term *auscultation* is the name given to the technique whereby doctors listen to internal organs in order to determine if they sound as if they are functioning properly. For example, a doctor can listen to a patient’s heart and literally hear “heart murmurs” that might indicate the presence of health problems. Here Bergson is using this language in order to make the claim that his goal of intuition is a thought that attempts to hear the inner workings of the object, to hear the heart of the object beat and to attempt to coincide with the pulsations that keep the object “alive.” He is calling for a new form of thought that is extremely difficult because it

⁸ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1402/168.

⁹ *Ibid.* 1408/175.

cannot make use of concepts as they are given by society. Bergsonian empiricism has a requirement that one takes the time and makes the effort to elucidate the intricate aspects of beings. Deleuze formulates this as his second rule of Bergsonian method: “Struggle against illusion, rediscover the true differences in kind or articulations of the real.”¹⁰ The true differences of kind result when one takes the time to examine the miniscule aspects of the object and formulates what one might call singular concepts.

In the second introduction to *Le pensée et le mouvant* (*The Creative Mind*), Bergson uncharacteristically shows a minor outburst of emotion as he examines the state of education in France.¹¹ Among many things, Bergson seems to ridicule those thinkers who are adept at using language, and are thought to be experts in all areas because of their facility with words. “*Homo faber, Homo sapiens*, I pay my respects to both, for they tend to merge. The only one to which I am antipathetic is *Homo loquax* whose thought, when he does think, is only a reflection upon his talk.”¹² Bergson’s critique here is aimed at those who would replace the real with words that are supposed to represent the totality of the objects to which they refer. These smooth talkers are able to harness all aspects of existence: art, sport, emotion, literature, politics, within their conceptual nets and speak with ease about all subjects because they can play the same word games and use their vocabularies to impress others. It is a socialization of the truth that then others who see these leaders use to talk about society and life in their own verbal circles. However, Bergson says that “this socialization must be reserved for practical truths for

¹⁰ Deleuze, *Bergsonism*, 21.

¹¹ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1323-1329/82-88.

¹² *Ibid.* 1325/85.

which it is made. It has no business in the domain of pure knowledge, science and philosophy.”¹³

In contrast to the human who uses concepts provided through the socialization of the truth to subsume all reality under conceptual schemata, Bergson renounces utility.

The duty of philosophy should be to intervene here actively, to examine the living without any reservation as to practical utility, by freeing itself from forms as habits that are strictly intellectual. Its own special object is to speculate, that is to say, to see; its attitude toward the living should not be that of science, which aims only at action, and which, being able to act only by means of inert matter, presents to itself the rest of reality in this single respect.¹⁴

As A.D. Lindsay points out, Bergson’s philosophy “attempts to apprehend reality, not in the light or as it may serve the particular purposes of action, but as it is in itself.”¹⁵ It is here that we find another important aspect of Bergsonian philosophy. In contrast to the intellectual analysis which almost always appears to Bergson as knowledge for the sake of something else, Bergsonian intuition attempts to counter the utilitarian schemata of the intellect by thinking with no regard to practical utility.

It is important to note that in releasing one from practical thought and the intellect, one cannot reduce Bergson’s method to a merely emotional or instinctual method. Bergson vilifies those who would reduce his method of intuition to feeling or instinct. “I recommend a certain manner of thinking which courts difficulty; I value effort above everything.”¹⁶ He says that no line of what he has written about intuition

¹³ Ibid. 1328/ 87.

¹⁴ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 661/161.

¹⁵ Lindsay, *The Philosophy of Bergson*, 236.

¹⁶ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1328/87-88.

could be reduced to emotion or instinct.¹⁷ Intuition is reflection for Bergson, and this mode of thought requires intense effort for each new object. It is not merely a relaxation of the mind in the attempt to eliminate conceptual thought. Instead, it is always a new effort for each new object. It is the attempt to think through each experience and perception in order to understand the singularity and its relations with other singularities.

What one finds when one examines Bergson's ideas about philosophical thought is that Bergson believes that metaphysics is the study of the internal intuition of the givenness of ourselves and of reality. "My initiation into the true philosophical method began the moment I threw overboard verbal solutions, having found in the inner life an important field of experiment."¹⁸ Bergson believes that his philosophy is a protest against those metaphysicians who set up conceptual schemata at the foundations of reality or those who would extend their philosophical observations to general principles that govern the rest of the world. "All my philosophical activity was a protestation against this way of philosophizing."¹⁹

Bergson's philosophical discovery was his method, and this method is a form of empiricism that attempts to think objects as they appear and outside of typical conceptual frameworks. This method does not call for the elimination of conceptual thought. Rather, he claims that philosophy must reform its concepts. Philosophy thus understood is the attempt to zero in on the target object. Rather than extrapolate about foundations and extend attributes to the object that do not reside in the representation of the object,

¹⁷ Ibid. 1328/88.

¹⁸ Ibid. 1330/89-90.

¹⁹ Ibid. 1330/90.

Bergson proposes that one analyze according to the measure that is given. This involves a reversal of the normal mode of the intellect. Typically, humans tend to go from concepts to objects. They begin by elucidating concepts that apply to an object before they have reflected on the object itself. “To try a concept on an object is to ask of the object what we have to do with it, what it can do for us.”²⁰ To ask what an object can do for us is to take a certain position in relation to the object both intellectually and physically. It is to preconceive the relations that can be satisfied by the object, and this mode is based on the view from action. There is no problem with understanding objects for the roles that they can play or that we might be able to play in relation to them. However, for Bergson, this mode automatically disqualifies this form of thought from the realm of the philosophical. The problem with analysis in the realm of the philosophical is that it tends to solidify and immobilize objects and relations: “analysis operates on immobility, while intuition is located in mobility or, what amounts to the same thing, in duration.”²¹ Bergson claims that philosophers have tended to set up systems of thought that inevitably display weaknesses that become points of destruction of these edifices. However, he believes that there is another mode of philosophical thought that could be more fruitful. “It would be to seek experience at its source, or rather above that decisive *turn* where, taking a bias in the direction of our utility, it becomes properly *human* experience.”²² David Morris does an excellent job explaining the outcomes of this mode of philosophy when he says that, “what we are seeking, concepts that let us make sense of

²⁰ Ibid. 1410/177.

²¹ Ibid. 1412/180.

²² Henri Bergson, *Matter and Memory*, trans. Nancy Margaret Paul (New York: Zone Books, 1991), 184.

articulations of a continuity, are not found by contacting a transcendent beyond, or by adding a magic dash of universals to experience; what we are seeking is *within* experience, but at its source, past our usual fragmentation of it.”²³ As we have said numerous times before, the fragmentation of the real occurs because of the view from utility that characterizes the intellect. In moving away from utility and the turn of experience that casts reality in a utilitarian light, “Bergsonian intuition seeks precisely what Kant would have called intellectual intuition: an intuitively given experience that already contains the concepts that make sense of it.”²⁴ For Bergson, the real is variability, and the views taken by the intellect merely form snapshots of the mobility of the real. To think that one can begin from immobile concepts in order to understand the mobility of the real is to make the most common intellectual error. One using ready-made concepts will not be able to adequately come to knowledge of the inner nature of the real. Metaphysics must be the attempt to go against the natural thinking of the intellect and to “place oneself immediately, through a dilation of the mind, in the thing one is studying, in short, to go from reality to concepts and not from concepts to reality.”²⁵

Bergson claims that the intellect multiplies the views it can take of the object, but it never enters into the object. In contrast, “it is to the very inwardness of life that *intuition* leads us – by intuition I mean instinct that has become disinterested, self-

²³ Morris, David. “Bergsonian Intuition, Husserlian Variation, Peircean Abduction: Toward a Relation between Method, Sense, and Nature.” *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 43, (2005): 281.

²⁴ Morris, “Bergsonian Intuition,” 281.

²⁵ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1415-1416/183.

conscious, capable of reflecting upon its object and of enlarging it indefinitely.”²⁶ In saying this, Bergson is making a distinction between animal intuition and human intuition. The sympathy by which animals perceive their worlds allows them to perceive from within. That is, they are unable to step outside of their immediate perceptions, encircle those perceptions, and determine actions in relation to those perceptions. Here we see that intuition is the sympathy that is properly human. In humankind, instinct has become self-conscious and disinterested. It is able to respond through thought. It no longer has to react according to instinctual pathways (although sometimes humans do and must). It is important to note that this human intuition (sympathy) is the mode by which Bergson believes humans can attempt to adopt the movement of the objects of their perceptions. However, it is not evident what Bergson means by sympathy and this concept must be examined.

Bergson uses the example of the artist and the artistic intuition in which the artist attempts to display the object in terms of that which runs through the object in order to present his ideas about the sympathy by which one can coincide with the object of thought. For example, realism is not the master of all art genres. In fact, the reactions to realism display the artistic intuition that something else must be elucidated in the object of artistic expression, that perhaps there is something more in the object than what occurs on its surface. Perhaps one sees the lines of the object that seem to hold the object together and one expresses these lines in the attempt to display the underlying current of movement in the body. In another instance, hyper-realistic sculptures shock the viewer into a sense of surreal awe. The body resembles a human perfectly. No detail is omitted.

²⁶ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 645/144-145.

However, the discomfort occurs because one realizes that this is not a living human. It does not adequately reproduce humanity no matter how intricate the detail. These artists show us that there are other modes of perceiving the object that lie outside the immediate quantification and boundary making of the intellect. All art is the attempt to provide a vision, and most of the time this vision represents something that is unseen by most onlookers, no matter how “realistic” the artistic image. Great art is a vision that is unique and that can manifest the intuition and perceptions that motivated the artist to produce the art work. Bergson proposes a similar aesthetic intuition in the face of the real: “But we can conceive an inquiry turned in the same direction as art, which would take life *in general* for its object...”²⁷

Although Bergson promotes such a turn of consciousness, he does understand that intuition is a “vague nebulosity” in relation to the dominance of intellect.²⁸ However, this does not mean that one should give up the search for this shrouded aspect of the mind. Rather, in addition to the knowledge that intelligence provides, “intuition may enable us to grasp what it is that intelligence fails to give us, and indicate the means of supplementing it.”²⁹ Intuition may be able to use the intellect to teach the intellect that its moulds are not a perfect fit for the reality it attempts to harness.

Thus, intuition may bring the intellect to recognize that life does not quite go into the category of the many nor yet into that of the one; that neither mechanical causality nor finality can give a sufficient interpretation of the vital process. Then, by the sympathetic communication which it establishes between us and the rest of the living, by the expansion of our consciousness which it brings about, it

²⁷ Ibid. 645/145.

²⁸ Ibid. 645/145.

²⁹ Ibid. 646/145.

introduces us into life's own domain, which is reciprocal interpenetration, endlessly continued creation.³⁰

Although intuition may be able to educate the intellect, it is not independent of the intellect. This is because it is the intellect that has allowed for the self-consciousness of intuition, i.e. it is the intellect which allows humans to think about the other aspect of human thinking (intuition) and its relationship to knowledge. If the intellect had not developed the ability to think about the constructions in the human mind, human intuition would have remained in the realm of instinct.³¹

These analyses lead Bergson to claim that metaphysics is integrally related to theory of knowledge. We must remember that metaphysics for Bergson is not the attempt to synthesize or create a structure of explanation. Instead, metaphysics is the process by which humans come to understand the existence of the real in an immediate and uncovered manner. We must also remember from our earlier discussion that in *Creative Evolution*, Bergson claims that metaphysics is the elucidation of the manner in which the human mind emerged. Metaphysics is the study of the foundations of the human mind. Bergson believes that it is only through the study of the process of evolution that one will come to understand how it is that there is the dual aspect of human thought. "The double form of consciousness is then due to the double form of the real, and theory of knowledge must be dependent upon metaphysics."³²

Although humans tend to fragment reality in order to study it and live in it, they also have the ability to use their minds to adopt the movement of reality. They can

³⁰ Ibid. 646/145-146.

³¹ Ibid. 646/146.

³² Ibid. 646-647/146.

actually reverse the intellectual bent of the mind and coincide with objects, move with them, and intuitively experience their own internal durational movement as they perceive these objects. They can cast off the categories and concepts for a direct knowledge. The perceiver is able to perceive the movement of the object internally and the internal duration of the perceiver flows with the same rhythm as the external object that is the cause of that intuitive flow. In other words, because the object causes an intuitive perceptual experience in the perceiver, the perceiver is reliant on the object (or objects) for the experience of internal duration. As one listens to a piece of music, his or her inner intuitive experience of duration (of being/existence in its internal flowing) is reliant upon the perceptions that he or she receives from the artist. One is able to experience his or her internal duration only because one is given perceptions from one's environment that in a sense, demand that one perceive them. One is at the whim of that which emits the perceptual material. He or she must follow it as it moves and fluctuates. He or she is sympathetic to it.

In order to understand the harmony that comes through sympathy, let us imagine a hunter who is hidden in a dense thicket as the sun rises over an alfalfa field as he waits for a white-tail deer to come for its morning food. He is clothed in camouflage that makes him virtually invisible in the tangle of brush where he is seated. First, he has become his surroundings. He sits almost motionless, lest he frighten his quarry as it passes. He scans the edge of the woods that line the field, searching for movement. All of a sudden, the antlers of a male deer emerge from the woods across the field. At this moment, the hunter's heart quickens and he waits for hours while the deer feeds and gets into range. As the deer moves into range, the hunter sights his target through a scope and

begins to coincide with his perceptions. We are not interested in an argument about motivations and the practical desire for food or for a certain kind of trophy. Instead, we use this example because it is a case in which the hunter perceives intuitively. He has forgotten all concepts and adopted a disposition in space that is the deer. He feels every movement that the deer makes, and time ceases to exist. There is only duration remaining. The deer is not merely influencing the perceptions of the hunter. The deer's movements are the hunter's movements. The position of the deer is the hunter's position. He has transported himself (with the help of a tool no doubt) across the field and he is living the life of the object as time breaks down. There is no immobility even when the deer stops to bend down and pluck up some food. The life of the hunter is his perception. He will recount later around a fire how his inner duration emerged, how time seemed to stop, and how he felt his perception hone in on the animal. His own life is his experience of that moment, a moment that cannot rightly be called a moment because it exists outside of time and in the realm of duration. It is in this way that one can and does adopt the becoming of the world and actually lives out the being of other objects.³³ The concentration of the hunter and his coincidence with the reality of his experience is translatable outside of the realm of sport. However, the problem is that it is not often that one perceives with the same concentration that one uses when trying to accomplish a task

³³ In his article, "Intuition and Sympathy in Bergson," David Lapoujade spends most of the article attempting to elucidate the relationship between sympathy and intuition (*Pli: Warwick Journal of Philosophy* 15, [2004]: 1-17). He does this through the lens of "reasoning by analogy." In the article he claims that sympathy is the aspect of mind that allows objects to become mind for us when he says that "It is through sympathy that life and matter become *mind* whereas it is through intuition that mind becomes duration." (Lapoujade, "Intuition," 17) However, I do not think that this adequately renders Bergson's more radical meaning. It is not through sympathy that objects become mind. Rather, it is through sympathy that the mind reaches out and literally becomes objects. This might be a rather arcane distinction, but I think it is necessary in understanding Bergson's philosophy. I believe the way that Lapoujade presents Bergson fails to adequately display the materiality of the world and its effects on human consciousness. Instead, he focuses more on ideas and thought processes as being constitutive of reality.

that takes great skill and dexterity. This is why Bergson is able to say that intuition requires intense effort and a rejuvenation of effort for each individual object. It requires focus and dedication to the idea that if one focuses, one will really see the object. It is in this sense that Bergson can say that humans have the capability of coinciding with that which they perceive. We are able to intuitively grasp the existence of other beings and our inner duration depends on the perceptual material that they exude into the realm of the real.³⁴

It is imperative for Bergson that the intuitional knowledge that one seeks in metaphysical thought should remain free from typical symbolization that would change it into analytical knowledge. Relativity in the realm of knowledge emerges when one substitutes the immobile analysis for the moving reality. “*Relative is symbolic knowledge [la connaissance symbolique] through pre-existing concepts, which goes from the fixed to the moving, but not so intuitive knowledge [la connaissance intuitive] which establishes itself in the moving reality and adopts the life itself of things.* This intuition obtains the absolute.”³⁵ Bergson believes that the grail of the harmonization of metaphysics and science can occur only when one recognizes that intuition is the mode of metaphysical thought.

³⁴ In his book *The Philosophy of Bergson*, A.D. Lindsay also points out that intuition can take place in human action as well as perception. He contrasts the movements carried out by a machine as it pounds out replicas of some particular car part or cuts through logs of wood with the hand of the concert violinist as she plays her instrument and falls into a kind of harmony with her violin. There is a sympathy that occurs because of the familiarity a master craftsman or artist has with her subject, and this sympathy is qualitatively antithetical to the methods of mass production that seek to create the most copies with the least cost of production.(220-221)

³⁵ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1424/192.

For Bergson, the error of historical metaphysical thought is that it has posited that there is more in the stable than in the unstable, more in contemplation than in action, and more in the Idea than perception. Others have attempted to show that metaphysical thought is a battle ground between opposing positions and that reality can be “poured” into pre-existing conceptual apparatuses that provide for human experience of the world. In contrast to these ideas, Bergson claims that metaphysics is not a dialectic on certain ancient questions about existence. Rather, it lives in philosophical masters.³⁶ Metaphysical thought that emerges from the great philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, and Kant has its source in intuition. What Bergson means here is that the fundamental intuitions of these philosophers led them to develop theories about the constitution of reality. Although they differed in their views, they all followed their intuitions of reality and what seemed to be the foundations of that reality. It was the initial impulse of intuition that led to their actions in bringing forth their ideas and working to hone those ideas in order to more adequately express them. The various schools that emerge and the battles that surround those schools are the results of the analysis of these masters by their disciples. Bergson believes that the foundation of the thoughts of these philosophers is metaphysical intuition of reality. This intuition has manifested itself in conceptual thought as the masters had to translate their initial intuitive experiences into symbols. However, there is a harmonious, underlying motivational source that one can feel coinciding between the thought of these different great philosophers. Impulsion

³⁶ Ibid. 1430-1431/198.

[*impulsion*] is the name that Bergson gives this source of philosophical motivation.³⁷

Providing the impetus for creation, this impulsion drives the creator to continue on in his or her study and provides relations and connections between that which has been studied and the fruitful ideas that come from the philosopher's mind. However, one cannot find this impulsion or this source if one turns one's attention towards it: "if one turns around suddenly to seize the impulsion felt, it slips away; for it was not a thing but an urge to movement, and although indefinitely extensible, it is simplicity itself."³⁸

Metaphysical intuition is the impulse that drives great philosophers (and even not so great philosophers) to produce and create. However, this impulse does not come about as one waits in one's apartment staring at a blank sheet of paper. Rather, it is the experience of a force that demands response as one makes the effort to study the world and its singular objects. In addition, one must reflect on the workings of the mind and its relationship to objects in the world in order to understand those ideas and perceptions that are given with utility as the aim and those that reveal something about duration and the essence of those objects. "For one does not obtain from reality an intuition, that is to say, a spiritual harmony with its innermost quality if one has not gained its confidence by a long comradeship with its superficial manifestations."³⁹ Again Bergson brings the idea of intuition back to an effort. This time the effort is the study of the seemingly simple aspects (superficial manifestations) of life and reality. However, metaphysical

³⁷ Ibid. 1431/199.

³⁸ Ibid. 1431/199.

³⁹ Ibid. 1432/200.

knowledge is not a complete synthesis of the facts of existence. Instead, Bergson claims it is “the whole of experience.”⁴⁰

In the following section, we will turn our attention to Bergson’s understanding of the metaphysical foundations of reality. Once we understand Bergson’s ideas about the foundations of reality, we will attempt to show how his philosophical method seeks to understand that reality more adequately. Turning towards objects and the multiplicity of reality will lead to a metaphysics that attempts to grasp the totality. However, totality in a Bergsonian sense differs from the subsuming of all individuals under a common banner or concept. Instead, this totality is filled with the descriptions and infinite minutiae that allow each individual to emerge. Philosophy itself then becomes the mode by which one pursues knowledge of the real in its entirety. This job is perhaps never complete, but results in an attunement characterized by joy. Ultimately, we will argue that Bergson’s proposal about the method and role of philosophy leads one to a state of being characterized by joy. One could say that the end of the philosophical method for Bergson is joy in a harmonized understanding of the multiplicity of the totality of being.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF REALITY AND THE GOAL OF PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT

Now that we have outlined some of the attributes of Bergson’s proposed mode of intuition, it is necessary to determine the foundations of reality for Bergson. Having discovered a method of inquiry, one must determine what it is that one will find in the

⁴⁰ Ibid. 1432/200.

world using this method. It is evident that if the intellect continually fragments and eliminates integral aspects of reality, then “the real” must be constituted of attributes and a harmony that only intuition can perceive in its totality. In order to determine the metaphysical foundations of reality for Bergson, we will begin by examining his ideas about the concept of “the Nothing” [*le neant*]. Our analysis will show us that for Bergson, the human ability to negate and to think of a nothing is the result of the mode of the intellect. After analyzing the nothing, we will then turn our attention to the three constitutive attributes of reality in Bergsonian metaphysics: change, movement, and creation. The analysis of these three fundamental attributes and the mode of intuition will provide the framework from which we will be able to see how philosophy (as put forth by Bergson) has the attunement of joy as its end.

The Nothing

In chapter four of *Creative Evolution*, Bergson claims that one illusion of thought is caused by the fact that humans “go from absence to presence, from the void to the full, in virtue of the fundamental illusion of our understanding.”⁴¹ This illusion results in a false conception of negation in the void and the nought [*le neant*]. It is the nought that Bergson calls the “hidden spring” from which much philosophical thought emerges.⁴² If one pushes away all the questions of why one exists, there is the idea that “existence

⁴¹ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 727/226.

⁴² *Ibid.* 727-728/226.

appears to me as a conquest over nought.”⁴³ It appears that non-existence, or nothing, is that which underlies all existence and is a kind of substratum in which existence emerges. Bergson believes that this idea leads to unending metaphysical speculations that do not address actual problems. In contrast to this idea, Bergson hopes to show that the idea that nothing stands in contrast to existence is a “pseudo-idea” that is associated with “pseudo-problems.”⁴⁴

In the beginning of his analysis of the nothing/nought, Bergson claims that it can be represented in one of two ways: either through imagination or conception. That is, one must either imagine that the nothing exists or one must have a concept of its existence. He begins with the image of nothing in the imagination by trying to stop up his senses in order to eliminate all his perceptions. However, he finds that although he cuts off perception, he still has the perceptions from the interior of his body and his memories.⁴⁵ As Bergson continues his experiment, he attempts to extinguish his memories and consciousness. However, the moment that he eliminates consciousness, another arises. Stated more adequately, in order to extinguish his consciousness, the other had to arise to be the spectator of the act of quenching. “I see myself annihilated only if I have already resuscitated myself by an act which is positive, however involuntary and unconscious.”⁴⁶ Therefore, no matter how hard one tries, one will never be able to eliminate perception, sensation, and internal consciousness at the same time. It

⁴³ Ibid. 728/227.

⁴⁴ Ibid. 730/228.

⁴⁵ Ibid. 730/229.

⁴⁶ Ibid. 731/229.

is then impossible to form the image of a nothing that could be placed in contrast to being. This first mode that Bergson rejects is in relation to attempting to experience a nought in the body, and although he refers to this mode as the nothing formed in imagination, he attacks it using arguments that indicate that it is impossible to experience a non-perceptual nothing. This mode of forming a nought cannot be the foundation for the existence of Being because one is unable to escape being when one attempts to imagine nothing.

The second way in which Bergson attacks the nought is in its relation to the realm of ideas. “It may be agreed that we do not imagine the annihilation of everything, but it will be claimed that we can conceive it.”⁴⁷ One may not be able to experience the annihilation of everything. However, it is thought that one can experience the nothing by following a path of ideas that leads to an annihilation of all objects through the idea of total annihilation. Bergson believes that the concept of the annihilation of everything is not really a concept (it is like a square circle) because it is impossible for it to exist along with the action that it promotes. For example, if one attempts to think the annihilation of an object, one necessarily posits a void in which the object once resided. That is, one posits a place in which the object once dwelled.⁴⁸ If one examines perception, what is actually perceived “is the *presence* of one thing or another, never the *absence* of

⁴⁷ Ibid.731-732/230.

⁴⁸ In his article “The Relation between Duration and the Critique of the Idea of Nothing in Bergson’s Thought,” Keith Sullivan argues that it is not necessary to think of a void that is spatial when thinking of the annihilation of an object. However, Bergson could counter by saying that a void is empty space and that humans are unable to conceive of a non-dimensional void. In addition, in his article Sullivan focuses on sparse statements made by Bergson and he fails to account for the relationship between the positing of a void and the human action that tends to see a void when the desired object is “lost” or when one is unable to find the object where one thought it was.

anything. There is absence only for a being capable of remembering and expecting.”⁴⁹

When humans say that there is nothing somewhere, they are merely expressing the disappointment of an expectation. What they really perceive is the object for which they were searching in another place or a new object where they expected to find the old object. This is the manner in which humans represent a “partial nought” in the external world.

It is not merely in the external world that humans form a partial nought. When they think of the annihilation of themselves, they must take up another point of view of perception. If I try to imagine the destruction of myself, I see myself being engulfed in a vaporizing flame. However, I am seeing all this occur in my mind. I have automatically taken a bird’s-eye view of the event. My consciousness sees my body destroyed, but consciousness remains active. If one is to be consistent, then one must continue to annihilate everything that would take the place of the previous object. This would end in the annihilation of the annihilative compartment of the human mind itself.⁵⁰ Bergson has shown us that to annihilate the mind, one must still be thinking, i.e. that it is impossible to absolutely annihilate the mind while one is alive and is endowed with human consciousness. Therefore, again it is impossible to form an adequate concept of annihilation. It follows from this that “*the representation of the void is always a*

⁴⁹ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 733/232.

⁵⁰ In attempting to think the annihilation of the world, one must annihilate the very ability of the mind that one is using to think the annihilation of all the beings in the world. This is impossible because one is using that ability to negate the being of all reality. If one is then to annihilate the ability to think the annihilation of the rest of the world, then one must annihilate the mode of thought that one is in at that moment. Bergson believes that this is a contradiction, and even if one thinks the annihilation of all things, one cannot annihilate the thinking of that annihilation of all things. Therefore, all things are not annihilated (the thinking that is annihilating still remains).

*representation which is full and which resolves itself on analysis into two positive elements: the idea, distinct or confused, of a substitution, and the feeling, experienced or imagined, of a desire or regret.”*⁵¹

Bergson believes that the problems that emerge out of thinking of the nothing are the result of the powers that humans ascribe to negation. “We represent negation as exactly symmetrical with affirmation. We imagine that negation, like affirmation, is self-sufficient.”⁵² It is by affirmation that one can affirm one thing after another and reach the idea of an “All.” However, it is by the reverse process that humans deny one thing after another and arrive at the idea of “Nothing.” For Bergson, affirmation is what he calls “a complete act of the mind.”⁵³ In contrast, negation is only a half-act. As an example, Bergson uses the image of a black table. If I say, “this table is black,” I express an affirmation. However, if I say, “this table is not white,” I am expressing what Bergson calls a “judgment on a judgment.”⁵⁴ What this means is that my negative expression is a judgment that would counter the judgment that one might have of the table being white (a judgment on a judgment). You might have believed (judged) the table to be white, and I express a judgment that your potential judgment is incorrect. “Thus, while affirmation bears directly on the thing, negation aims at the thing only indirectly, through an interposed affirmation.”⁵⁵ In this case, the interposed affirmation would be that the table

⁵¹ Ibid. 734/233.

⁵² Ibid. 737/236.

⁵³ Ibid. 738/236.

⁵⁴ Ibid. 738/237.

⁵⁵ Ibid. 738/237.

was white. What this form of negation shows is that it is not concerned with the objects themselves. Instead, it is concerned with potential judgments about those objects. In negation is the anticipation of community in that one is warning others or teaching others about their potential judgments, even when that other is potentially one's own self.

The main problem that Bergson finds with negation is that it fails to take account of the reality that presents itself. It is necessary, "in order to see it, and consequently in order to speak of it, to turn our back on the reality, which flows from the past to the present, advancing from behind."⁵⁶ A mind that was unable to negate would affirm everything, and would only experience facts, states, and existence. "It would live in the actual, and, if it were capable of judging, it would never affirm anything except the existence of the present."⁵⁷ It is when one includes memory and expectation that one finds a being that is capable of negation. There is a supposed affirmation lying at the base of negation: that there is a void that exists alongside positive reality. Perhaps a better way to say it is that reality is superimposed on a primordial nothingness. However, through his analysis, Bergson shows that the idea of nothing is really the idea of everything along with a mind that jumps from object to object, eliminating things as it goes along.

Bergson claims that to oppose the Nought to the All is then to oppose the full to the full. However, the idea of a nothing is tenacious in human minds. In "spite of all, the conviction persists that before things, or at least under things, there is 'Nothing.'"⁵⁸ The

⁵⁶ Ibid. 743/242.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 743/242.

⁵⁸ Ibid. 745-746/244.

reason that humans feel this impulsion to think of an underlying nothing is because of the social, practical element that is the foundation of negation. Because humans developed to act in the world, it is necessary that they think in order to act. “Now, it is unquestionable...that every human action has its starting-point in a dissatisfaction, and thereby in a feeling of absence. We should not act if we did not set before ourselves an end, and we seek a thing only because we feel a lack of it.”⁵⁹ Because human action tends to proceed from a felt nothing to a something, and thought is integrally related to action in Bergson’s thought, he claims that this felt absence translates itself into thought. It is important to note that the felt nothing is not really nothing, but the lack of a utility. In order to illustrate his point, he gives the example of an unfurnished room. I might take someone into the room and say that there is “nothing in the room.” However, there is air in the room. Therefore, although I have claimed there is nothing in the room, there is actually something in the room. We tend to express ourselves in terms of a lack of something utilizable. “Our life is spent filling voids, which our intellect conceives under the influence, by no means intellectual, of desire and regret, under the pressure of vital necessities; and if we mean by void an absence of utility and not of things, we may say, in this quite relative sense, that we are constantly going from the void to the full.”⁶⁰ Our speculative faculty (ability to philosophize) follows the same void filling method and the ability to negate becomes absolute because our minds can work with the “totality” of things perceived. For these reasons, Bergson believes that the idea of nothing is the result of the manner in which humans act in the world.

⁵⁹ Ibid. 746/245.

⁶⁰ Ibid. 746/245.

It is because humans begin from the Nothing and move to reality that they perceive reality given forever on the backdrop of a primordial nothing. In contrast to this foundation, Bergson calls for the attempt to think the being of the real.

But we must accustom ourselves to think being directly, without making a detour, without first appealing to the phantom of the nought which interposes itself between it and us. We must strive to see in order to see, and no longer see in order to act. Then the Absolute is revealed very near to us and, in a certain measure, in us.⁶¹

Here we see Bergson proposing a sort of proto-phenomenology, i.e. a return to thinking being directly without thinking it in terms of practical interest and action. He says that when we take up this mode of perception, we will discover aspects of “the Absolute.” It is now necessary to examine the foundations of reality and what sort of absolute Bergson believes upholds reality and will allow humans to have an intuitive knowledge of the real.

Change, Movement, and Creation

Bergson begins from the premise that there is a reality that exists outside of the perceiver. “This reality is mobility.”⁶² All immobility is merely the result of the solidification that takes place through the intellect. “*All reality is, therefore, tendency, if we agree to call tendency a nascent change of direction.*”⁶³ The human intellect gathers sensations and ideas by halting the flow of the real. It is in this way that it is able to deal with and interact with the flow of reality. However, in so doing, “it allows what is the

⁶¹ Ibid. 747/246.

⁶² Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1420/188.

⁶³ Ibid. 1420/188.

very essence of the real to escape.”⁶⁴ The major error of the intellect is that it believes that it is searching for uninfluenced knowledge of the real through analysis when really it is using a method that can only be used when practical knowledge is the goal. The mobility that is characteristic of the real can never be reconstituted with immobile snapshots. Multiply the points of a movement to infinity and one will still never be able to recreate what happened in the movement itself.

In a lecture given at Oxford University entitled “The Perception of Change,” Bergson seeks to examine change in order to display what the intuition of change could do for human lives and philosophy. In the first few lines of his address, Bergson makes the claim that the “insufficiency of our faculties of perception – an insufficiency verified by our faculties of conception and reasoning – is what has given birth to philosophy.”⁶⁵ The beginning of philosophy was very close to perception as these philosophers equated reality with elemental substances. However, once the theory of ideas emerged, philosophy progressed down a road that saw more in the idea than in the percept. These philosophers saw an insufficiency in the senses that had to be compensated for by other faculties of consciousness.

Bergson sees a problem with these philosophies in that they cannot agree on the point from which to start their analyses. He therefore wonders if it would not be better to “return to perception, getting it to expand and extend.”⁶⁶ It is only in this way that philosophy will attempt to grasp everything (the totality) rather than leaving behind

⁶⁴ Ibid. 1421/189.

⁶⁵ Ibid. 1368/132.

⁶⁶ Ibid. 1369/134.

things that are rejected by concepts influenced by the interests of the perceiver. If nothing is left behind in the pursuit of the absolute, no philosopher will be able to trail behind and start from another strand or concept that has been left behind. The movement of philosophy would then be the expansion of perception in the attempt to examine everything that is “given” [*donné*].⁶⁷

Anticipating his critics, Bergson claims that some will say it is impossible to ask perception to do something (grow) that it by nature has not developed to do. However, Bergson claims that this argument is refuted by the work of artists. As we mentioned earlier, artists are those who are able to adopt a different view of the object, and artistic genius is the ability to translate that view into a representation that moves those who are unable to take up that view without the aid of the artist. “What is the aim of art, if not to show us, in nature and in the mind, outside of us and within us, things which did not explicitly strike our senses and our consciousness?”⁶⁸ The artists then become the revealers for those who are locked into the mode of the intellect. Those who are moved by the artwork find that they are sympathetic to it, i.e. that they feel certain emotions or experience a similar perception to that of the artist. The emotions were there, but they were hidden. Our own everyday perceptions of the objects represented through art unconsciously moved us or remained with us. However, “we perceived without seeing.”⁶⁹ This is because most of us are preoccupied with our lives and acts in the world. It is only in those who are “absent-minded,” those that live detached from the

⁶⁷ Ibid. 1370/134.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 1370/135.

⁶⁹ Ibid. 1371/136.

cares of the world, that objects appear in a more variegated and truthful manner. For Bergson, the more one has to focus on life and acting in the world, the more one is unable to take the time to see the minute aspects of life that constantly emerge. This is because Bergson believes that “distinct perception is merely cut, for the purposes of practical existence, out of a wider canvas.”⁷⁰ This canvas is the realm of philosophy and Bergson hopes that philosophy will explicate the realm of the real in a manner that will unlock the emotions and responses of those who are too busy to see the importance and vitality of being.

Humans tend to limit their spheres of perception because it is impractical for them to perceive things that are unnecessary for the attainment of their goals. However, “now and then, by a lucky accident, men arise whose senses or whose consciousness are less adherent to life...When they look at a thing, they see it for itself, and not for themselves. They do not perceive simply with a view to action; they perceive in order to perceive – for nothing, for the pleasure of doing so.”⁷¹ These humans are detached, and this detachment leads to a more variegated perceptual field. Bergson believes that this detachment is randomly and rarely provided by nature. However, he asks if philosophy could not “lead us to a completer perception of reality by means of a certain displacement of our attention?”⁷² Philosophy would then be a turning of attention from that which is

⁷⁰ Ibid. 1372/136-137.

⁷¹ Ibid. 1373/138.

⁷² Ibid. 1373/138.

practical to that which has no practical interest. “This conversion of the attention would be philosophy itself.”⁷³

Plato sought a form of knowledge that was turned away from the practical. However, this philosophy proposed that one had to leave the earth in order to attain that knowledge. Kant did not believe that humans would be able to attain those perceptive faculties that could attain knowledge of the things themselves, and so he rejected an intuitive metaphysics of reality. Bergson believes that Kant’s greatest service to philosophy was to recognize that only an intuition of things could present the things in themselves. However, Kant also rejected this vision as unattainable. For Bergson, Kant’s mistake (as well as Plato’s in a different sense) was to believe that it would require absolutely different faculties of perception to attain this sort of knowledge.

The idea that one would need different faculties of perception to attain to absolute knowledge seems to be the result of a distrust of the senses and perception in presenting reality. However, Bergson insightfully points out that there is also a certain trust in these philosophers that our senses and perceptions “make us grasp movement directly. They believed that by our senses and consciousness, working as they usually work, we actually perceive the change which takes place in things and in ourselves.”⁷⁴ It is the mistrust of the senses and perception mixed with the unspoken belief that they present reality indirectly that leads to insoluble philosophical difficulties for Bergson. As these philosophers looked at change and becoming, they found unsolvable problems, and they then rejected change as a foundation.

⁷³ Ibid. 1374/138.

⁷⁴ Ibid. 1375/140.

Bergson traces the emergence of metaphysics to the arguments about change and movement put forth by Zeno of Elea. These arguments led Zeno and other philosophers to claim that reality must be constituted by things that do not change. However, Bergson seeks a perception that would attempt to think duration and change in an original mobility. The first thing that Bergson asks his audience is to focus on a direct perception of change that attempts to free itself from the mediation that occurs between the intellect and reality. If one attempts to examine reality directly, Bergson believes that the first result is that one “*shall think of all change, all movement, as being absolutely indivisible.*”⁷⁵ This claim is in direct contrast to Zeno’s paradoxes and to the human tendency to think movement in terms of immobile snapshots. It seems that throughout his work, Bergson seems to take an overly mathematical view of movement. Do most humans actually perceive movement as a string of immobilities, or is this a distinction that is unnecessary? Bergson would say that humans perceive movement as movement and not as a string of immobilities. However, in order to understand movement, one then breaks down the flow or flux into discrete positions. Movement is given as a flux or a complete act. However, in order to mathematically understand movement, one tends to solidify the act into specific spatial positions. Even in the realm of everyday life, humans tend to fragment movements according to destinations or break the movements down into time increments. That is, when we see movement or when we take part in movement, it is generally with a view to where we are and where we are going. Because action is motivated by the ends that it produces, it is extremely difficult to think the movement as we are making it. When I drive my fiancé to work, I am focused on getting her to the

⁷⁵ Ibid. 1377/142.

door so that I can leave quickly and drive up to campus to work on my dissertation.

While I am driving to campus I do not pay attention to the ice on Lake Michigan or the line of buildings that string up Lake Shore Drive. Instead, I want to get to my usual parking area, walk to the library, and then get to work. I see the movement for the end, and when that movement is prolonged due to traffic I experience a sense of frustration because I cannot attain the end of that movement in the normal fashion. Human movements are generally undertaken with a view towards the result, and it is extremely difficult to remain and think the movement itself. Therefore, although Bergson tends to go to the extreme in his analysis of the fragmentation of movement, one can examine one's life and one will find that Bergson adequately represents what happens when humans move from perceived movement to represented movement.

For Bergson, immobility does not exist. Instead, the idea of immobility is the result of the mode of perception characterized by the intellect. "Movement is reality itself, and what we call immobility is a certain state of things analogous to that produced when two trains move at the same speed, in the same direction, on parallel tracks..."⁷⁶ Having the ability to immobilize objects allows humans to act on those objects and vice versa. However, one cannot then take this mode of thought and place it at the foundation of all reality. Movement takes place within space, but it cannot be reduced to space. There is something more in movement than there is in space. Each movement is indivisible. It takes place as a totality, and no matter how much we break it down into points or sections, our analysis never grasps what actually occurred in the movement. This is why the intellect leads humans to posit problems such as that of Achilles and the

⁷⁶ Ibid. 1378/143-144.

tortoise. Humans spatialize movement and treat it as if it could be broken down into discrete quantities. However, this leads to “problems” in that Achilles must always pass a point from which the tortoise has moved on, thereby never overtaking the tortoise. One can easily see in reality that that which moves at a faster rate overtakes that which is slower. Therefore, there must be something in movement that is left out when it is dealt with in spatial terms. Movement always takes place in space and it occurs because of spatial bodies. However, it is not identical to space. Bergson claims that, “All real change is an indivisible change.”⁷⁷ That means that when humans spatialize movement, they negate its indivisible aspect, and this is what leads to the logical dichotomies in relation to motion.

It is natural to think change in terms of states. This allows humans to act within the world in a practical manner and alter their realities. However, Bergson claims that in the realm of philosophy, if one begins from the premise that change is a series of states, one immediately places roadblocks up in the search for adequate knowledge of reality. Instead, one must seek to think of a movement and Bergson believes one will find that it is impossible to represent it adequately without representing it as a totality. “*There are changes, but there are underneath the change no things which change: change has no need of a support. There are movements, but there is no inert or invariable object which moves: movement does not imply a mobile.*”⁷⁸ It is difficult to think in this manner because the eye is used to separating objects and then seeing those objects as if movement is something that is added to the objects. However, if one moves into the

⁷⁷ Ibid. 1380/146.

⁷⁸ Ibid. 1381-1382/147.

auditory realm, it is easier to think of a change which has nothing underneath it. The sound of a melody is a totality that continually changes and has no underlying thing which changes. Although humans tend to think of a melody in terms of the individual notes, it is the totality which forms the melody as any other combination would result in a different melody.

Bergson is not merely making these statements as some sort of nebulous metaphysical comments for which he has no proof. He provides examples of the movement that constitutes reality from both scientific knowledge as well as human experience. The more science progresses in the realm of atomic theory and particle physics, the more it appears that movement is constitutive of reality. It appears then that reality, at its base level, is a group of “movements dashing back and forth in a constant vibration so that mobility becomes reality itself.”⁷⁹ Atoms are moving particles and are composed of even smaller particles that are in constant motion. Colors are waves of light of varying vibratory intensities. Human perceptual faculties halt all these movements in order to focus attention on specific objects in order to act on them.

In addition to the scientific evidence of movement at the basis of the smallest particles that constitute the material world, Bergson also calls the reader to examine his or her own inner experience, for “nowhere is the *substantiality* of change so visible, so palpable as in the domain of the inner life.”⁸⁰ For Bergson, there is no fundamental identity that underlies juxtaposed psychological states. If one searches oneself for an inner identity that underlies the thinking subject, one cannot escape the movement of

⁷⁹ Ibid. 1383/148.

⁸⁰ Ibid. 1383/148.

one's inner psychological states. That is, if one were to find some sort of foundational identity, one would have to experience that identity in an inner psychological state. Therefore, one is unable to escape the fact that one finds oneself in one's inner states of being. It is a fault of psychology to express inner states as the outcomes of some sort of inner ego rather than noticing that the two are so integrally related that the end of one dovetails perfectly into the other. There is no identity without the never ending string of inner states, and there are no inner states without the idea of an identity that is expressed in their movement.

In addition to the inadequacy of juxtaposing states and ego in the inner life, the flow of inner duration is not a series of separate states that cause reactions that produce new states. Instead, there is "simply the continuous melody of our inner life – a melody which is going on and will go on, indivisible, from the beginning to the end of our conscious existence. Our personality is precisely that."⁸¹ This mode of being is characterized by duration. "This indivisible continuity of change is precisely what constitutes true duration."⁸² Here Bergson says that the idea of duration is not something mysterious as his opponents might contend. Instead, "*real duration* is what we have always called time; but time perceived as indivisible."⁸³ The changes that humans view as simultaneities and successions are merely the result of the way in which perception must articulate reality. Bergson believes that time is a succession, but is not originally perceived as a before and after. Instead, the internal time that is constitutive of duration

⁸¹ Ibid. 1384/149.

⁸² Ibid. 1384/149.

⁸³ Ibid. 1384/149.

has the succession of a melody. This form of succession does not partake in simultaneity. Humans tend to form simultaneities where they perceive a melodic succession of duration. It is thanks to duration that the successions of changes in humans and in the reality they perceive takes place in a single time. For Bergson, the unified durational totality is what allows for the emergence of the mobility that is constitutive of reality.⁸⁴

Bergson's analysis of mobility leads him to another conclusion: that we must envision the past in a new way. Most view the past as something done away with. It is gone and we are called to live in the present, to seize the day. Those things from the past that do survive live only as memories, and memory is viewed as that faculty that allows certain past experiences to insert themselves into the present. However, Bergson's arguments about mobility will not allow for this kind of representation of memory and the past. True duration is that which underlies personality. Duration is time that is not reducible to juxtaposed instants. Therefore, the past must be acting constantly in the present of all humans. It is only because humans perceive in terms of practical interest that they create "presents" of varying temporal lengths. A consciousness that was sufficiently separated from the practicality of perception would be able to see the present as the continuous continuity of the past of the individual.⁸⁵ This form of consciousness is no Bergsonian philosophical dream. In an example of the preservation of the past, Bergson refers to those who are on the verge of death to show that when one releases one's attention towards the future, the past can come rushing back in ways never before conceived. Those who face their own deaths, accidentally or because of capital

⁸⁴ Ibid 1385/150.

⁸⁵ Ibid. 1387/152.

punishment, often have the experience of their entire lives running through their minds. Bergson believes this is the result of the mind no longer having any interest in the future. In these severe cases, the future becomes null because one is close to having a guarantee that he or she will have no future.

For Bergson, it is wrong to think that the brain has little areas dedicated to the preservation of certain perceptions that then become memories. Instead, it is the job of the brain to forget most of what it sees. It has to do this because a consciousness that could not forget would be one that would be so full that it would be unable to continue on and focus its attention on life sustaining actions. It appears then that the past sustains itself. “The preservation of the past in the present is nothing else than the indivisibility of change.”⁸⁶ If change is indivisible, then the past preserves itself in a present that is the natural progression of the totality. To radicalize change into chaos or instability is to turn a blind eye to the reality that presents itself to humans and holds itself together. At the same time, placing substance in the realm of the unattainable idea is to fail to note that integral aspects of reality are change and mobility. This leads Bergson to the claim that a view of mobility that is free from the veil inserted between perception and analysis is one that can help eliminate many of the problems that have plagued philosophy.

One of the most important ideas that emerge from Bergson’s discussion of mobility is that the present is something that is absolutely new. Each moment of the present is filled with the totality of the past and is the existent change that has occurred as the mobility of the totality has continued to change. The accumulations of changes do not merely alter the totality but allow for the emergence of absolute newness. It is

⁸⁶ Ibid. 1389/155.

impossible to envision a completed totality when one attempts to harness reality into concepts in order to express that reality. As Keith Ansell-Pearson says in his book *Germinal Life*, “The reason why individuality can never be fixed once and for all is due precisely to the vital character of life. A perfect definition could only be intelligible in relation to a completed reality, but ‘vital properties’ are never such realities since they exist only as ‘tendencies’ never as ‘states.’”⁸⁷ It is of the utmost importance that one thinks the becoming and newness of reality in Bergsonism. This vision of reality is what Bergson believes will benefit philosophy and humanity. Bergson argues that when humans grasp the becoming of the world, philosophy will experience an awakening to new possibilities. He believes that philosophy will be able to provide satisfactions that art provides only in rare circumstances. Art “dilates our perception” and enriches our lives.⁸⁸ However, it remains on the surface. Bergson believes that a philosophy that thinks mobility is what will allow life to acquire depth. The present will not be isolated from the past and objects will not be separate from the movement of which they are a part. There will be a depth in that the past will present itself in a present that continually moves on to a future. However, the three aspects of time will be united in a singular time in which change is constitutive of the human as well as the totality. Reality will not merely be the present perception of a material world of objects distinct from one another, but will perhaps be thought of in terms of its history and that from which it emerged as the movement of reality brought it into existence. We tend to say that things have changed form when our perception notices an accumulated mass of minute changes.

⁸⁷ Keith Ansell-Pearson, *Germinal Life: The difference and repetition of Deleuze* (New York: Routledge, 2002): 43.

⁸⁸ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1391/157.

“But in reality the body is changing form at every moment; or rather, there is no form, since form is immobile and the reality is movement. What is real is the continual *change* of form: *form is only a snapshot view of a transition.*”⁸⁹ When philosophy comes to an understanding of the irreducibility of change:

What was immobile and frozen in our perception is warmed and set in motion. Everything comes to life around us, everything is revived in us. A great impulse carries beings and things along. We feel ourselves uplifted, carried away, borne along by it. We are more fully alive and this increase in life brings with it the conviction that grave philosophical enigmas can be resolved or even perhaps that they need not be raised, since they arise from a frozen vision of the real and are only the translation, in terms of thought, of a certain artificial weakening of our vitality. In fact, the more we accustom ourselves to think and to perceive all things *sub specie durationis*, the more we plunge into real duration. And the more we immerse ourselves in it, the more we set ourselves back in the direction of the principle, though it be transcendent, in which we participate and whose eternity is not to be an eternity of immutability, but an eternity of life: how, otherwise, could we live and move in it? *In ea vivimus et movemur et sumus.*⁹⁰

It is now necessary to turn our attention to this “impulse” that underlies all reality and drives it forward. In this way, we will see that the Bergsonian philosophical method seeks to present a reality that emanates from its foundational force. The final aim of practicing this method is to coincide with the foundations of reality and experience the joy of a perception that views the world from the double aspect of intellect and intuition.

⁸⁹ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 750/249.

⁹⁰ (Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1391-1392/157-158) [For in this we live, and move, and exist] The end of this passage is a variation of Acts 17:28 from the Latin Vulgate where it says, “*in ipso enim vivimus et movemur et sumus.*” This has been translated into English as “In him we live, and move, and have our being.” (King James Version)

Life

Bergson begins his analysis of life from an examination of the material world and objects in that world. The second law of thermodynamics states that entropy increases. That means that energy tends to move from areas of high concentration to a homogeneity in which the energy of the space is uniform. If one focuses on reality, Bergson claims one will “find that the direction, which this reality takes, suggests to us the idea of a thing *unmaking itself...*”⁹¹ This unmaking is what the chemist would refer to as entropy increasing. The immediate question that comes to the mind of anyone who first learns of this rule of the universe is, “How then are there things?” The scientist might respond that earth is not a closed system because it has an energy source: the sun. This energy source has provided the power necessary to counteract the law of degradation. However, this does not account for life. Life is the amoeba that glides through the muddy pond water, it is the roses that line a campus sidewalk, or the squirrel chattering at potential threats that walk by underneath. How did these living beings come about from an energy source that provides photons of light? “That the simple play of physical and chemical forces, left to themselves, should have worked this marvel, we find hard to believe.”⁹² Bergson seeks to provide a foundation for living beings in the principle of life itself.⁹³ It is in life that one finds the current that provides vitality, while matter is that medium in which life is

⁹¹ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 703/202.

⁹² *Ibid.* 706-707/205.

⁹³ “Life is an original impetus, *une poussée formidable*, not the mere heading affixed to a class of objects which live.” (Gunn, Alexander. *Bergson and his Philosophy*. [London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1920]:89). It is important to note that Bergson uses the term life in two different ways. First, life can represent the totality of living organisms on earth. Second, life can refer to the force that runs through the living objects and keeps them animated and regenerating. One cannot then call life merely the totality of objects. Instead, “Life, or the vital impulse, consists in a demand for creation, we might almost say ‘a will to create.’” (Gunn, *Bergson and his Philosophy*, 89)

harnessed and tends to descend or degrade. It appears then that there is a dual movement in reality. “In vital activity, we see, then, that which subsists of the direct movement in the inverted movement, *a reality which is making itself in a reality which is unmaking itself.*”⁹⁴

Before one immediately reacts to these statements with a remark about the nature of this “life” or “vitality,” it is important to first plunge into the real to see what it displays to us. This is one of the tenets of Bergson’s philosophical method. As one examines reality, it is evident that Bergson is merely attempting to give an account of the forces that he sees (I would argue that we all see) as he examines life on earth. We have already talked about the tendency towards homogeneity or degradation that is a verified scientific principle of the real. However, at the same time we are surrounded by trillions of organisms that stand out in contrast to the principle. These organisms display another tendency: that of existing and reproducing in spite of the tendency to degrade. Even at the cellular level we see a replacing of dying cells and the manufacturing of proteins necessary for repair and the continuation of life. “All our analyses show us, in life, an effort to re-mount the incline that matter descends.”⁹⁵ Bergson’s analyses are his attempt to account for the phenomena that show themselves as one analyzes the real. When Bergson sees the real, he sees the movement of life constantly creating and regenerating against the laws of degradation.⁹⁶ He sees, “an action which is making itself across an

⁹⁴ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 705/204.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* 703/202.

⁹⁶ In speaking of Bergson’s philosophy, Ralph Tyler Flewelling says, “the two streams of reality are matter and spirit and the very intersection of the two is life itself.” (*Bergson and Personal Realism*.)

action of the same kind unmaking itself, like the fiery path torn by the last rocket of a fireworks display through the black cinders of the spent rockets that are falling dead.”⁹⁷ No matter how many deaths occur each day, there is life flowing through living beings that continue to move through the decay and the finitude that surrounds them.

At the base of the movement towards creation is Bergson’s idea of the vital impetus [*élan vital*]. In his article, “Life, Movement and the Fabulation of the Event,” John Mullarkey begins by giving different views of Bergson’s idea of the *élan vital*. Bergson indicated in *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, that the vital impetus is what Mullarkey calls an “epistemological corrective.”⁹⁸ That is, the *élan vital* represents the fact that any scientific totalizing theory is inadequate to represent what it is that keeps existence alive. Richard Green has argued that Bergson’s *élan* was a poetic expression of that which could not be understood in terms of mechanism.⁹⁹ Others such as Leszek Kolakowski point out that as one examines reality, one sees a constant pushing forward, an effort that is supported by the germs of the organisms that continue to create and repair themselves against the forces of degradation. In the foundations of human existence, at the molecular and cellular level, being pushes forward to keep life alive and moving even when contrary powers seek to break it down. Bergson calls this an effort of life. However, one must understand this effort as one that is not intentional in the sense of

[New York: Abingdon Press, 1920]: 70). In another example from Bergson, Flewelling says that “life is a stream which in its evolution continues an initial impulsion.” (*Bergson and Personal Realism*, 70)

⁹⁷ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 708/206.

⁹⁸ John Mullarkey. “Life, Movement and the Fabulation of the Event.” *Theory, Culture and Society* 24, no.6 (2007): 54.

⁹⁹ Richard Green, *The Thwarting of Laplace’s Demon: Arguments against the Mechanistic World-View* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995).

undertaking a pre-established goal or form. Kolakowski says it well when he says that, “Purposefulness is an aspect of life as a whole, and not of single organisms; it does not consist in materializing pre-existing models, but in trying, albeit not always successfully, to follow a direction.”¹⁰⁰ The movement of life follows a direction in that it presents itself as working against other powers. However, this movement is not an effort with a desired end but one that is constantly facing obstacles and running into dead ends.

Whatever others might say in attempting to assign a specific interpretation to Bergson’s idea of the *élan vital*, it is always most important to examine what the philosopher has to say about his ideas. Bergson claims that the “*original impetus*” [*élan original*] of life passes “from one generation of germs to the following generation of germs through the developed organisms which bridge the interval between the generations.”¹⁰¹ This impetus is a force that is limited by the materiality with which it must interact in order to bring about new species.¹⁰² The finitude of the *élan vital* is displayed in the numerous forms and species that have been dead ends in that they no longer exist and have neither direct nor indirect descendents. The dichotomy between the *élan vital* and the materiality through which it flows displays the same form as the dichotomies we have been analyzing throughout this dissertation: intellect versus intelligence, duration versus time, mobility contra immobility. In fact, for Bergson, this distinction is the result of the battle between movement and immobility that we analyzed above. “The profound cause of this discordance lies in an irremediable difference of

¹⁰⁰ Leszek Kolakowski, Leszek. *Bergson*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985): 57.

¹⁰¹ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 569/71.

¹⁰² *Ibid.* 602/103.

rhythm. Life in general is mobility itself; particular manifestations of life accept this mobility reluctantly, and constantly lag behind.”¹⁰³ Humans tend to categorize things as objects and negate the movement that is, for Bergson, their foundation. However, Bergson does say that a glimpse of primordial mobility is seen in maternal love, be it human or animal. Although in general and for the most part organisms seek to obtain the greatest possible benefit with the least possible effort (what one could call the mode of materiality), there are some exceptional instances of maternal love that display the tendency of life. This form of love “shows us each generation leaning over the generation that shall follow. It allows us a glimpse of the fact that the living being is above all a thoroughfare, and that the essence of life is in the movement by which life is transmitted.”¹⁰⁴ The perpetuation of life is so integrally constitutive of organisms that they often give their lives in order to protect their offspring.

It appears then that life vacillates between two options of manifestation through matter. First, it can appear in a form that seeks its benefit with the least possible effort (degradation of materiality, intellect, utility). However, there is another modality that presents itself in the forms of regeneration, instinct and intuition. Life is constantly pushing forward and following a direction, but the materiality in which it lodges itself tends towards immobility and often leads to “failed” species that die out without contributing to future generations. In the same way, the human mind has developed a dual tendency. Humans are naturally predisposed to examine the real through the intellect. However, in the next section we will attempt to show how Bergson’s

¹⁰³ Ibid. 603/104.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. 604/105.

philosophy is the attempt to coincide with the principle of reality and thus to bring about the joy of a rejuvenated perception and a mind brought back to its source.

JOY AS THE END OF BERGSONIAN PHILOSOPHY

To philosophize means to reverse the normal direction of the workings of thought.

Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*

Bergson's philosophy seeks to draw a line between the inert and the living. The intellect does well to use its laws and categories when it works with the inert, but the living only artificially inserts itself into the frames of the intellect.¹⁰⁵ As we have seen throughout the course of this project, the idea of the inert is actually a projection of the intellect that is superimposed on the real. For Bergson, it is necessary that humans examine the living with eyes that are different from those used by the intellect. This is where philosophy emerges with its own frames able to handle (at least more adequately than the intellect) the living. "Philosophy, then, invades the domain of experience. She busies herself with many things which hitherto have not concerned her."¹⁰⁶ Bergson's call is for an invasion of the domain of human experience. It is a return to the presentations that are given to the intellect and the attempt to think a living thought, one that is able to follow the direction and alteration that is the foundation of the real.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. 663/163.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid. 663/163.

The problem with philosophy as Bergson sees it is that it is presented on too wide a canvas. Philosophical systems do not adequately represent “the reality in which we live...”¹⁰⁷ After reading philosophers, one might imagine that the world is a place where “neither plants nor animals have existence, only men, and in which men would quite possibly do without eating or drinking, where they would neither sleep nor dream nor let their minds wander...”¹⁰⁸ In contrast to these systems, Bergson claims that one must propose an analysis or explanation that attempts to coincide with its object. It is this explanation of what he sees when he sees reality that we have laid before us in his works. It is often representative and inadequate, some might say mere poetry. However, it is affirmative and if one plunges into his works, one gets glimpses of the original intuitions that inspired his philosophical ideas. In fact, affirmation is the cornerstone of Bergsonian philosophy and this is what makes his attempts to explicate his ideas so difficult.

Bergson often critiques ideas and philosophers. However, it is always with the goal to show how the ideas are the outcomes of a more primordial harmony of thought or are the outcomes of some aspect of the human mind that is leaning too far in one direction. In speaking of the suppression of the tendency to negate, Bergson claims that if we, “Suppress every intention of this kind, give knowledge back its exclusively scientific or philosophical character, suppose in other words that reality comes itself to inscribe itself on a mind that cares only for things and is not interested in persons: we shall affirm that such or such a thing is, we shall never affirm that a thing is not.”¹⁰⁹ This

¹⁰⁷ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1253/11.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. 1253/11.

¹⁰⁹ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 741/239-240.

quote perfectly exhibits one of the goals of Bergsonian philosophy: complete affirmation of reality or a shifting in consciousness away from negation towards positive statements.¹¹⁰ This manner of thought does not lend itself adequately to a language that attempts to make positive statements about difficult human experiences such as time and perception of vitality. However, this does not mean that all such talk is mere poetry or literature. To those who would claim that Bergson's philosophy is ambiguous or even mere poetry, one could present the numerous elegant logical rejections of concepts that are held to be common knowledge that are found throughout his works. In the passages where Bergson must resort to language that is not as "logically demanding," he is attempting to stretch the concepts in order to say something that needs to be said but cannot be said in a manner adequate to language.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ In an interview conducted by Jeanette Columbel, Gilles Deleuze says that "Spinoza or Nietzsche are philosophers whose critical and destructive powers are without equal, but this power always springs from affirmation, from joy, from a cult of affirmation and joy, from the exigency of life against those who would mutilate and mortify life. For me, that is philosophy itself." (*Desert Islands*. [New York: Semiotext(e), 2004]: 142. Bergson's philosophy is also that which fights against critique for the sake of critique. He constantly seeks affirmation and gives voice to his ideas in the hope that he will more adequately express those ideas.

¹¹¹ In his book *Bergson and Personal Realism*, Ralph Tyler Flewelling critiques Bergson's proposal that the highest form of perception is one that moves away from the intellectual analysis of the world. However, Flewelling tends to polarize the situation too much by claiming that Bergson seeks to eliminate the intellectual. First, we find this elimination of the intellectual in contrast to what Bergson actually says about the two forms of knowledge and each reaching an absolute. Bergson never says that one must eliminate the intellectual. This is impossible. He does say that we must attempt to make a turn toward the immediate experience of the real through intuition in order to allow for the empowering of the faculty of intuition. Flewelling, like many critics of Bergson, does not pay attention to the details of his thought. He swallows Bergson's ideas about intuition up into a Nirvana-like perception that fails to recognize itself. In Bergsonism, it is not first that one eliminates an ego or a self in order to have a pure perception of an object. Rather, it is in the process of focusing on the object, attempting to think intuitively, that one begins to lose oneself. This is not the loss of the total person, for one will never be able to escape the perspective from which one must perceive. Instead, the loss of the self refers to the loss of the interests that would influence one to perceive in a certain way. For example, there is a big difference between seeing a student that I tutor as a human in need of help with the hope that she will achieve understanding, and seeing a student as another slot in my schedule that contributes to my overall economic well-being and safety. In the first sense, I lose myself as I attempt to perceive her for what she is giving

In addition to the critiques of the way in which Bergson uses language, others will argue that Bergson condemns his philosophy from the start in his own critiques of language and concepts. A.R. Lacey critiques Bergson in his book *Bergson* in this manner in the section entitled “The Nature of Philosophy.”¹¹² He makes the claim that one is unable to do metaphysics, science or anything else in a method that transcends concepts. The arguments brought against Bergson (including Lacey’s) run along these lines:

- 1) Bergson argues that language is inadequate in expressing things themselves.
- 2) Bergson also critiques concepts in that they tend to lose the singularity and differences of individuals by lumping them into groups.
- 3) Humans require language and concepts in order to express themselves.
- 4) Bergson must use language to express his ideas.
- 5) Therefore, Bergson’s own ideas fall into the same inadequacies of language and conceptual formation that he critiques.

There seems to be an implicit conclusion that pops up after this formal conclusion. The implicit conclusion is that Bergson ought not speak at all nor write anything if he is going to critique language and concepts in such a manner. In addition to this form of critique, Lacey adds that Bergson fails to provide examples of what intuitional knowledge “consists in.” It is necessary that we address these critiques because in so doing we will come to a better understanding of Bergson’s project and the limits of that project.

We have talked earlier about intuitional knowledge and a manner of attempting to think in an intuitional manner so we will not broach that subject again. However, one

me. In the second case, I am only a self, a self that perceives the other in terms of what the other can provide instead of focusing on what it actually gives.

¹¹² Lacey, *Bergson*, 164-167.

must remember that intuitional knowledge is knowledge that turns back to an examination of the real and what it provides to the perceiver. This idea is not so difficult to understand since the advent of phenomenology proper and its return to the things themselves (Husserl). In addition, Heidegger claims that phenomenology is the attempt to allow the things to show themselves, from themselves, as they are in themselves. Although I do not want to promote the idea that Bergson's was a form of phenomenology, both because it is beyond the limits of this paper and also because of the specificity with which Heidegger and others sought to elucidate phenomenology, it is evident that there are threads that are consistent with phenomenology that run through his doctrine of intuition.¹¹³ Intuitive knowledge is one that adopts the movement of reality. It is what humans do every day as they walk around on the earth and act in the world. However, it is always accompanied by an intellectual faculty that takes the intuitive knowledge and turns it into something shaded toward utility and fragmentation.

We would like to say a few words in response to the idea that Bergson's philosophy is condemned from the outset because of his ideas about language and concepts. In his presentation "Philosophical Intuition," Bergson claims that philosophers throughout the history of time have attempted to express a simple intuition. We must not be confused here by the word intuition. In this address, Bergson uses the word simple intuition not to represent a form of perception, but an inherent idea or motivating force that the philosopher attempts to explicate through language throughout the course of his or her life. The philosophical intuition is that thing that the philosopher finds in him or

¹¹³ For a discussion of Bergson and phenomenology see Michael R. Kelly "What's Phenomenological about Bergsonism(?): Critical Notice of Leonard Lawlor's 'The Challenge of Bergsonism.'" *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 13, no. 1 (March 2005): 103-118.

herself that lies in the core of his or her being. It is the wellspring from which his or her ideas emerge. It is the impetus that the philosopher spends the rest of his or her life attempting to express. It is a point in which “there is something simple, infinitely simple, so extraordinarily simple that the philosopher has never succeeded in saying it. And that is why he went on talking all his life.”¹¹⁴ As one reads philosophy, one coincides with the hiddenness of the intuition that inspired the philosopher. One reads the abstractions of the philosopher, but at moments seems to be filled with the knowledge of what the philosopher was attempting to express through his or her abstractions. These moments are a mere link and glimpse to the original intuition that are often lost as quickly as they emerge. As an example, Bergson talks about his experiences with Spinoza’s *Ethics*. He claims that one cannot help but be overcome by the structure of the work as if one is facing the most formidable battleship. However, at the same time, there is “something subtle, very light and almost airy, which flees at one’s approach...”¹¹⁵

Bergson spent the course of his career attempting to express the intuition that he found inside the deepest part of his being. One of his main “philosophical intuitions” was that intuition is a faculty that has been neglected and unjustly ridiculed in philosophical thought. Bergson never claims that we should eliminate language (a fact that often seems implied in these critiques). He merely says that language is inadequate. When he expresses his *philosophical intuition* (i.e. that intuition exists), he submits to language. However, he continuously attempts to express the intuition that motivates his work in more adequate explications. “He could not formulate what he had in mind without

¹¹⁴ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1347/108-109.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.* 1350-1351/113.

feeling himself obliged to correct his formula, then to correct his correction...”¹¹⁶

Bergson often uses evocative language in the attempt to display the ideas that he has about intuition and the foundations of existence. This shows that Bergson does not contradict himself in a strong sense. He does not say, “do not use language.” To do so would be to speak in a language. He merely states that language and concepts share an internal flaw in that they cannot fully represent the intuition of something. This does not mean that one ought not represent his or her intuitions. In contrast, Bergson’s ideas about philosophical intuition promote a contrary form of being. A truly creative intuition (what Bergson calls a “creative emotion” in *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*) is one that by necessity manifests itself in the world. It cannot not express itself. It must instantiate, and when it does, it creates something absolutely new in the world.

Bergson perhaps “failed” because he was unable to adequately express his philosophical intuition. Perhaps Heidegger failed as well because he was unable to render an adequate representation of “Being.” However, as one moves through Bergson’s or Heidegger’s texts, there are moments when their works literally resonate inside the reader. One catches an instantaneous glimpse of what it is the philosophers are trying to express: their simple philosophical intuitions. In those moments, one feels the power of the ideas that were the spring from which the written words flowed. I can criticize Heidegger’s notion of the “Nothing” in “What is Metaphysics?” by claiming that the concept itself is empty or meaningless. However, what I feel when I read that essay is the expression of a man who for years thought about being, a man who was driven by existence to confront those aspects of life where others fear to tread. When I read

¹¹⁶ Ibid. 1347/109.

Heidegger, I feel the power of a thought that seeks that which is beyond beings. That thought is vibrant, powerful and demands that others follow it in both their own thoughts and in their philosophical works. My analyses of Heidegger's works will soon be forgotten. However, his essay will remain in *Wegmarken* to challenge generations of future philosophers, and this is the result of his original intuition that inspired him to make the attempt to do justice to Being. Those readers are drawn to the essay precisely because it has a meaning. This meaning is shrouded in the language that Heidegger uses, but this language is still able to inspire ideas in the reader and the more familiar one becomes with the language, the more this supposedly ambiguous language becomes honed and precise.

It is not Bergson's project to destroy the foundations of language and conceptual formation. It is also not adequate to claim that his philosophy condemns itself from the outset when it talks of transcending concepts and language. In *Creative Evolution*, Bergson talks about transcendence and claims that, "An intelligent being bears within himself the means to transcend his own nature. He transcends himself, however, less than he wishes, less also than he imagines himself to do."¹¹⁷ Bergson's humility would never allow him to make the claim that the transcendence of concepts will be complete or will reach a state where it can absolutely represent the objects with which one is interacting. However, this does not mean that humans should not make the attempt. Bergson did not cut off a path from which he would be able to use concepts and language. He says in his "Introduction to Metaphysics" that concepts are indispensable to

¹¹⁷ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 623/123-124.

metaphysics.¹¹⁸ However, metaphysics “is only itself when it goes beyond the concept, or at least when it frees itself from the inflexible and ready-made concepts and creates others very different from those we usually handle, I mean flexible, mobile, almost fluid representations, always ready to mold themselves on the fleeting forms of intuition.”¹¹⁹ In a related passage from *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, Bergson claims that there are two modes of producing literature and art. “Anyone engaged in writing has been in a position to feel the difference between an intelligence left to itself and that which burns with the fire of an original and unique emotion, born of the identification of the author with his subject, that is to say intuition.”¹²⁰ In the first case one hammers and builds in a manner that is forceful and somewhat brutal, piling concepts upon concepts in order to create a framework that encompasses reality. However, in the second form one is overcome by the melding of the intuition with the ideas that attempt to express it.¹²¹ However, it is often difficult to express these thoughts through language. It is often necessary to “strain the meaning of a word, to mould it to the thought.”¹²² It is the intuition that is the impetus for the creation and expression of the idea in the second instance. The straining of words often leads to problems of interpretation as well as

¹¹⁸ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1402/168.

¹¹⁹ Ibid. 1402/168.

¹²⁰ Henri Bergson, *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, trans. by R. Ashley Audra and Cloudesley Brereton (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977), 1013-1014/46.

¹²¹ In his article, “The Joyous Struggle of the Sublime and the Musical Essence of Joy,” (from *Research in Phenomenology* 25, [1995]: 68-89) Michel Haar examines Nietzsche’s ideas about music and the musicality of joy. At the end of the article, in speaking of the artist, Haar claims that language is always “tragically amputated” in that it cannot express the ideas of writers adequately. It is difficult for thought to translate originary rhythm. However, it is the originary rhythm that “can breath life into language again.”(84)

¹²² Bergson, *Two Sources*, 1014/46.

expression. However, “it is in such a case only that the mind feels itself, or believes itself, to be creative.”¹²³

We believe that Bergson’s own writings were the outcomes of his philosophical intuition. He attempted to express those ideas using language that often borders on poetic expression or discordant ideas. However, it was only in this way that Bergson felt he could express the movement that he saw at the foundation of reality and time. His critiques of language and intelligence do not relegate him to silence or a perception that loses itself in a flux of becoming in which it cannot find itself. Rather, he merely points out the inadequacies of language and concepts when one expresses them from only the perspective of the intellect and utility to the detriment of intuition and the manner in which they present themselves directly to consciousness.

The affirmation that lies at the foundation of Bergson’s philosophy makes his a philosophy that is difficult to explicate. It is often easier to show things in terms of negations of that which they are not a part. However, Bergson wants to show his audience that the unfolding of Being is the constant emergence of the absolutely new. Repetition introduces something new in all cases. The tendency to lump into categories and think through life in terms of utility is necessary, but philosophy (as Bergson conceives it) is the opportunity to be absolutely human. It is the chance to think the newness and singularity of all objects. It is in this sense that Bergsonian philosophy promotes a heterogeneity that is a durational totality. At one end Bergson calls us to think objects durationally. In the other direction, he calls humans to release themselves from their constant tendency to generalize objects into categories that do not allow for the

¹²³ Ibid. 1014/46.

totality of the objects to emerge. “The duty of philosophy should be...to examine the living without any reservation as to practical utility, by freeing itself from habits that are strictly intellectual. Its own special object is to speculate, that is to say, to see...”¹²⁴ He asks his readers to promote a state of mind in which the totality emerges in its infinite variety.

How is one supposed to live in and view reality if one is called to seek the emergence of the creative vitality of life and reality? In order to analyze this question it is necessary to continue the examination of Bergson’s ideas about time. Bergson asserts that time, “*is invention or it is nothing at all.*”¹²⁵ It is important to understand what Bergson is saying here. He is not saying that time is an invention of the human. Rather, he is saying that time (in its durational foundation) is that which brings about the unfolding newness of being. It is time that allows for the “invention” of new beings as well as works of art. To change the amount of time it took for these things to occur is to change the outcomes of what they are or are to become. Bergson claims that in contrast to the knowledge that captures time and fragments it into individual frames, there could be a mode of thought that lays the cinematographical mode of thought aside, and breaks with “the most cherished habits of the mind.”¹²⁶ This other form of knowledge is “practically useless, it will not extend our empire over nature, it will even go against certain natural aspirations of the intellect; but, if it succeeds, it is reality itself that it will

¹²⁴ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 661/161.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.* 784/282.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.* 784/282.

hold in a firm and final embrace.”¹²⁷ Looking towards a day when humans have attained this sort of dual knowledge (that of the intellect and of duration), Bergson says that when humanity reaches this state, it will understand that there is “a life of the real.”¹²⁸ Reality will no longer be given once and for all, but will be part of a duration that never ceases to create. When humans reach this mode of knowledge, intuition will have re-emerged alongside the intellect.

In opposition to the mental grasping that subordinates becoming and duration to being, the mind that grasps intuition will find that the “flux of time is the reality itself, and the things which we study are the things which flow.”¹²⁹ The ancients, and most philosophers to this day, have placed the mode of the intellect at the apex of philosophical thought. According to Bergson, when one starts from the intellect, one ends with the conclusion “All is given.”¹³⁰ It is important that the philosopher not think that physics has mastered the universe. He or she must not take the laws of science and attempt to explain away all the occurrences on earth using these constructions. For when a philosopher attempts to categorize everything, “he neglects what is concrete in the phenomena – the qualities perceived, the perceptions themselves. His synthesis comprises, it seems, only a fraction of reality.”¹³¹ Bergson believes that, “Real duration is that in which each form flows out of previous forms, while adding to them something

¹²⁷ Ibid. 784-785/282-283.

¹²⁸ Ibid. 785/283.

¹²⁹ Ibid. 786/284.

¹³⁰ Ibid. 787/284.

¹³¹ Ibid. 790/288.

new, and is explained by them as much as it explains...”¹³² However, Bergson does not want to deduce this form from a larger being from which all these forms flow. In order to stay away from constructions and reductions, Bergson proposes a return to experience. “We must appeal to experience – an experience purified, or, in other words, released, where necessary, from the molds that our intellect has formed in the degree and proportion of the progress of our action on things.”¹³³ This mode of perception and reasoning follows the “sinuosities” of the real. Rather than develop a construction of concepts that build on one another, becoming more general as they pile higher, this form of thought focuses on the details of existence. “It is the detail of the real, and no longer only the whole in a lump, that it claims to illumine.”¹³⁴ At the end of *Creative Evolution*, Bergson claims that the goal of the philosopher should be to eliminate the concepts that he or she uses in order to quantify the objects that are cut out of the durational reality by the intellect. When one attempts to experience the flowing of reality, he or she is brought back to the durational aspect of reality that is lost when one harnesses and juxtaposes a multiplicity of frames of the development of being. “So understood, philosophy is not only the turning of the mind homeward, the coincidence of human consciousness with the living principle whence it emanates, a contact with the creative effort: it is the study of becoming in general, it is true evolutionism and consequently the true continuation of science...”¹³⁵ It is important to note that Bergson claims that true philosophy leads to

¹³² Ibid. 801/299.

¹³³ Ibid. 801/299.

¹³⁴ Ibid. 801/300.

¹³⁵ Ibid. 807/305-306.

unification with the creative impulse that has accounted for the emergence of life on earth. This means that for Bergson, philosophy leads to a knowledge that inspires creation and harmony with reality. In eliminating the fragmentation that occurs through the operation of the intellect, one comes into harmony with the becoming of the totality of being.

Although Bergson believes that humans start from a state of fragmentation and juxtaposition, it is important to note that Bergson does not then make claims that humans must begin from a state of alienation and abandonment in relation to their everyday mode of perception. Rather, he is much less stark in that he believes that it is vital that the intellect function properly. Bergson is not calling for a release from the intellect that leads into a region where one is lost in the flow of becoming. Instead, he constantly reminds the reader that there must be a dual movement, a diving down into the internal flow of duration and then a springing forth into the sectioned reality of human action. He understands that the intellect must do its duty in order for humans to survive and thrive on earth. However, he does not want to exclude the role of intuition and its emergence through duration and instinct. As I mentioned earlier, Bergson hopes for a unification of the two forms of knowledge for a more adequate grasp of the “details of the real.”¹³⁶ One might argue that Bergson loses site of the whole in focusing so much on the details. However, for Bergson the whole is the detail of the movement of reality. In this way, Bergsonism is practical and one can certainly see how Bergson himself thought that his philosophy could lead to a new form of discovery. He gives up the holy grail of philosophy (the all-encompassing conceptual structure) for a focus on the details of

¹³⁶ Ibid. 801/300.

existence. In so doing, he turns away from the power of conceptual construction that lies in the human intellect. However, he also leads the reader towards a return to the details of reality. The concepts are brought back to earth, and Bergson invites us to examine how new forms emerge out of previous forms. One loses a structure that might explain the totality, but it makes perfect sense to examine the details of the totality before attempting to unite it into a system. In this sense, Bergson loses something. Philosophy loses the hope that it will one day comprehend the whole in the general. However, this is a false hope for Bergson. For Bergson, the only true hope emerges in his philosophy as one focuses on the minutiae of existence. This hope unfolds as one experiences unification with the creative emergence of being and one realizes that the externality of the world is a necessary mode of perception that, when released from consciousness, leads to a harmony with and participation in the emergence of new forms in the world. It is in this sense that Bergson's critique of the intellect leads to a mode of existence characterized by the joy of harmony with oneself and with nature. This joy is the result of the harmony of the human with his or her surroundings and constitutes the first way in which Bergson's philosophy generates joy as attunement.

It is here that we come to the philosophical intuition with which this dissertation is interested. Bergson could never separate himself from the idea that philosophy could (and perhaps ought to) lead to joy. For Bergson, philosophy is not a relationship to the world that is characterized by pain and abandonment. It is also not a mode of existence in which one seeks principles that lie outside the realm of the real. It is not a realm of thought that exists for a special few who are condemned or blessed to study questions that pertain to being human. Instead, philosophy is a mode of existence. It is open to all,

and it is that form of being in which one is able to examine reality, harmonize with it, and create in the face of the forces that seek to degrade living beings.

In his essay “Philosophical Intuition,” Bergson claims that the role of science is to determine outcomes from specific conditions. It focuses on simultaneities and moves between juxtaposed moments. Scientific thinking “cannot follow the moving reality, adopt the becoming which is the life of things.”¹³⁷ However, the role of philosophy is to attempt to take up an attitude and position from which one can attempt to coincide with the things themselves. “The philosopher neither obeys nor commands: he seeks to be at one with nature.”¹³⁸ Bergson believes that the act of philosophizing is a simple one and that it must be taken out of the classroom and back into relation with life. The difficulty with making this change is that common sense, like scientific analysis, works from conditions that pulverize time into instants and separate objects in the world. Movement then becomes a series of juxtaposed points and time a series of juxtaposed instants. However, it is at this point that Bergson calls common sense to make a “volte-face” in order to steer it in the direction of philosophical thought.¹³⁹

If the mind is able to move back into relation with its own duration, a time that is not a series of instants but a flow in which one state moves into another, one will find him or herself in the realm of intuitive knowledge and philosophy. This realm is characterized by knowledge of a time that is real and that moves indivisibly. In addition, the perceptions that were once merely surface states related to some substance that

¹³⁷ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1362/125-126.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.* 1362/126.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.* 1363/127.

upheld the perceptions is transformed into “one identical change which keeps ever lengthening as in a melody where everything is becoming, but the becoming, being itself substantial, has no need of support.”¹⁴⁰ Bergson claims that a view that recognizes reality as continuous and indivisible is on the road to intuitive knowledge.

Consciousness and perception have reduced time and change to strings of immobilities in order for humans to be able to act on objects in the world. However, one is able to think in a mode counter to this vision and restore a more primordial mode of perception that does not reduce reality to dust. This intuitive vision does not involve acquiring new faculties, but in uncovering the faculties that have been covered by the accumulation of the intellectual tendencies. This mode of existence will not only allow for a new mode of philosophical thought, but also provide a new way of living in the world. “For the world into which our senses and consciousness habitually introduce us is no more than the shadow of itself: and it is as cold as death.”¹⁴¹ However, Bergson calls his audience to view the world not in the sense of utility and fragmentation, but with a view to the depth that it displays. The present is not merely an instantaneous moment that is followed by another instant that seems to spring out of nowhere. Instead, the present is thick with the past that provides the impetus for the emergence of the present. The present is connected to the totality of the past and the future that emerges is such that it is unforeseeable. When one learns to view objects through the lenses of duration and intuition, “immediately in our galvanized perception what is taut becomes relaxed, what

¹⁴⁰ Ibid. 1363-1364/127.

¹⁴¹ Ibid. 1364/128.

is dormant awakens, what is dead comes to life again.”¹⁴² The joys that art rarely provides to those who are privileged enough to have the means to view it as well as understand it, “philosophy thus understood will offer to all of us, at all times, by breathing life once again into the phantoms which surround us and by revivifying us.”¹⁴³ It is in this sense that philosophy arises alongside science to provide another vantage point from which one can view reality and adopt the becoming of that reality. Science “gives us the promise of well-being, or at most, of pleasure. But philosophy could already give us joy.”¹⁴⁴ In a similar passage, Bergson claims that knowledge of the absolute is not the only goal of philosophy. In addition, “we shall gain also in our feeling of greater joy and strength.”¹⁴⁵ The joy that emerges is the result of the overturning of the dominance of the intellectual perception. This new philosophical mode of perception presents a view from which one can see “ever-recurring novelty, the moving originality of things.”¹⁴⁶ At the same time, these new philosophers will experience greater strength, “for we shall feel we are participating, creators of ourselves, in the great work of creation which is the origin of all things and which goes on before our eyes.”¹⁴⁷

These passages display what Bergson had in mind when he thought of the end of his philosophical method. In Bergsonism, the dialectic of life vacillates between intelligence, science, and pleasure on one side and intuition, philosophy and joy on the

¹⁴² Ibid. 1365/129.

¹⁴³ Ibid. 1365/129.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid. 1365/129.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid. 1344-1345/105.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid. 1344/105.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. 1345/105.

other. It is important to note specifically that for Bergson, science can lead at most to a sort of pleasure. The intellect seeks that which provides safety and stability in the world. Not only does the intellect fragment perception of reality, it also leads humans to promote their well-being, to store up goods in times of crisis, and to seek objects that will give them safety against the forces on earth that threaten them. However, pleasure is fleeting and is lost as soon as the forces of degradation become too powerful to be thwarted. Scientific discoveries and technological advances seek to bring about new comforts and safeties in the face of the severity of Being. At the same time, these technologies also harness powers that can exponentially enhance the powers that destroy humanity and its safety. Because the intellectual analysis of the world has become the ruler of human thought in our society, we have become more and more utilitarian in our orientation towards existence. Everything becomes a commodity, and those who are most “innovative” with these commodities become monetarily successful and respected as leaders. Trades and vocations become means to means and competition reigns supreme. The recent economic situation has shown the values that people attach to their jobs, their homes, and themselves. Humans believe that their pleasures are worth so much that they would rather die than lose them to another. Intellectual desire is insatiable and it extends to the world which humans perceive, ultimately leading to a quantification of everything and a lumping into categories that eliminate the minutiae that are constitutive of reality.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁸ In my own example here I must revert to the very thing that Bergson cautions us to avoid: harnessing a group into a genus that eliminates the details of reality.

On the other side of life we have a perception brought back to intuition, a perception that perceives in order to see rather than in order to act. It is in this mode of perception that Bergson believes one is awakened to the world. Not only is intuition rekindled, but the world itself takes on a new vitality. One is caught up in the movement of organisms and existence. Time becomes the surge of the absolutely new in a moment that was preceded by the entire history of life. One finds that the same impetus that brings about existence and maintains it in the face of entropy is that which keeps one alive as well. Philosophy (as Bergson conceives it) shows us that life is more than use value. One who attempts to coincide with the world through intuition is one who is open to a harmony that is lost in the distance that the intellect requires of perception. It is this harmony that provides the foundation from which one can experience joy as attunement.

Bergson's hope was that his philosophy could lead to joy as one practicing his method coincided with the intuition that had been covered over during the course of evolutionary history. A deeper understanding of the creative power of the vital order is gained through intuitive knowledge. Problems that once haunted the mind are synthesized by examining the faulty questions themselves. In addition, the mind brought back to intuitive knowledge once again awakens that tendency that split into two directions (intellect and instinct). One experiencing the world in this manner is revived by the coincidence with the vital impulse that constantly brings forth the newness of the present. From this perspective, one releases oneself from the drudgery of existence. If one can actually think the newness of each situation, organism, and event, one will stand in wonder at the emergence of being on the earth. A tree turns into an ecosystem, vibrating with droves of organisms all battling and working together to keep life moving.

Objects that were once thought banal can become something beautiful; the world takes on an enhanced aesthetic aspect. Others become the totality of their pasts, and not mere genus names or ethnic classes. Everything pulses with a unifying force that drives it forward in spite of the fact that the universe seeks homogenous energy. Everything participates in the emergence of life.

In addition to the new understanding of reality as a continual emergence of the new, Bergson's philosophy seeks to release humanity from being shackled to a perception that constantly provides a view from utility. We saw in chapter two how Bergson's analysis of the intellect leads into the human experience of desire. Human desire often manifests itself through the lens of utility. Desires that flow through the intellect tend to focus on objects that will be thought to satisfy needs. Once the desires necessary for survival are satisfied, the intellect then turns toward other things offered in society. However, these desires often become absurd and grow out of control. They are insatiable, just as the intellect is insatiable in its constant presentation of reality. There is no material object that escapes its powers, but there are experiences that go beyond its ability to fragment.

Bergson proposes that humans seek to reawaken intuition and the reality that it presents as the foundation of perception. When one seeks to perceive for the sake of seeing, one is transported from the realm of intellectual desire to intuitional desire. Taking a tactic from Bergson, one can say that there is not a quantitative difference between these two forms of desire. Instead, the difference is so drastic that one can say that the difference is qualitative. This form of difference separates absolutely the desires of the intellect from the desires of intuition. The desires of intuition can no longer be

called desires as we define them normally. They have changed form so much that they have become something other than the desires of interest and self-promotion. Returning to intuition is twisting free from intellect and desire. One is overcome by a desire to see, but this desire is no longer related to any particular object that is thought will bring happiness. Instead, it is a mode of existence characterized by the hope that the inner intuition humans have that there is something that is missing in the reality they perceive is a disguise. Having set up layers over intuition, the intellect has provided for the emergence of the transcendent human race. It has allowed humans to be the organisms that can move outside of their immediate givenness and perceive the world outside of immediate reaction. The intellect has opened the possibility of response rather than reaction to perceptions and being in the world. However, Bergson believed that it was now time to move back to the primordial state from which humanity emerged in order to regain that contact with the world that has been lost over the course of evolutionary history. In this way, humans will not only experience a greater coincidence with life, but will also become free for life to show itself to them. “How much more instructive would be a truly intuitive metaphysics, which would follow the undulations of the real! True, it would not embrace in a single sweep the totality of things; but for each thing it would give an explanation which would fit it exactly, and it alone.”¹⁴⁹ A vision with only a desire to see is one that can experience peace. Intellectual desire sees objects as things that ought to be attained according to taste and resources. It notes their utility in different circumstances and how they will be able to promote the best interests of the living being in relation to its environment: social, familial, economic, and geographical. However,

¹⁴⁹ Bergson, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1271-1272/31.

apart from the aid that it supplies in monitoring all these aspects of objects in the world, it also creates an insatiable tendency to want to consume. One cannot be joyful in the mode of the intellect precisely because one cannot experience peace. Peace, as we will see in the next chapter, is integrally related to joy as a necessary component of the conditions for the possibility of joy.

Intuition is the attempt to see in order to see. It is free from the multiple objects of intellectual desire. When we merely explain the real through the vision of the intellect, “it limits too much the meaning of life: intellect, such at least as we find it in ourselves, has been fashioned by evolution during the course of progress; it is cut out of something larger, or, rather, it is only the projection, necessarily on a plane, of a reality that possesses both relief and depth.”¹⁵⁰ The intellectual understanding of the world has been cut out of something wider, and one discovers this in the experiences of life in which one perceives that which extends past intellectual representation, those experiences that provide a glimpse of a truly original intuition. “For the effort we make to transcend the pure understanding introduces us into that more vast something out of which our understanding is cut, and from which it has detached itself.”¹⁵¹ This vast region is that which is open to the new vision that is characteristic of Bergson’s philosophy.

In addition to a greater harmony with the real, Bergson believed that his philosophy could release humans from the bonds of desire that so often lead to dissatisfaction. Remember from Bergson’s critique of the nothing that humans often express themselves in terms of that which they were seeking. This leads to negative

¹⁵⁰ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 538-539/42-43.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.* 664/164.

judgments upon judgments that leave out the positive judgments that could actually say something about the reality that surrounds the perceiver. A mind caught up in intuition of reality is affirmative and does not see what is missing, only that which is actively presenting itself and interacting with other beings in reality. It is released from the multiple finite desires of the intellect, and its new desire is to see in order to see, to coincide with the principle of life that constantly keeps it moving in a direction counter to that which would seek to undo it forever. The emergence of the new in the real provides aesthetic satisfactions that were once only provided by art. A philosophy that seeks to absorb intellect in intuition not only experiences the world differently, but also has more power to act and live in the world. “For, with it, we feel ourselves no longer isolated in humanity, humanity no longer seems isolated in the nature that it dominates.”¹⁵² Humans are part of the totality of reality that all moves forward against the laws that degrade life. It is in this sense that all organisms march forward and overcome obstacles, including death.¹⁵³ All organisms yield to death at some point. However, at the same time there is an army of life that continues to surmount the obstacle of death, to fight against it at every moment. In this sense, life overcomes death at every instant that it exists. Harmony of perception with the vitality of the real and a new understanding of the power of life lead to the joys that Bergson believed were the ends of proper philosophy.

We will now turn our attention in the next chapter to an analysis of joy as attunement. Spurred on by Bergson’s claims about pleasure and joy, as well as Heidegger’s own distinction between angst and fear, we will juxtapose what we will call

¹⁵² Ibid. 724/222.

¹⁵³ Ibid. 725/223.

happiness as the inauthentic manifestation of attunement with the authentic attunement of joy. It is because of the hiddenness or coveredness of joy that humans continually desire happiness, often directing their efforts towards attaining objects that are unable to satisfy the fundamental desire for joy. Bergson has provided us with a philosophical method that he hopes can lead to joy. In the final chapter, he will provide a foundation from which one can uncover primordial joy. This will be our concern as we approach the end of our analysis.

CHAPTER IV

JOY AS FUNDAMENTAL ATTUNEMENT

We have seen how Bergson believed one could attain joy through the practice of philosophy. However, we would like to go further and analyze the foundations of joy itself for Bergson. However, before attempting to elucidate the structure of joy in Bergson's thought, we will first turn our attention back to Martin Heidegger in the attempt to outline a Heideggerean joy. Heidegger's ideas about attunement were the guiding thrust of the elucidation of joy as attunement in Bergson, and it is first necessary to see what Heidegger has to say about joy before we delve into the joy that we find undergirding Bergson's entire corpus. We will see that Heidegger's joy always arises alongside other attunements and experiences. However, Bergson's explication differs in that it is always positive, arising by itself out of itself, never in relation to any other attunement. However, we must not get ahead of ourselves. It is necessary to turn our attention to Heidegger and what he has to say about joy, and that is where we begin.

HEIDEGGEREAN JOY

Heidegger's work often focused on the attunements of angst and boredom. In the first chapter, we saw that Heidegger's conception of anxiety as attunement arises in relation to Dasein's being in the world as well as being towards its own death. In this section, I will examine Heidegger's concept of joy as attunement. Although Heidegger

rarely speaks of joy and never gives an ontological account of joy, one is able to elucidate a conception of joy from Heidegger's writings. We will see that joy always arises alongside or in juxtaposition to anxiety or Dasein's existence in relation to the nothing. In order to explicate the joy that can arise from Dasein's being in the world, I will turn to Heidegger's thoughts about meditative thinking in the hope that this provides for a more primordial revelation of Being to Dasein. I will use some of Heidegger's works to analyze how angst is overcome by an attunement of joy as one abides in meditative thought and "releasement" [*Gelassenheit*] towards being. In addition to the experience of joy that arises in relation to Dasein's being towards Being, Heidegger also claims that joy arises alongside the anxiety that Dasein experiences as it confronts its own death. In regard to the joy that can arise alongside the anxiety of being towards death, I will examine Heidegger's writings in *Being and Time* that explicate authenticity in terms of "resolute anticipation" in the attempt to reconcile Heidegger's idea that joy arises alongside the anxiety that emerges in being towards one's death. After examining how Heidegger conceives of joy in relation to being in the world and being towards one's own death, I will analyze Heidegger's conception of joy in order to determine that towards which it is focused as well as some of the problems that spring out of his view of joy.

In the address at the beginning of *Discourse on Thinking*, Heidegger claims that there is in humanity a "flight from thinking" [*auf der Flucht vor dem Denken*].¹ To those who would point to the development of technology and scientific discoveries of the day as proof against this view, Heidegger responds by saying that although the development

¹ Martin Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, trans. by John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund. (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 45. [*Gesamtausgabe* 16:519] All subsequent references to Heidegger will make reference to the original German found in the *Gesamtausgabe* before the reference to the English translations.

of scientific knowledge was excelling at a more rapid pace than ever before, this fact only represented movement in one aspect of thought. Heidegger calls the type of thinking that plans with a view to specific results “calculative thinking” [*Das rechnende Denken*].² In contrast to calculative thinking, Heidegger claims that humans also have the capability for meditative thought [*besinnliche Nachdenken*], and it is Heidegger’s goal in this address to examine the relationship between meditative thought and humanity’s relationship to the earth.

The central theme of the address is that humanity has lost its rootedness [*Bodenständigkeit*], or autochthony, on earth. In his day, Heidegger saw that humans had an entirely new relation to the world and living on the earth than previous generations of humans. This was and continues to be due to the technologies that have arisen and inserted themselves into everyday existence. “The world now appears as an object open to the attacks of calculative thought, attacks that nothing is believed able any longer to resist. Nature becomes a gigantic gasoline station, an energy source for modern technology and industry.”³ It seems then that calculative thought tends to view the world in terms of resources and approaches nature with preconceived ideas about what nature can provide and its relevance in relation to problems that arise due to a scarcity of resources.

In the time that Heidegger delivered this address, humanity found itself surrounded by an ever tightening circle of technology that Heidegger accurately predicted would only continue to grow into the future. Because of the power of technology to

² Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, GA 16:519/46.

³ Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, GA 16:522/50.

interweave with human being in the world, it appears that humanity is at the will of the forces of technology that will propagate indefinitely. Heidegger argues that because of humanity's reliance on new technologies, humans have lost a sense of connection with the earth. This loss is a loss of rootedness. Although technology has provided for the development of certain aspects of cultures, it has also led to a sense of alienation from the earth. Heidegger believed the danger of technology (in addition to its capability to destroy all of humanity) was that, "the approaching tide of technological revolution in the atomic age could so captivate, bewitch, dazzle, and beguile man that calculative thinking may someday come to be accepted and practiced as the only way of thinking."⁴ However, all hope is not lost as one examines the oncoming tide and multiplicity of technology. Heidegger does claim that there is one thing that can re-establish rootedness in this type of world: meditative thinking.

Heidegger provides more insight into his ideas about calculative thought in his "Postscript to 'What is Metaphysics?'" In this work, Heidegger responds to those who critique his work ("What is Metaphysics?") because of its rejection of logic. In this essay, he calls thinking in the accepted logical mode "exact thinking" [*exakte Denken*].⁵ However, "exact thinking merely binds itself to the calculation of beings and serves this end exclusively."⁶ This mode of thought only allows what is countable to come into the realm of thought, and in calculating and counting beings, one thinking in this mode believes one has explained the being of those beings. In this way, beings are consumed

⁴ Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, GA 16:528/56.

⁵ Martin Heidegger, *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), [GA 9:308/235].

⁶ Heidegger, *Pathmarks*, GA 9:308/235.

by calculative thinking, and logic itself becomes a species in the genus of calculative thinking [*das rechnende Denken*]. Calculative thinking only resembles something productive because it is able to add an infinite number of beings to the group it has already established.⁷ However, “such thinking lets all beings count only in the form of what can be set at our disposal and consumed.”⁸ Heidegger’s language here resembles the language of Bergson as we outlined his critique of the mode of the intellect.

Heidegger, like Bergson, believed that the calculative mode of thought fails when it thinks that its representations of beings are adequate to elucidate the totality of those beings. Although the two had different accounts of the foundation of the intellect, they both recognized that the intellect presented the world in a manner that contained an essential lack.⁹ For Heidegger, there is something that withdraws as calculation seeks to find it, and this is exactly the Being of beings. The truth of this being, “no ‘logic’ is capable of grasping.”¹⁰ It is only “essential thinking” [*wesentliche Denken*] that

⁷ Ibid. *GA* 9:309/235.

⁸ Ibid. *GA* 9:309/235.

⁹ Bergson attempted to outline the evolutionary development of the intellect and found the inadequacies of the intellect in the fact that for him it was a tool that humans used to stay alive in the world and satisfy needs. The intellect had to develop in such a way that it left out the totality and the details because if humans were trapped in a homogenous array of sensations, they would be unable to satisfy requirements for survival (starting fires, procuring sweet water, gathering food, avoiding predators and danger). Heidegger on the other hand provides little in terms of the development of the intellect. In “What is Metaphysics?” he does say that, “the possibility of negation as an act of the intellect, and thereby the intellect itself, are somehow dependent upon the nothing.” (*Pathmarks* 86) However, when he speaks of the intellect or calculative thought, he usually begins his analysis from the givenness of the intellect and examines more what it does than how it emerged. For Heidegger, the inadequacies of the intellect exist more in relation to the social use of concepts that over time have come to reside in a space of unquestionable truth, yet fail to say anything about the actual existence of objects or concepts. Over time, humans have over-used certain concepts to the extent that they take them for granted and act as if all have an adequate understanding of the concepts. For Heidegger, the concept that had the most deposited layers distorting it was the concept of *being*.

¹⁰ Heidegger, *Pathmarks*, *GA* 9:309/236.

“expends itself in being for the truth of being.”¹¹ Essential thinking is that thinking that stands opposite calculative thinking. Calculative thinking reduces, counts and quantifies beings in relation to their potential for producing specific outcomes. However, essential thinking (meditative thinking) is that thinking that is able to re-establish Dasein’s rootedness on earth.

Those who approach the world from only the calculative view are in danger of being overcome by the dazzling nature of technology. They have lost their relationship of rootedness with the earth and find solace in the created objects of technology as being indicative of reality in itself. Technology usurps the natural relationship of humankind to nature and in turn radicalizes humanity’s loss of rootedness. In contrast to an existence overcome by the astonishment of technology, Heidegger proposes that one establish a relationship in which one is able to welcome technology and use technology, but that can also keep technology out of the domination of one’s life. “I would call this comportment which expresses ‘yes’ and at the same time ‘no’ by an old word, releasement toward things.” [*Die Gelassenheit zu den Dingen*]¹²

Releasement is the primary theme of Heidegger’s “Conversation on a Country Path about Thinking.” In this dialogue, a teacher, scientist and scholar are walking on a path outside of their hometown while they discuss the foundations of being and perception. In the beginning of the dialogue, the teacher claims that he wants to achieve a form of thought that wills non-willing; “I want non-willing” [*Nicht-Wollen*].¹³

¹¹ Ibid. GA 9:309/236.

¹² Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, 59.

¹³ Ibid. 59.

According to the teacher, it is only in willing non-willing that one can keep awake for releasement.¹⁴ The horizons of perception and transcendence are the outcomes of human perception of objects in the world. However, what allows the horizon to be is something other than the individual ontic manifestations of objects. Material objects are not that which delimits the boundaries of possible human perception.

Objects themselves do not bring about the horizon of perception and being. Instead, there is a primordial openness that surrounds humanity. The scientist then asks for an explanation of this openness, and the teacher responds that this openness is “something like a *region*” [*Gegend*].¹⁵ It is at this point that Heidegger introduces the idea of a region that regions. This region regions in that it gathers everything into an abiding, i.e. all that exists in the world has the characteristic of remaining (abiding), and it is the regioning that allows for this abiding.¹⁶ If one understands the region external to Dasein (but also the region in which Dasein finds itself originally) as coming forth out of itself one could say that this region regions in that it brings about the space in which all emerges. This region allows for the abiding of beings. This abiding merely refers to the fact that ontic beings are present and remain present. They abide. They do not vanish, randomly scatter and then coincide, or radically morph into something absolutely new. Instead, the chair that is overlooking Lake Michigan in the corner of the room abides there. If one turns one’s attention to the chair, one will see it abiding, just as the lake outside the window abides in its being.

¹⁴ Ibid. 61.

¹⁵ Ibid. 75.

¹⁶ Ibid. 66.

Relationships between beings are also a manifestation of this abiding. The birds plunging into the lake abide in a relation with the lake, while the student who just sat down in the chair unthinkingly recognizes the abiding of the chair while also enacting the abiding relationship that humans have with chairs (we enjoy lounging in them). The regioning allows for the emergence of things in an openness where everything rests and coincides with all other things. However, in order to begin to think in a manner that reveals the foundational regioning of being, the teacher informs the scientist and scholar that one must enter the realm of non-calculative thought. This thought remains in a mode of waiting for a glimpse into the openness of being. However, at the same time, the mind that waits finds itself already in openness to the foundations of reality because it is open to the occurrence of that reality without a lens of utility. It is open to see what the region presents.

It is in waiting that humans are released from being locked into a calculative relation to their immediate horizons. In this way, they are able to move back into the openness of the horizon. This waiting for that which regions is releasement. However, humans are caught between in that they constantly harness the regioning of being by quantifying and reacting in the world, while being at the same time part of the regioning that allows for the horizon of all being. If they are to enter into the openness of the regioning of being, then they must relinquish quantification and wait for that which regions. “When we let ourselves into releasement to that-which-regions, we will non-willing.”¹⁷ It is in being released from the will that one finds oneself in that mode of thought that is able to view the emerging of the world as it is given rather than as

¹⁷ Ibid. 79.

something that is readily manipulated for utilitarian aims. In willing non-willing, Dasein releases itself from the mode of existence that tends to think Being in terms of that which has been provided for Dasein. When Dasein releases itself from this mode of being, Heidegger believed there could be the potential for a more authentic unveiling of Being. Being had been covered over time as humans forgot the original question of existence (What is Being?). However, in releasement Dasein is open to a new revealing of Being that is apart from the everydayness and categories that have collected over Being over time and obscured Being as well as the relationship between Dasein and Being.

In his essay “The Word of Nietzsche: ‘God is Dead,’” Heidegger spends much of the end of the essay examining how the positing of values in the world does not allow for the essence of the world (Being) to show itself. It is because the most recent age has come to view the world as having value in terms of resources that humans have spent copious amounts of effort in harnessing the world’s resources. These resources have become the main value of the world as such. However, in this valuation, the Being of beings has been lost. One sees the heart of Heidegger’s ideas about valuation when he says:

Then, thinking in terms of values is radical killing. It not only strikes down that which is as such, in its being-in-itself, but it does away utterly with Being...it absolutely does not let Being itself take its rise, i.e., come into the vitality of its essence. Thinking in terms of values precludes in advance that Being itself will attain to a coming to presence in its truth.¹⁸

¹⁸ Martin Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology and other Essays*, trans. William Lovitt. (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), 108. [*Gesamtausgabe* 5:263]

This value thinking is then the consummation of the history of thought about Being that “begins, and indeed necessarily, *with the forgetting of Being* [*mit der Vergessenheit des Seins*].”¹⁹

How can one “remember” what has been lost in the forgetting of Being? In addition to his ideas on waiting, Heidegger explicates another mode of thought in his essay “On the Question of Being.” In this essay, Heidegger begins from the position of the absence of being. “Being remains absent in a strange way. It conceals itself. It maintains itself in a concealment that conceals itself. In such concealing, however, there lies the essence of oblivion as experienced by the Greeks.”²⁰ However, this oblivion is not merely the negation of being. Instead, Heidegger claims that oblivion is the concealment of the essence of things and that this concealing holds “untapped treasures and is the promise of a find that awaits only the appropriate seeking.”²¹ What is this appropriate form of seeking? “Recollective thinking [*Andenken*] has the task of attending to *this* concealment, in which unconcealment (*Ἀλήθεια*) is grounded.”²² It is in recovering the oblivion of being that one recovers metaphysics. For Heidegger the experience of anxiety is that which coincides with the revelation of the oblivion of beings and the emergence of Being and is therefore the site of the recovery of the oblivion of being.

¹⁹ Ibid. *GA* 5:263/109.

²⁰ Heidegger, *Pathmarks*, *GA* 9: 415/313.

²¹ Ibid. *GA* 9:415/314.

²² Ibid. *GA* 9:416/314.

After he makes these claims about the oblivion of being, Heidegger goes on to assert that his goal has never been to demolish metaphysics as some who critiqued his work in his days claimed. The failure to comprehend his goal “began with the superficial misconstrual of the ‘destruction’ [*Destruktion*] discussed in *Being and Time* (1927), a ‘destruction’ that has no other intent than to reattain the originary experiences of being belonging to metaphysics by deconstructing [*Abbau*] representations that have become commonplace and empty.”²³ It is evident from these few sentences that Heidegger undertook his investigations not in order to lay waste to all forms of thought and ideas about universals, but in order to attain a more authentic understanding of being, an understanding that had been lost over time as being withdrew from the manner in which humans attempted to think it. If one moves back to the second introduction to *Being and Time*, one finds Heidegger elucidating the “destructuring” [*Destruktion*] of the ontological tradition that he believed was necessary in order to examine the question concerning being. According to Heidegger, the question of being had been forgotten in the accumulation of metaphysical concepts that began with the Greeks and carried on through Descartes, Kant and Hegel. The tradition had concealed the question of being, and the task of philosophy for Heidegger was to dissolve those concealments. This task was “the destructuring of the traditional content of ancient ontology which is to be carried out along the *guidelines of the question of being*. This destructuring is based upon the original experiences in which the first and subsequently guiding determinations of being

²³ Ibid. GA 9:417/315.

were gained.”²⁴ Heidegger goes on to say that this goal is not based in the “pernicious relativizing of ontological viewpoints. The deconstructing has just as little the *negative* sense of disburdening ourselves of the ontological tradition.”²⁵ In contrast to the negative ways in which one might conceive of the destructuring of ontology, Heidegger claims that this mode of study “should stake out the positive possibilities of the tradition...”²⁶ The goal is not to bury the past or annihilate it, but to critique the way in which people view the tradition and “dominate it.”²⁷ Here we see that Heidegger’s own ideas about his destructive method indicate a desire to regain a primordial position in which Dasein is not bound by concepts that have become so commonplace over time that they essentially say nothing about the actual being of the world. Instead, he wants to elucidate how the history of the question of being has been covered over and how the reformulations of the question of being have actually led to the forgetting of the question of Being itself.

The Being that Heidegger pursues throughout his works is another name for the regioning that regions and is the origin of ontic being. It is the Being of beings that resides beyond ontic beings. Dasein is the being that is able to go beyond beings. “Going beyond beings occurs in the essence of Dasein.”²⁸ In going beyond beings, Dasein seeks to coincide with the Being of beings. In order to attain to the origin, “thinking and poeticizing must return to where, in a certain way, they have always

²⁴ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 22/20.

²⁵ Ibid. 22/20.

²⁶ Ibid. 22/20).

²⁷ Ibid. 23/20.

²⁸ Heidegger, *Pathmarks*, GA 9:121/96.

already been but have never yet built.”²⁹ Above we noted that recollective thinking was that which Heidegger believed could uncover the layers that had been deposited over Being through time and had masqueraded as metaphysical knowledge. It was through recollective thought and poetic insight that Heidegger believed one could build a path that allowed one to move to the place where one could recover metaphysics. There is an ambiguity in saying that is maintained in language through rules that guide the saying (thinking). This saying is actually the result of thinking and so the ambiguity of language reflects the thinking that grounds it. The ambiguity of words “is the garden of the wilderness in which growth and nurturance are attuned to one another out of an incomprehensible intimacy.”³⁰ Heidegger believed that poets and philosophers were those Dasein that labored in the realm of the ambiguity of thought in order to eradicate the everyday way in which humans think and speak. This everyday mode uses a language and thought that is rife with common words and ideas that fail to represent anything at all as these words level down objects, ideas, and possibilities. It was the recollective thought of the philosophers and poets that Heidegger hoped would continually seek new ways in which to elucidate and retrieve the original insights into Being. The ambiguity (flexibility) of thought could be used to destructure the words that had lost their meanings and reinstate the importance of reflective thought that takes the utmost seriousness in its task. Heidegger ends “On the Question of Being” with a quote from Goethe that provides insight into the way in which Heidegger viewed the use of language.

²⁹ Ibid. *GA* 9: 423/319.

³⁰ Ibid. *GA* 9:423/320.

If someone regards words and expressions as sacred testimonials, rather than merely bringing them into quick and fleeting circulation like tokens or paper money, seeking instead to employ them as true equivalents in intellectual exchange, then one cannot chide him for drawing attention to the way in which conventional expressions that no one takes exception to any longer indeed have a damaging influence, obfuscating opinions, distorting concepts, and leading entire disciplines in a wrong direction.³¹

Heidegger seeks a refuge in the ambiguity of thought and saying because this ambiguity is able to create a crack in the mode of thought that expresses in terms of clichés and colloquial language. The ambiguity of language is best expressed by those who understand the importance of recollective thought and continually work to express the essence of concepts and what it means for Dasein to exist. “Is there any more worthy endeavor to save what has been destined for us and handed down to us in its destiny than such recollective thinking?”³² Heidegger believed that it was this form of saying (thinking) that would allow for the formation of a path back to the essence of being (metaphysics).

At the end of his essay on Nietzsche and metaphysics, we see Heidegger again calling for a thinking that could eliminate the thought that had taken over as metaphysical thought. Heidegger claims that people are no longer able to seek Being because they can no longer think.³³ They no longer think because they have come to view the earth in terms of values and this has led to a view that covers over Being and scrutinizes beings (resources in this case). The madman from Nietzsche’s *Gay Science* (section 125) who announces the death of God challenges humans to think about the outcomes that now lie

³¹ Ibid. GA 9:425-426/322.

³² Ibid. GA 9:425/321.

³³ Heidegger, *Question Technology*, GA 5:267/112.

ahead after the death of God, what Heidegger equates with the “suprasensory world.”

However, those in the market place who already do not believe in God chuckle to themselves when the madman confronts them. However, their amusement displays their own ignorance. They have not undertaken the task of thinking about the outcomes of such a death, and they definitely have no thoughts about how the infinite could be sacrificed by the hands of humanity. It is only thinking that will allow one to be able to hear this madman. However, thinking “begins only when we have come to know that reason, glorified for centuries, is the most stiff-necked adversary of thought.”³⁴

Heidegger ends the essay with this quote not only to show that thinking is something that takes place outside of the realm of reason as it has been characterized and examined in the history of metaphysical thought, but also to show that reason can be aligned with the value-positing thought that views the world as an abundance of resources. This thought then seeks to harness and overcome the world in order to maximize the attainment of that which is valued (resources). In this sense, thinking must extend out of the value-positing in which it finds itself. However, what happens when the madman enters and claims the death of all values up to this point? Have humans taken the time to think about such a claim? What is left when the positing of values is no longer sufficient, and what is the outcome for those who have placed all their faith in such values? Reason is there providing the impetus that pushes humans into a value-positing relationship with the Being of the world. In contrast, the thinking that Heidegger proposes is one that opposes the value-positing of reason that covers the actual being of things with layers of value and meaning that obfuscate the things in their being.

³⁴ Ibid. *GA* 5:267/112.

In his “Conversation on a Country Path,” Heidegger calls this new form of thought meditative thought, and one who abides in this form of thought is one who draws closer to the emergence of the truth. The scholar says that if one understands truth as a recovery, then that-which-regions, “is presumably the hidden coming forth of this nature.”³⁵ Therefore, releasement is a steadfastness that desires the coming forth of nature’s truth that requires an in-dwelling [*Inständigkeit*] in the world that waits for the emergence of being from that which regions. “A patient noble-mindedness would be pure resting in itself of that willing, which, renouncing willing, has released itself to what is not will.”³⁶ Bret Davis claims that waiting lies in a relationship to the willing that wills non-willing when he says that “‘waiting’ can perhaps provisionally be understood as a radical passivity that interrupts active willing, and thus as a counterpart to ‘willing-nonwilling’.”³⁷ Davis goes on to claim that waiting represents a non-passive, non-active relationship to the regioning of being. This resting (waiting) of the will would allow for the emergence of the truth and would provide a vantage point (if we can use that term in this context) from which one would be able to see a more authentic vision of the openness that emerges in the regioning of being. Patient waiting is then the resting of the will in non-calculation as one gives up the position of utility and value-positing. One wills that one will no longer will objects in terms of satisfactions and from the view of resources and pre-established values. It is in this way that meditative thought and

³⁵ Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, 81.

³⁶ Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, 85.

³⁷ Bret Davis, *Heidegger and the Will: On the way to Gelassenheit*. (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2000), 222.

releasement can lead one out of the calculative thought that continues to press forward as the most accepted form of discovery and interrogation of the world.

In relation to the experience of being thrown into the world, Heidegger proposes a corrective to the everyday calculative thought that seeks its own gain in every organism and views nature as a vast source of potential energy. Dasein finds itself in a world in which it is abandoned to being and must seek meaning in whatever fashion it can. However, Dasein tends to fall into conditioned possibilities and finds solace in the comforts of that which society finds important. Heidegger indicates that one who was able to establish openness to the emergence of being would experience something other than the anxiety that is seemingly so prevalent in the journey towards Being that Heidegger lays out in his works.

At the end of *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, Heidegger claims that mankind is a transition. Humanity is a transition in that it is unable to remain but it is trapped in its being there. To make this statement more concrete, one could say that humans are essentially absent from their immediate environments and temporal present. What allows humans to exist as absent is the fact that they are able to transcend time and to think about past and future even when they are immersed in a present in which it might appear that they have interests. Humankind then is this transition between being there (*Da-sein*) and being away (*Weg-sein*). It is because humans are able to experience the transition and see their ends that they are able to be overcome with anxiety. Heidegger claims that it is because humans are constantly “mistaken concerning what is actual,” that they can become “seized by terror [*entsetzen*]. And only where there is the perilousness of being seized by terror do we find the bliss of astonishment— being torn away in that

wakeful manner that is the breath of all philosophizing...”³⁸ The “bliss of astonishment” [*die Seligkeit des Staunens*] indicates a positive attunement that Heidegger believed could arise alongside the experience of terror in the realization that one is mistaken about what he or she believes is actual. This bliss is aroused by being torn away from the error of what one thought was actual, and we see this being torn away directly related to an awakening that comes through philosophizing.

In addition to the bliss that arises out of philosophy, Heidegger also finds joy alongside the anxiety that arises in the uncovering of Being and knowledge of the openness of existence. In his “Postscript to ‘What is Metaphysics?’” Heidegger makes reference to Nietzsche’s ideas of affirmation as well as the relationship between anxiety and joy when he says that “Readiness for anxiety is a Yes to assuming a stance that fulfills the highest claim, a claim that is made upon the human essence alone.”³⁹ Heidegger makes reference to Nietzsche when he makes reference to the “Yes” that is the affirmation of the anxiety that arises when one holds oneself out into the nothing in which beings as ontic manifestations fade and the Being of beings emerges. It is necessary that Dasein stands courageously in the face of this nothing because in so doing it allows for the emergence (the uncovering) of the Being of beings. In Heidegger’s “What is Metaphysics?” he writes in a similar fashion about those that are able to stand in the face of the anxiety that arises when Dasein comes close to the nothing. In this article, he calls those that can courageously face this anxiety daring.

³⁸ Martin Heidegger, *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 366. [GA 29-30: 531]

³⁹ Heidegger, *Pathmarks*, GA 9:307/ 234.

But those daring ones are sustained by that on which they expend themselves – in order thus to preserve the ultimate grandeur of Dasein.

The anxiety of those who are daring [*Die Angst des Verwegenen*] cannot be opposed to joy or even to the comfortable enjoyment of tranquilized bustle. It stands – outside all such opposition – in secret alliance with the cheerfulness and gentleness of creative longing.⁴⁰

In this quote we see the juxtaposition of anxiety with more positive experiences. In this case, Heidegger claims that the anxiety is allied with cheerfulness and creative longing.

He indicates that the one who is able to stand courageously to preserve the place of Dasein as meaning bearer does not necessarily get swallowed up in anxiety, but experiences a sort of cheerfulness.

If we move to Heidegger's "Postscript to 'What is Metaphysics?'" we see that essential anxiety gives way to awe. "For close by essential anxiety as the horror of the abyss dwells awe [*Scheu*]. Awe clears and cherishes that locality of the human essence within which humans remain at home in that which endures."⁴¹ Heidegger juxtaposes anxiety with the experience of awe. If Dasein can find the courage to stand in the anxiety that reveals the ontological Being of the world, Dasein will experience awe in the face of Being. This awe results in a cherishing of Dasein's position as it is able to "experience the wonder of all wonders: *that beings are*."⁴² Being in the face of the "wonder of all wonders" [*das Wunder aller Wunder*] indicates a sense in which one is overcome by being in relation to Being. Awe is the experience of Dasein as it finds itself as spectator to that which allows for the existence of all beings, what Heidegger calls the wonder of all wonders.

⁴⁰ Ibid. GA 9:118/ 93.

⁴¹ Ibid. GA 9:307/234.

⁴² Ibid. GA 9:307/234.

We have shown that Heidegger believed that there was a mode of thought that could take the place of the calculative mode that had seemingly become the only accepted mode of thinking. We have also seen that the tranquilization of Dasein's angst about being in the world is the result of being engrossed in *das Man* and the conditioned possibilities of the being together of Dasein with others. Although angst is the attunement that emerges in the primordial uncovering of the truth of being, the uncovering of Being that occurs as a result of a new thinking (meditative thinking) also results in awe, cheerfulness, and creative longing.

The analysis above shows us that Heidegger believed that the courageous one who stood in the face of anxiety would find something arise alongside that anxiety. For Heidegger, this means that as one moved away from calculative thought to a mode of existence where one attempts to wait for the emergence of being, one would be open to see the uncovering of being. One waits in courage and patience of will in order to move away from concepts and representations that fail to grasp the Being of beings. Heidegger's hope is that in waiting, a more primordial experience of Being will emerge, or better said, will have the space to reveal itself.

Heidegger believed that humans needed to establish a rootedness in existence through releasement towards being. In order to attain this comportment, one had to will a non-willing, leaving behind the will that tends to see things in the world as satisfactions of certain desires. It was only in this way that one could allow for the approach of that which upholds and brings forth the existence of beings in the world and the relationships between these beings. It is in this way that the anxiety of being in the world and facing

the nothing that confronts Dasein as it approaches the question why something exists is replaced by a rootedness in that which regions.

In an article on the loss of origin and *Unheimlichkeit*, Fabio Ciaramelli begins the article with quotes from Heidegger about Holderlin's poem *Germanien*. Heidegger meditates on this poem in order to think about the return to origin: "in Heidegger's terms, 'the unique place found by the poet in his homeland.'" ⁴³ Ciaramelli claims that the speaking of origin hints at a hidden dimension that is concealed under that in which humans are engrossed each day. Poetic thinking is that thinking that reveals the origin of that which is lost "within the self-evidence of our being-at-home in the familiar."⁴⁴ According to Heidegger, the primordial manifestation of being occurs in the withdrawal of the familiar.⁴⁵ This is attested to in his explications of authentic anxiety in *Being and Time* as well as his discussion of standing in the face of "this" nothing in "What is Metaphysics?" and the other writings associated with that text.

Carefree dwelling in the familiar is the most common attitude and it does not concern itself with delving into the primordial being that is veiled by everyday at-homeness. However, "Originary nearness implies in itself the ontological dimension of *Unheimlichkeit* (uncanniness), even if the latter is very often concealed. In this sense, the ontological modality of the *Heimischsein* (being-at-home, familiarity) already contains

⁴³ Fabio Ciaramelli, "The Loss of Origin and Heidegger's Question of *Unheimlichkeit*," *Epoche 2*, no. 1 (January 1994): 13.

⁴⁴ Ciaramelli, "The Loss of Origin," 14.

⁴⁵ Ciaramelli, "The Loss of Origin," 15.

Unheimlichkeit (uncanniness).”⁴⁶ In *Introduction to Metaphysics*, Heidegger claims that Dasein is that being which “opens itself to the project of poetic thinking.”⁴⁷ “Only poetic thinking, only this peculiar perspective...offers that determination of the essence of humanity that can lead humanity to its originary and essential belonging to being.”⁴⁸ However, in order to understand the secret of the origin, it is necessary that Dasein experience *Unheimlichkeit*. It is precisely uncanniness that rips Dasein out of its carefree being at home in the world. It is in uncanniness that everyday beings fade and Being emerges. When one is not at home in the world, objects no longer offer themselves in the same comforting manner. One can no longer find solace in the beings that once were never thought about because they were so common, mundane, and unobtrusive. However, in the experience of the uncanny, Dasein loses the relationships to objects and beings that have kept it blind to the realm of Being as it lives in everyday carefree being in the world. Poetic thinking is that thinking that is able to think in terms of the origin and is able to speak of that origin when it remains in the *Angst* of being torn out of everyday being. “Thus – understood as the essence of humanity by the poetic-thinking project – *Unheimlichkeit* lets humans become familiar with nearness to origin. In this event, the whole of being is disclosed.”⁴⁹

The familiarity that Dasein has with its world in carefree everyday being at home is lost in the experience of the *Unheimliche*. This results in ontological *Angst*. However,

⁴⁶ Ciaramelli, “The Loss of Origin,” 16.

⁴⁷ Martin Heidegger, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, trans. Gregory Fried and Richard Polt (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 149.

⁴⁸ Ciaramelli, “The Loss of Origin,” 19.

⁴⁹ Ciaramelli, “The Loss of Origin,” 22.

many then flee from this primordial *Angst* in the hope that it will be replaced by the previous comfort. However, standing resolutely in the face of this uncanniness is precisely what Heidegger calls Dasein to do in order to remain open for the unveiling of Being. In this way, Dasein holds itself out into the nothing and remains in the uncanny realm in which everyday relations with ontic beings fade into the background and one is lost in being not at home in the world. Ciaramelli claims that it is necessary that Dasein go through a three-fold progression 1) being-at-home in the world in everydayness, 2) being ripped out of everydayness by *Unheimlichkeit* and experiencing the *Angst* that arises in the face of a world without a home, and 3) traversing this *Angst* not with a view to eliminate it at all costs, but with the resolution that being in relation to the origin is better than being blind to that which grounds ontic existence. This third mode of being is the antithesis of the mode in which one would flee back into entanglement in order to ease the *Angst* with which one is overcome in uncanniness. Ultimately, Ciaramelli concludes that the “original and concealed anxiety of *Unheimlichkeit* (uncanniness) can reverse the inauthentic familiarity among beings in which we are first and foremost fallen, by the discovery of such an originary withdrawing of being, that is, at the same time, the primordial condition of its manifestation.”⁵⁰

In the first chapter of this dissertation, we analyzed anxiety in the face of Dasein’s finitude. This experience is important because in it, one is able to experience the uncanniness of existence. In being towards death, one is ripped from the tranquility of a life that is free from thinking about the end of all possibilities. Everyday carefree being is not concerned with death, and when the subject of death arises, people tend to curb the

⁵⁰ Ciaramelli, “The Loss of Origin,” 32.

discussion or not allow for the space for adequate anxiety about death. However, it is this anxiety that is able to allow for the experience of the uncanny. This experience rips Dasein from its everydayness, presents Dasein with a world that has lost its hospitality, and provides the choice of how Dasein will respond to its new state of existence. Ciaramelli shows us that uncanniness is the transition phase from inauthentic at-homeness (what we have been calling “care-free”) to the potential for authentic being at home in the world for Heidegger. Therefore, it is necessary to examine how one can respond to this experience in order to show the joy that Heidegger claims emerges when one finds oneself faced with Being.

Although Dasein in general flees from confronting its own finitude, Heidegger does claim that there is a mode of authentic relation to one’s finitude. He says that in order to be authentic, being toward death “must be understood as possibility, cultivated as possibility, and endured as possibility in our relation to it.”⁵¹ Because death is not something at hand that can be examined, it must be maintained as a possibility. It is in anticipation [*Vorlaufen*] that being toward death can be maintained as a possibility.⁵² Anticipation is what allows Dasein to recognize that being toward death is non-relational. It cannot be taken by another, and it is something that lies at the basis of one’s existence. In addition, anticipation shows being toward death as a possibility that is “not to be bypassed.”⁵³ Authentic anticipation is that mode of being that does not attempt to flee

⁵¹ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 261/241.

⁵² Ibid. 262/242.

⁵³ Ibid. 264/243.

from the impossibility of bypassing death. Rather, one is free for this possibility in standing in anticipation towards this possibility.

As one frees oneself for one's own death, one is in relation to one's ownmost possibility. There is no place for distractions or mundane possibilities that society at large provides. One is not in a place where one can flee to enjoyment, art, nature, or relationships in order to cover over one's primordial relationship to finitude. Rather, one is totally laid bare before one's own death and one realizes the gravity of one's relation to death. Inauthentic possibilities fade into the background and are lost when one comes into the nearness of finitude in anticipation. It is only from this view that Dasein becomes authentic in relation to the less primordial possibilities it can undertake in everyday life. "Anticipation discloses to existence that its extreme inmost possibility lies in giving itself up and thus shatters all one's clinging to whatever existence one has reached."⁵⁴ The meanings Dasein has used to create itself in the world are now recognized as inauthentic possibilities conditioned by a flight from death. In this recognition, Dasein sees through those inauthentic possibilities. Dasein realizes that it has been conditioned by those possibilities and that up to this point, it has formed itself in relation to those possibilities. It is now free to begin anew. It has shattered itself on its ownmost possibility not to be bypassed, and has emerged free for its death. It anticipates its death and recognizes the importance of its death as the end of its possibility. In this new light, all other possibilities are then disclosed to Dasein as relying on its finitude. All other possibilities can be undertaken from the perspective that they could be Dasein's final undertaking. In summary, Heidegger claims that:

⁵⁴ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 264/244.

*Anticipation reveals to Dasein its lostness in the they-self, and brings it face to face with the possibility to be itself, primarily unsupported by concern taking care of things, but to be itself in passionate anxious freedom toward death which is free of the illusions of the they, factual, and certain of itself.*⁵⁵

According to Heidegger, angst is that attunement in which Dasein is able to hold itself out in anticipation into the threat of its own finitude.⁵⁶ However, the outcome of doing so is freedom toward one's own death and a release from the carefree everydayness that is characteristic of being caught up in inauthentic possibilities.

In order to emerge from angst, one must stand courageously in resolute anticipation in relation to one's finitude. Heidegger only uses the German word for joy [*Freude*] twice in his *Being and Time*. It occurs once as Heidegger speaks about "anticipatory resoluteness." Heidegger says that it is only in resolute anticipation that one can be free for one's death and eliminate one's self-covering. Self-covering is that which occurs when one is entangled in every day being and lives in relation to ontic beings in such a manner that one's finitude does not appear in consciousness. Resoluteness is that mode of existence in which Dasein does not flee its possibility of death, but confronts it through the mood of anxiety and remains in it rather than distracting itself from its finitude. However, this anxiety is accompanied by joy. "Together with the sober *Angst* that brings us before our individualized potentiality-of-being, goes the unshakable joy [*gerustete Freude*] in this possibility."⁵⁷ Here one finds Heidegger directly juxtaposing anxiety with joy. It is evident that in this passage Heidegger believed that joy could emerge alongside anxiety as one was freed from being

⁵⁵ Ibid. 266/245.

⁵⁶ Ibid. 265-266/245.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 310/286.

distracted and encompassed by inauthentic possibility and was cast more fundamentally into the experience of one's finitude. Heidegger believed that although one is overcome by anxiety in the authentic experience of one's finitude, one was not condemned then to live a life that was full of anxiety and the negativity that emerges when one thinks about the end of one's life. Instead, there arises an "unshakeable joy" in this possibility. This unshakeable joy is the joy that arises when one finds oneself outside of the everyday, carefree existence that has kept one blinded in entanglement. Although one finds oneself confronted by the anxiety of the end, this anxiety reveals a new realm in which one finds oneself free from the givenness of societal existence and one has the experience of the unveiling of truth in one's own life. A new realm has been unveiled in which one can see the untruth that has guided one's existence up to this point. This joy is unshakeable because it is the joy of one who sees into the realms of Being that have been closed up to this point. One is free to start a new life that can commence from a foundation that is free from the deposits that obscure Dasein's ideas about itself and about what is important in existence, thereby opening Dasein to a more authentic uncovering of Being.

CONCLUSIONS ABOUT HEIDEGGEREAN JOY

It is evident that a concept of Heideggerean joy is one that emerges out of certain negative aspects of existence. First, Heideggerean joy surfaces in the meditative thought that opens itself for releasement in the face of the nothing. In addition, Heideggerean joy arises from the anxiety of living in resolute anticipation in relation to being towards death and the emergence of a new recognition of Dasein's possibilities and the importance of

its actions. Heidegger's joy is one that comes at the end of patient waiting and thinking that attempts to think the Being of beings. It emerges from an angst that is the fundamental attunement of Dasein as it is in relation to its being and its death. Heideggerean joy emerges in releasing oneself from one's will as well as re-appropriating existence in relation to inauthentic possibility. If one is able to confront and remain in relation to being towards death, there is joy as one is freed from the tranquillization that occurs in existence through the possibilities given by "the they." One is freed from the illusions one has used to construct one's being, and one recognizes the importance of certain possibilities in relation to others. Although angst emerges alongside this joy, there is joy nonetheless in a more primordial understanding of possibilities and their importance. It is in this way that I believe Heidegger conceived joy, and I have attempted to show this conception in the attempt to remain true to his ideas about the relationship between the positive and negative aspects of the uncovering of Being.

Although we have spent a significant amount of time outlining a conception of Heideggerean joy, there is an idiosyncrasy that emerges as one works through Heidegger's sparse passages on joy. Heidegger says that "unshakeable joy" arises alongside angst in relation to death. It seems that in the joy that arises alongside the anxiety of death, one is released from the possibilities given by society and experiences a new freedom. However, it also appears that one becomes even more abandoned to Being. This is the case because the inauthentic entanglement that has kept Dasein content and carefree up to this point is replaced by a clearer understanding of Dasein's lostness in inauthenticity. One finds oneself absolutely alone in the world. That means that this joy is one that relishes abandonment and separation. If we remember the

influence of Nietzsche on Heidegger's idea in *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, this does not seem to be a problem, for Nietzsche often claimed that one had to learn to live a type of solitary existence (although not necessarily apart from other people). We have mentioned earlier that Heidegger could say that in releasement towards being one experiences a harmony with being that comforts in the face of abandonment. However, if it is not the case that being provides this comfort, then it seems that Heidegger's joy is a peculiar one to say the least.

As Heidegger writes, he masterfully elucidates the realm that has been covered over for humanity and that is hidden beneath the realm of beings. He explains how it is that Dasein can approach the origin of existence, and this approach is characterized by anxiety. Dasein's anxiety arises in relation to the fact that it can no longer find solace in the world that has held total meaning for it up to this point. As the meanings of beings fade into the background, Dasein recognizes that which underlies beings and causes the regioning that we examined earlier. However, as Dasein approaches this origin, it falls deeper into anxiety and the horror of this nothing. There is no father god that comforts as one approaches that in which all abides. As we will see later, in the experience of being abandoned to Being, one confronts the horrific. However, upon taking his reader to the brink of destruction (throughout his works), Heidegger tends to pull back at the last minute and make a brief remark about an awe, joy, cheerfulness or creative longing that also emerges alongside this experience. It seems then that at the moment that Being would engulf Dasein in absolute horror, Dasein experiences the awe of Being or the joy of being in relation to Being. However, just as soon as Heidegger mentions these experiences that keep Dasein from being overcome in anxiety or horror, he moves back

into a discussion of “this nothing” or “resolute anticipation” and leaves the explication of the positive experiences behind. We have attempted the task of extending Heidegger’s ideas in order to examine the conception of joy that comes out of Heidegger’s own writings. However, we have found that Heidegger’s ideas about joy arise in relation to the negative and are cut short for a more intense examination of the anxiety and horror out of which joy is supposed to emerge.

It appears then that Heidegger’s ideas fall within the realm of a juxtaposed joy. What I mean by this is that his conceptions of joy arise in relation to anxiety, pain, and annihilation of possibility. Heidegger’s joy emerges out of the anxiety that arises as one finds oneself first in relation to being and second in relation to one’s own death. In addition, the joy or creative longing that emerges out of anxiety appears to arise out of Dasein’s internal recognition of its place in the world as that being which is able to see the emergence of being. As Dasein authentically confronts Being through the attunement of anxiety, Dasein experiences joy in the moment when it recognizes its position in relation to Being. Dasein is that being for which being emerges, and Heidegger claims that it is this recognition that provides a sense of gratitude in Dasein for its position in the world. Dasein thanks existence because it finds itself as the place where the being of the world emerges. It is in this sense that Dasein can “assume the guardianship [*Wächterschaft*] of being.”⁵⁸ Dasein is willing to sacrifice itself for the emergence of the truth because it is filled with gratitude when it recognizes the position it has been given in the world. What is important to recognize here is that the awe with which Dasein views its own position and the gratitude it experiences all arise out of a singular understanding

⁵⁸ Heidegger, *Pathmarks*, GA 9:310/ 236.

that emerges in a specific Dasein. It is out of its own singular existence that Dasein recognizes its place in being and experiences the liberation from its previous understanding of being.

We see something similar in Heidegger's second explication of joy that arises alongside anxiety in the face of the finitude of Dasein. As Dasein stands resolutely and patiently in the experience of primordial anxiety, it comes to a place where this anxiety is juxtaposed with joy in this possibility. The joy of this possibility is related to the freedom that comes when one is released from everyday conceptions of life and inauthentic appropriations in relation to death. However, this freedom is again a singular experience that arises in an individual out of the individual and its own struggles to be courageous in the face of anxiety. It appears then that Heidegger's joys are singular events that perhaps have no relation to other humans. They are experiences that rely on the internal recognition of one's place in the world and a more authentic understanding of the being that brings forth Dasein and provides for the abiding of Dasein. The joy of anticipation and being overcome by being is an outcome of an experience of ultimate freedom. Heidegger says that the sacrifice of Dasein in expending itself "in being for the truth of being," is "that of the human essence expending itself – in a manner removed from all compulsion, because it arises from the abyss of freedom – for the preservation of the truth of being for beings."⁵⁹ In a similar manner noted above, the anticipatory resoluteness allows Dasein, "to be itself in passionate anxious freedom toward death

⁵⁹ Ibid. *GA* 9:310/ 236.

which is free of the illusions of the they, factual, and certain of itself.”⁶⁰ Both of these experiences of the revelation of being and the emergence of joy then result from a newfound freedom that occurs inside Dasein as it recognizes its position in the world and its previous entanglement in conditioned possibilities.

From these analyses, it appears then that joy (or the other positive experiences that arise out of authentic understanding) is an outcome of an experience of freedom that allows Dasein to see that it has been blinded to the reality of being (both the being of the world and itself). Joy then is not primordial, but the offspring of the freedom that comes with the emergence of a more authentic self-understanding. In addition, joy, creative longing, and cheerfulness are all reliant on Dasein’s relationship to being. They are singular events in singular Dasein that have nothing to do with others. We will not broach the question of the relationship between joy and other human beings in Heidegger’s thought. Heidegger says nothing about this relationship at all, and it would be impossible to account for such a relationship in his thought. However, we do believe that it is necessary to account for the primordially of joy as well as the relationship between joy and humanity at large. Bergson will provide an account that emphasizes both of these aspects. In contrast, Heidegger’s account of joy always presents itself as arising in response to liberation of the singularity that occurs not in Dasein’s relation to other humans, but in its relation to the being of the world. If other Dasein are involved, it is only because the authentic Dasein must wrench itself free from the layers that have accumulated over an authentic understanding of being due to the forgetting of the question of being and the leveling of knowledge by *das Man*. Heidegger’s joy is not

⁶⁰ Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 266/245.

fundamental and it has nothing to do with Dasein's interactions with other humans but with an internal, authentic self-awareness that arises as Dasein confronts anxiety and the horror of existence in courageous waiting.

The history of human existence has always pointed to the relationship of pain and joy. It has often been stated that one must go through the sufferings of life in order to experience joy. One can merely examine his or her experiences and one will find that the pains of death, destruction, and violation often become catalysts for growth, development, and birth. However, one must not go too far and make joy merely the outcome of pain and suffering. Joy does not exist as the offspring of agony. It stands on the other side of the vast expanse of human experience and emerges from the opposite edge to counter that which would seek to leave humanity abandoned to meaninglessness in the face of the destructive powers on earth. We did not characterize Heidegger's conception of joy with the goal of tearing it apart. However, now that we have moved through this section, it is evident that Heidegger had more to say about anxiety and freedom than about joy. It is more evident that he always brought joy out of relations with death (*Being and Time*) and pain (*The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*). We have extrapolated to also claim that perhaps another aspect of joy could emerge in relation to his views on releasement towards being. Heidegger did recognize that there had to be a reformation of thought if one was to experience a newfound joy. He also shows us that it is necessary to persevere in the face of misery and anxiety in order to, at the very least, see what might lie on the other side of these experiences. However, we also believe that Heidegger goes too far in his characterization of the foundations of existence in relation to anxiety, death, and the nothing. There are experiences of joy and

there is an at-homeness in the world that is not inauthentic and that does not have to be attained from an original state of entanglement. Perhaps we can say that Heidegger explicates the courage that it takes to experience the joy that is related to the anguish of existence. However, he does not provide insights into the positive joys that emerge randomly and merely out of the fact that one exists in the world (what one could call fundamental joy). In Bergson, we will see an account of joy that is located at the opposite pole of existence, mood, and experience. How could two philosophers have such differing views on joy and its fundamental manifestation? Before we turn to Bergson's account of joy, we feel that it is necessary to attempt to answer this question by linking the two through the concept of "the nothing." The concept of "Nothing" is integral for both philosophers. We have outlined Bergson's critical account of the idea and the concept of nothing in chapter two.⁶¹ Now it is time to provide an account of the nothing in Heidegger's thought in order to display the foundations from which the ontologies of both philosophers emerge. In this way, we will see the fundamental relationship that each has to the nothing, and we will show that the extremes towards which each move is the result of his understanding of the nothing, its action, and its existence in the world. Analysis of the nothing will also shed light on the ideas the two philosophers had about mood and the fundamental manifestation of mood. Is anxiety fundamental? Is joy fundamental? Could it be that these philosophers found, not what they were searching for with some method that attempts to let things reveal themselves as they are, but the things that they were predestined to find given that the attunements that they found to be fundamental were first located in each one of them? Was their

⁶¹ Pages 106-112

givenness attuned in a certain manner that necessitated the revelation of anxiety and joy as fundamental? We hope to shed light on the relationship between mood and the emergence of the ontologies of both of these philosophers, showing that their conceptions of the nothing guided their views on fundamental mood as well as the foundations of existence itself.

THE NOTHING AND ITS PLACE IN THE ONTOLOGIES OF HEIDEGGER AND BERGSON

Heidegger lays out his most in depth analysis of the nothing in his essay “What is Metaphysics?” and the essays related to this essay. It is necessary to examine this work along with the others associated with this text in order to understand Heidegger’s conception of the nothing and its place in the emergence of being. Heidegger begins the work by talking about metaphysical inquiry. However, he transitions early in the essay and begins to speak about science. “Our existence – in the community of researchers, teachers, and students – is determined by science. What is happening to us, essentially, in the grounds of our existence, when science has become our passion?”⁶² Why this strange shift to science? This question can be answered if we look at Heidegger’s “On the Question of Being.” In this essay written in honor of Ernst Jünger, Heidegger comes back to a discussion of his “What is Metaphysics?” In this discussion, Heidegger claims that it has been forgotten that this “essay” (“What is Metaphysics?”) was actually an

⁶² Heidegger, *Pathmarks*, GA 9:103/82.

address that Heidegger gave at an inaugural philosophical lecture before other faculty members.

The question ‘What is Metaphysics?’ was discussed in an inaugural philosophical lecture before all the assembled faculties. For this reason, it places itself in the sphere of all sciences and speaks to them.⁶³

One sees that it is because Heidegger is addressing a group of professors from all fields that he begins by speaking about the realm of science and its mode of inquiry.

Heidegger goes on (in “What is Metaphysics?”) to elucidate the general characteristics of scientific enquiry. He believes that the scientific mode allows beings to show themselves in a unique way. “The relation to the world that pervades all the sciences as such lets them seek beings themselves in order to make them objects of investigation and to determine their grounds – in each case according to their particular content and manner of being.”⁶⁴ The way in which the scientist seeks the knowledge of these aspects of beings is related to the stance that he or she takes in relation to the beings. The stance that one takes in the realm of science is different from the everyday stance that one takes in relation to beings or the stance that one takes when one is enjoying being and living in the world. In the scientific “stance” one allows the being to exude its properties and one attempts to record the information given off by the object. “In such impartiality of inquiring, determining, and grounding, a peculiarly delineated submission to beings themselves obtains, such that beings are allowed to reveal themselves.”⁶⁵ It is in the pursuit of science and the stance that one takes that humanity

⁶³ Ibid. *GA* 9:418/316.

⁶⁴ Ibid. *GA* 9:104/83.

⁶⁵ Ibid. *GA* 9:104/83.

“irrupts” into the world of beings, “indeed in such a way that in and through this irruption beings break open and show what they are and how they are.”⁶⁶ Beings show themselves how they show themselves to the scientific investigators when humans have a specific relation to the world and a scientific stance in that relationship.

The trinity of scientific enquiry is then 1) relation to the world, 2) stance, and 3) irruption. Heidegger relates these three aspects of scientific life to the nothing.

That to which the relation to the world refers are beings themselves – and nothing besides.

That from which every stance takes its guidance are beings themselves – and nothing further.

That with which the scientific confrontation in the irruption occurs are beings themselves – and beyond that, nothing.⁶⁷

Heidegger finds an interesting dichotomy between the study of science and its relation to beings. It appears that in the scientific view, one studies beings and beyond that, nothing. There is nothing outside of the realm of beings that the scientist can study. However, Heidegger asks about this nothing. In its own explication of its task, science speaks of the nothing (“We study beings, and beyond that, nothing”). However, it rejects the nothing as if it were a phantasm. “If science is right, then only one thing is sure: science wishes to know nothing of the nothing.”⁶⁸ It is at this point that Heidegger finds the question that he will pursue throughout the rest of the essay: “How is it with the nothing?”⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Ibid. *GA* 9:105/83.

⁶⁷ Ibid. *GA* 9:105/84.

⁶⁸ Ibid. *GA* 9:106/84.

⁶⁹ Ibid. *GA* 9:106/84.

The question of the nothing is unique in that when one posits the question, one seemingly falls immediately into a contradiction. If one asks about the nothing, then one is treating the nothing as an object. However, in treating the nothing as object one is then negating that which is most integral to the nothing: its nothingness. It seems then that the question “deprives itself of its own object.”⁷⁰ However, it is not science that teaches humans that the nothing cannot be an object. Instead, the logical rules of thought negate this question from the beginning. If logic is the master of all thought, the contradiction that arises in the thinking of the nothing should lead humanity to reject it at the outset and to say nothing more of it. However, it is the intellect itself that allows humans to posit the existence of the nothing. It seems that the nothing is the negation of all being, and is therefore nonbeing. However, Heidegger questions which type of negation comes first. Is the nothing only given because of the intellect’s power of negation, or is it that the nothing is primordial and the intellect can think negation only because it in some sense recognizes the nothing?⁷¹ “We assert that the nothing is more originary than the ‘not’ and negation.”⁷² This means that the intellect is dependent upon the nothing, not that the power of negation of the intellect is primary.

If the nothing is to be enquired about, then it must be able to be encountered. What points to the encounter of humanity with the nothing? Heidegger claims the first thing that indicates humans have a relationship to the nothing is the way in which it is used in everyday talk and the fact that there is a definition for it. “The nothing is the

⁷⁰ Ibid *GA* 9:107/85.

⁷¹ Ibid. *GA* 9:108/86.

⁷² Ibid. *GA* 9:108/86.

complete negation of the totality of beings.”⁷³ How does humanity (a group of finite beings) come to this definition if it is unable to adequately present everything to itself and then eliminate it? Heidegger answers that:

We can of course think the whole of beings in an ‘idea,’ then negate what we have imagined in our thought, and thus ‘think’ it negated. In this way we do attain the formal concept of the imagined nothing but never the nothing itself.⁷⁴

The formal concept of nothing is then something different from the “proper” nothing that is being investigated in this essay. For Heidegger, just because one finds oneself located within the realm of beings, surrounded by beings, does not mean that one can form an adequate concept of this realm that could be negated absolutely. This passage from Heidegger has a striking coincidence with Bergson’s critique of the nothing posited as the negation or annihilation of all beings. Bergson also rejected a similar conception of the nothing as the negation or annihilation of all beings. For Bergson, his critique involved the inability to adequately represent the annihilation of everything because even if one were to conceive of this nothing, one would still have to posit the space in which all beings had once existed. In this sense, the concept was inadequate. In both Heidegger and Bergson we see the rejection of an idea of the nothing as the negation of all beings. We will examine this idea in more detail later when we deal with the outcomes of their respective conceptions of the nothing.

Dasein finds itself among beings because it is primordially attuned to existence. “Finding ourselves attuned not only unveils beings as a whole in various ways, but this unveiling – far from being merely incidental – is also the fundamental occurrence for our

⁷³ Ibid. *GA* 9:109/86.

⁷⁴ Ibid. *GA* 9:109/86-87.

Dasein.”⁷⁵ Heidegger claims that most attunements present a world to Dasein in which it can focus on beings and be immersed in these relationships. However, there is an attunement in which beings fade, and Dasein is brought before the nothing. This mood is anxiety [*Angst*]. Anxiety is fundamentally different from fear in that fear is always fear in the face of this or that being. Because fear is related to innerworldly beings, it does not reveal the nothing for which we are searching.

In contrast to the fear that arises in relation to beings, anxiety arises in relation to something that is indeterminable. “The indeterminateness of that in the face of which and concerning which we become anxious is no mere lack of determination but rather the essential impossibility of determining it.”⁷⁶ The indeterminable that arises in anxiety makes one feel uncanny. Uncanniness (not being at home in the world) is the result of what Heidegger calls the fading of beings. “All things and we ourselves sink into indifference...The receding of beings as a whole, closing in on us in anxiety, oppresses us. We can get no hold on things...Anxiety makes manifest the nothing.”⁷⁷ Because Dasein finds itself without a foothold in being, it feels suspended in the whole. Not only do beings in the world fade into the background, but Dasein’s own personality fades and Dasein is left speechless. There is an absolute experience of the nothing in which all beings fade as well as the internal being of Dasein itself, leaving only pure Dasein (being

⁷⁵ Ibid. *GA* 9:110/87.

⁷⁶ Ibid. *GA* 9:111/88.

⁷⁷ Ibid. *GA* 9:111-112/88.

there). “With the fundamental attunement of anxiety we have arrived at that occurrence in Dasein in which the nothing is manifest and from which it must be interrogated.”⁷⁸

Heidegger claims that it is necessary to explicate how the nothing reveals itself in the experience of anxiety in order to hone in on what it is. First, the nothing does not reveal itself as an object in anxiety.⁷⁹ At the same time, beings in the world fade and slip away when one is overcome by anxiety. The fading of objects in the world is the result of the essential repelling of the nothing. “This wholly repelling gesture toward beings that are slipping away as a whole, which is the action of the nothing that closes in on Dasein in anxiety, is the essence of the nothing: nihilation [*die Nichtung*].”⁸⁰ This nihilation is not the annihilation of all beings. Instead, it is the slipping away of beings as a whole from Dasein. It is in this sense that Heidegger can make his famous claim that “The nothing itself nihilates [*Das Nichts selbst nichtet*].”⁸¹ The nihilation of the nothing is in relation to beings as they slip away from the everyday contexts and meanings that they once held for Dasein. However, as these preconceived ideas and relationships to beings fade, the being of beings emerges in a strange new way. They are radically other than the nothing. “In the clear night of the nothing of anxiety the original openness of beings as such arises: that they are beings – and not nothing... The essence of the originally nihilating nothing lies in this, that it brings Dasein for the first time before

⁷⁸ Ibid. GA 9:112/89.

⁷⁹ Ibid. GA 9:113/89.

⁸⁰ Ibid. GA 9:114/90.

⁸¹ Ibid. GA 9:114/90.

beings as such.”⁸² Appearing as something that is an absolute absence, the nothing actually allows for the emergence of beings in a radical primordiality and in so doing, the nothing nihilates itself.

It is only because Dasein is held out into the nothing that it can respond to beings. “Dasein means: being held out into the nothing.”⁸³ Because Dasein is held out into the nothing, it is beyond beings. Dasein realizes its being beyond beings when it experiences beings in their strangeness in the experience of the nothing that comes from anxiety. Because Dasein holds itself out into the nothing, it is able to take a position from which it can analyze beings and itself. “Without the original manifestness of the nothing, no selfhood and no freedom.”⁸⁴ The nothing is neither an object nor a being. Instead, it is the ground from which beings are manifest to Dasein. “The nothing...originally belongs to their (beings) essential unfolding as such.”⁸⁵

How can Heidegger say that the unfolding of beings occurs in anxiety in the face of Dasein’s recognition that it is held out into the nothing? Most people experience beings outside of any originary anxiety. However, Heidegger claims that the everyday manner in which beings are experienced merely displays that an originary relationship to the nothing is covered over in general for most Dasein. To say that most people do not experience ontic beings in the attunement of anxiety says nothing of whether or not their experiences are authentic. Running towards its interests and being overcome by

⁸² Ibid. *GA* 9:114/90.

⁸³ Ibid. *GA* 9:115/91.

⁸⁴ Ibid. *GA* 9:115/91.

⁸⁵ Ibid. *GA* 9:115/91. [parentheses mine]

superficialities of existence, Dasein finds itself blind to the nothing that underlies the realm of beings. This coincides with what Heidegger said about the nihilation of the nothing. As the nothing nihilates itself, beings emerge. In the hiddenness of the nothing, beings come to the forefront and Dasein focuses on those beings and is blind to the existence of the nothing.

For those skeptical of the idea that this nothing is a primordial aspect of the emergence of being, Heidegger attempts to argue that the idea of negation (the not) displays the primordial relationship that Dasein has to the nothing. There would be nothing to be negated if Dasein did not have a primordial ability to negate. If all there are in the world are existent beings, then how is it that humans have the ability to negate in the first place? From whence did this mysterious power emerge? Heidegger states that the human power to negate “can become manifest only when its origin, the nihilation of the nothing in general, and therewith the nothing itself, is disengaged from concealment.”⁸⁶ It is therefore the ability to negate that rests on the existence of the nothing and not the other way around.

Negation is not the only way in which the original understanding of the nothing emerges in Dasein. In addition, various experiences point towards the nothing as their source.

Unyielding antagonism and stinging rebuke have a more abysmal source than the measured negation of thought. Galling failure and merciless prohibition require some deeper answer. Bitter privation is more burdensome.

These possibilities of nihilative comportment [*nichtenden Verhaltens*] – forces in which Dasein bears its thrownness without mastering it – are not types

⁸⁶ Ibid. GA 9:116/92.

of negation. That does not prevent them, however, from speaking out in the ‘no’ and in negation.⁸⁷

Heidegger believes that the multiplicity of negative experiences and attunements displays another way in which the nothing reveals itself primordially in Dasein. However, the ultimate “comportment” in which the nothing originally manifests itself is anxiety.⁸⁸ This means that anxiety is covered over. This also means that anxiety is latent but existent in Dasein. “Anxiety is there. It is only sleeping.”⁸⁹ Humans feel anxiety in varying degrees, but it is only those who are “daring” that are able to most authentically experience this anxiety.⁹⁰ Dasein is daring to the extent that it faces its anxiety in order to, “preserve the ultimate grandeur of Dasein.”⁹¹ What is this ultimate grandeur of Dasein? We see almost immediately that the ultimate grandeur of Dasein is that it of all creatures is the “lieutenant of the nothing.”⁹² The grandeur of Dasein is manifest in its high position in relation to the nothing. Evoking military language and images of daring again point toward Heidegger’s ideas about the courage that it takes to stand in relation to the nothing. Heidegger tells the reader that in this courageous act, Dasein will again experience something positive.

The anxiety of those who are daring [*Die Angst des Verwegenen*] cannot be opposed to joy or even to the comfortable enjoyment of tranquilized bustle. It

⁸⁷ Ibid. GA 9:117/92-93.

⁸⁸ Ibid. GA 9:117/93.

⁸⁹ Ibid. GA 9:117/93.

⁹⁰ Ibid. GA 9:117-118/93.

⁹¹ Ibid. GA 9:118/93.

⁹² Ibid. GA 9:118/93.

stands – outside all such opposition – in secret alliance with the cheerfulness and gentleness of creative longing.⁹³

Having the ability to stand outside beings as a whole, Dasein has the position of being the lieutenant of the nothing. “Being held out into the nothing – as Dasein is – on the ground of concealed anxiety is its surpassing of beings as a whole. It is transcendence.”⁹⁴

Because Dasein has a primordial relationship to the nothing, it experiences the nihilation of the nothing in which beings emerge. Therefore, it is able to “surpass” beings. It becomes the lieutenant of the nothing in that it manages the space in which beings come to be. Because Dasein is held out into the nothing, it can examine beings outside of its immediate temporal present and it can evaluate being (the totality of beings). This makes it the special being in which Being reveals the being of beings.

Heidegger believes that his analysis has shown that the Nothing is not in direct contrast to Being. Instead, the Nothing and Being are integrally related.

‘Pure Being and pure Nothing are therefore the same.’ This proposition of Hegel’s (*Science of Logic*, Book 1: *Werke*, vol. III, p.74) is correct. Being and the nothing do belong together, not because both – from the point of view of the Hegelian concept of thought – agree in their indeterminateness and immediacy, but rather because being itself is essentially finite and manifests itself only in the transcendence of a Dasein that is held out into the nothing.⁹⁵

How does this revelation then fit into the theme of scientific investigation that was posited at the beginning of the lecture? If Dasein is presented with beings because of its original relationship to the nothing, then scientific inquiry (that field of study which attempts to elucidate beings) is grounded in the nothing. For Heidegger, it is now time

⁹³ Ibid. *GA* 9:118/93.

⁹⁴ Ibid. *GA* 9:118/93.

⁹⁵ Ibid. *GA* 9:120/94-95.

that science recognize the nothing and its place of importance in allowing for the emergence of beings.

Only because the nothing is manifest in the ground of Dasein can the total strangeness of beings overwhelm us. Only when the strangeness of beings oppresses us does it arouse and evoke wonder. Only on the ground of wonder – the manifestness of the nothing – does the ‘why?’ loom before us.⁹⁶

Dasein finds itself asking the why question because it is able to penetrate into the realm of beings and examine the ground of those beings. Therefore, we see that in his analysis, Heidegger has attempted to show that metaphysics is the fundamental occurrence in Dasein and that science is grounded in that fundamental mode of being. As long as humans exist, they find themselves in the mode of metaphysics (philosophical questioning). It is not that humans exist and then they discover that they are interested in philosophy. Dasein ultimately is the being that in its being is fundamentally philosophical because it is the being that is held out into the nothing and for which other beings take on a peculiar aspect. In order to philosophize, Dasein must traverse back to its foundations and find its metaphysical roots. In order to do this,

it is of decisive importance, first, that we allow space for beings as a whole; second, that we release ourselves into the nothing, that is to say, that we liberate ourselves from those idols everyone has and to which they are wont to go cringing; and finally, that we let the sweep of our suspense take its full course, so that it swings back into the fundamental question of metaphysics that the nothing itself compels: Why are there beings at all, and why not rather Nothing?⁹⁷

In order to release oneself for the nothing, Heidegger claims that one must move away from the idols towards which one moves when anxiety emerges. One must move away from the comfort of innerworldly beings. In doing so, Dasein allows for the emergence

⁹⁶ Ibid. *GA* 9:121/95.

⁹⁷ Ibid. *GA* 9:122/96.

of a more intense form of anxiety that can reveal the nothing that undergirds all beings. In this way one will come back to the questioning that seeks the primordial metaphysical question: Why is there something and not rather nothing?

Before we move on to examine how Heidegger's ideas about the nothing play out in his ontology, it is first helpful to examine what he had to say about his ideas of the nothing in his later essay "On the Question of Being." These brief passages will give us much more insight into what Heidegger was trying to do in "What is Metaphysics?" and will also reveal more about his conception of the nothing, a revelation that is necessary in order to save him from attacks that focus on his idea as a negation or nothingness that underlies all of reality.

We have already referred to the essay "On the Question of Being" to set the stage for why Heidegger introduces the idea of scientific investigation in the beginning of this section. Now we again turn back in order to hear the man himself clarify his ideas in "What is Metaphysics?" Going back to the same passage from "On the Question of Being" we referenced above, we see Heidegger talking about his address being directed to individuals in all realms of scientific study. Because he was talking to a crowd that had certain presuppositions, Heidegger attempted to, "comply with a view that is dear to the sciences. They are of the opinion that the representation of beings exhausts the entire realm of what can be researched and questioned, and that apart from beings there is 'nothing else.'"⁹⁸ Heidegger attempted to begin from their perspective. However, his analysis moved about in the realm of metaphysics. Therefore, the address would

⁹⁸ Ibid. *GA* 9:418/316.

ultimately seek to examine “the surpassing: *the being* of beings.”⁹⁹ According to the scientific view, that which is not a being cannot be examined. Therefore, something that is not a being is nothing. For Heidegger, the being of beings is what is questioned in metaphysics. However, the being of beings is not a being. Therefore, Heidegger sought to elucidate this nothing.

This is why the lecture asks concerning ‘*this nothing*.’ It does not ask in an arbitrary or indeterminate manner about ‘the’ nothing. It asks: how do things stand with what is thus quite other than anything that is, with that which is not a being?¹⁰⁰

Heidegger claims that the human being is held out into that which is other than beings (the nothing). Dasein has a relationship to something that is other than beings. However, the nothing is not something that can be juxtaposed to being. “Being and nothing are not given alongside one another. The one employs itself for the other in a kinship whose essential fullness we have as yet scarcely pondered...Being no more ‘is’ than nothing. But *there is a giving* of both.”¹⁰¹ Heidegger claims that his ideas have been misconstrued in that some have argued against him that he creates “the nothing” that would then be the end of all thought. Instead, he claims that the question asked in the lecture is: “Why is it that everywhere only beings have priority, without our giving thought to the ‘not’ of beings, to ‘this nothing,’ i.e., to being with regard to its essence.”¹⁰² Following this statement, Heidegger says:

⁹⁹ Ibid. GA 9:418/316.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. GA 9:418/316.

¹⁰¹ Ibid. GA 9:419/317.

¹⁰² Ibid. GA 9:420/317-318.

The question ‘What is Metaphysics?’ attempts only one thing: to bring the sciences to think about the fact that they necessarily and thus at all times and everywhere encounter that which is quite other than beings, the nothing of beings. They already stand, without *their* knowing it, in a relation to being.¹⁰³

We see then that the goal of the lecture was to get those involved in the sciences to recognize that there is something other than beings on which their analyses of beings are dependent. However, as the lecture progresses, it also analyzes “this nothing” and its relationship to being.

Only *because* the question ‘What is Metaphysics?’ from the start recalls the surpassing, the *transcendens*, the *being of* beings, can it think the ‘not’ of being, *that* nothing which is equioriginarily the Same as being.¹⁰⁴

Those who do not understand the questioning of “What is Metaphysics?” then formulate the thrust of the lecture as a formulation of a philosophy of nothing. However, it is evident in at least two places (three if we include the quote from Hegel in the actual address) that Heidegger equates the nothing with the Being of beings. Even if one is reluctant to make this claim about “this nothing” and its relationship to being, one must at the very least say that Being and Nothing interpenetrate one another in the realm of metaphysics (another claim that Heidegger made directly). Our elucidation of the nothing is complete and we can move on to see how Heidegger’s conception of the nothing was fundamental to his ontology and to the existence of Dasein.

The first thing that we see in relation to the nothing and its place in Heidegger’s ontology is that the nothing is fundamentally related to the Being of beings, if not merely another name for the Being of beings, and that it is primordial for Dasein and its

¹⁰³ Ibid. GA 9:421/318.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. GA 9:421/318.

experience of the foundation of existence. Although Heidegger claims that the nothing is not a nihilative nothing, his analysis of its relation to comportment in “What is Metaphysics?” indicates that it is negative insofar as it holds a relation to the negative experiences of life that end in disappointment and failure. The “unyielding antagonism,” “stinging rebuke,” “galling failure,” and “bitter privation” all point, for Heidegger, to the fundamental relation Dasein has to the nothing. In addition, as we have mercilessly expounded numerous times, Dasein’s most adequate elucidation of the nothing occurs in authentic anxiety. It appears then that the nothing is the foundation of the being of beings, and that this nothing primordially manifests itself in negative human experiences, ultimately displaying its most authentic form in the experience of absolute anxiety in which one must stand courageously.

With the nothing we have found the spring from which Heidegger’s projects have their impetus. It is here that we see what it is that Heidegger finds veiled in the Being of beings that allows for the abiding of beings. He finds not a nihilative negativity, but a negativity that is much more powerful in that it is the foundation from which spring negative human experiences and disappointments. Heidegger’s ideas about the nothing undergird his analysis of Dasein and provide the foundation from which he can make claims about anxiety in the face of one’s finitude as being the most important attunement of Dasein. Fundamental attunements such as anxiety and boredom then are those that are examined as they are the moods in which the nothing threads through human existence. The Being of beings then is integrally related to the nothing, if not merely another name for this nothing (if one does not turn a blind eye to Heidegger’s claims that equate Being with the Nothing). In this system of thought then, the place for proper philosophy is in a

courageous standing in the face of Being. It takes courage because Being reveals itself in an almost unmaintainable anxiety. It takes courage because there is no hope for comfort when one comes into nearness with the origin. There is horror.

An experience of being as that which is other than all beings is bestowed in anxiety, provided that, out of 'anxiety' in the face of anxiety, i.e., in the mere anxiousness that pertains to fear, we do not evade the silent voice that attunes us toward the horror of the abyss [*Schrecken des Abgrundes*].¹⁰⁵

To the degree that we degrade such essential anxiety, together with the relationship of being to humans that is cleared within it, we denigrate the essence of courage. Yet courage is able to withstand the nothing. In the abyss of horror [*im Abgrund des Schreckens*], courage recognizes the scarcely broached realm of being from whose clearing every being first returns to what it is and can be.¹⁰⁶

One of the essential sites of speechlessness is anxiety in the sense of the horror [*die Angst im Sinne des Schreckens*] to which the abyss of the nothing attunes human beings.¹⁰⁷

If the oblivion of Being that has been described here should be our situation, would there not be occasion enough for a thinking that recalls Being to experience a genuine horror [*Schrecken*]? What can such thinking do other than to endure anxiously this destiny of Being, so as first of all to bring the oblivion of Being to bear upon us?¹⁰⁸

It is evident then that a goal of Heidegger's philosophy is to get Dasein to think its position in such a manner that it attempts to maintain its horror in the face of the abyss that lies in the ground of the nothing of the being of beings. It is also in these passages that one can see that which is most fundamentally important to Heidegger: negativity that prevails by appearing on earth in human experience, a foundation related to anxiety, and the horror of the abyss of courageously standing in relation to that foundation. Here we

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. GA 9: 306-307/ 233.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid. GA 9:308/ 234.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid. GA 9:312/ 238.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. GA 9:371/281-282.

also see why it is that Heidegger never gives an adequate account of joy and that his accounts of positive experiences (wonder, creative longing, and cheerfulness) are always cut short. For Heidegger, these experiences are always derivative, and they are always more hoped for than actually attained. In contrast, Heidegger carefully examines anxiety, privation, rebuke, and horror, and these are all related to his conception of the nothing and its place in his ontology as foundation and presenter of the realm of beings to Dasein.

What a strangely lopsided vision of reality we find emerging from one whose ultimate desire was to display the foundations of being. If we take Heidegger's philosophy seriously, then nearness to the origin of existence is wrapped up in anxiety and horror. Is it then any wonder why Dasein flees to the safety of beings or its projects? Why is it fundamentally inauthentic for Dasein to immerse itself in its projects and innerworldly beings such as its family and friends when to come into nearness with the origin of existence is to stand courageously in the face of a horrific abyss? Heidegger assures us that we cannot be free as long as we move around in tranquilized bustle and everydayness. He tells us that it is only in the relationships of authentic anxiety that Dasein can stand resolute and joyful in its possibility of freedom. However, what sort of freedom or joy is that which is only attained in a solitary vision of an abyss of horror?

Is it not much more plausible that if Heidegger is correct, then Dasein exerts its freedom from such a horror in creating its life through its projects and by making a family and web of relationships with others? If the nothing is integrally related with the foundations of being, and it primordially manifests itself in bitter privation and galling failure, is Dasein not more free when it works through these failures and privations to bring forth something new, and to help others to overcome their own failures, to in a

sense overcome the nothing? And if Heidegger is correct about the fundament of our world and the comportment we must undertake in relation to it, then how can he account for the newness of being and the creation that continually emerges on the face of the earth?

Our analysis of the nothing and its place in Heideggerean philosophy shows that this conception is fundamental in understanding why it is that he continually comes back to anxiety, being toward death, and courage. Even the Being of beings itself does not really bring into being, it merely allows for an abiding of beings. For Heidegger, beings emerge out of the nothing and they abide through Being. However, he never poses this relationship in terms of creation out of nothing or overcoming the nothing that appears to be so primordial. It is not that Being brings something new into existence; the existence of being is merely the result of the abiding that is allowed for by Being. Being does not seem to have some positive creative component in Heidegger's thought. Instead, it is what allows for the abiding of being recognized as the totality of beings. However, one must ask, from whence do beings spring? How does Being bring beings into existence? Being cannot be only that which allows for the abiding of beings. Beings must emerge in order to take part in being. This emergence is empty when one focuses on the abiding of that which is. There must still be something more primordial than that which allows something to abide. Beings must have some sort of beginning. If Being allows for abiding, it is something else that provides for the inception of beings.

We spent almost the entire third chapter (pp.106-153) attempting to show how Bergson's concept of the nothing led into his ideas about the foundations of what he often calls "the real." We ultimately focused on change, movement, and creation as that which

necessarily emerges from his analyses of reality. What we have in Bergson is someone who did not stop with the abiding of being but with its inception and movement. Before Bergson explicates his ideas about that which is fundamental, he undertakes an analysis of the nothing. He does this because he believes that the nothing is a false concept that has vitiated the human mind for too long, causing numerous difficulties in philosophical thought. However, we have also seen that Bergson's critique of the nothing falls into line with Heidegger's. They both deny that the nothing is a conceptual nothing or that it can be imagined. They also both deny that the nothing is absolute nihilation of existence. Instead, for Heidegger, we have seen that the nothing is integrally united with Being and that it primordially shows itself in the human ability to negate as well as the human experiences of failure and disappointment. When Bergson comes to the end of his analysis, he rejects the nothing altogether. The nothing then is merely the all with negation added to it. It is a pseudo-idea that has entrenched itself in the minds of humanity due to the fact that they initially and primarily experience the world in terms of privation.

It is at this point that we see the difference between Heidegger and Bergson and their ideas about the nothing. For Heidegger, the primordial manifestation of the nothing is shown in galling failure and privation. Heidegger sees these experiences as obscurely displaying the primordial nothing that resides alongside Being as that which allows for the abiding of beings. However, for Bergson, privation itself does not issue from a primordial negativity or nothing. Instead, privation itself is entrenched in the human mind because of the experiences humans have and the way in which the intellect determines these experiences. There is not some primordial Nothing for Bergson that is

encountered in a kind of absolute anxiety. Instead, because the intellect presents the world in terms of utility and with the “goal” of keeping humans alive, humans tend to see the world as a reserve of resources and act in the world to satisfy their inherent lacks (need for clean water, food, shelter, and protection). Humans then think in terms of that which they do not have and seek to attain those things of which they feel a lack. It is through constant satisfaction of things that are considered lacking (not enough food, not enough clean water, not enough money) that the idea of the nothing entrenches itself in the human mind. For Heidegger, the nothing becomes an integral part of the foundation of existence and it almost pre-determines Dasein to experience privation and anxiety. What we have in Bergson is something much less severe. The concept of an absolute nothing is merely the result of the ability of the human mind to extend its experiences (the experiences of a lack of resources that must be satisfied) to an infinite idea. Therefore, the nothing is not some primordial power that provides negation on earth. Instead, the idea of the nothing is merely the result of being a being that lives on earth. One of the common themes that Bergson comes back to throughout his works in different ways is the lack of resources on earth. One can see here that he translates that idea into human action and relates it to the concept that all being sprang from nothing.

Having different conceptions of the nothing, Bergson and Heidegger then have extremely varying conceptions of the relationship humans (Dasein in Heidegger’s case) have to the nothing. We have seen above that Heidegger’s position is severe and it appears that humanity must attempt to not only come into contact with this nothing, but to remain in a relationship characterized by horror if it hopes to be the being that can be the space for the emergence of a more authentic disclosure of Being. However, Bergson

believes that his analysis of the nothing shows that humans need to make a “volte-face” in order to see the nothing for what it is, rather than as an infinite abyss out of which existence has somehow come to be. Bergson believed that humans tended to express their ideas of nothing in terms of a lack of what is utilizable, not as a true representation of the nothing. For Bergson, once humans realize the error of the manner in which they experience the world and translate that experience into the idea of nothing, they are able to move away from that representation to one that provides more insight into the foundations of existence. Bergson claims that if one first passes through the nought to get to being, one will necessarily have a static conception of the real:

everything appears given once for all, in eternity. But we must accustom ourselves to think being directly, without making a detour, without first appealing to the phantom of the nought which interposes itself between it and us. We must strive to see in order to see, and no longer to see in order to act. Then the Absolute is revealed very near us and, in a certain measure, in us.¹⁰⁹

How is it that two philosophers who sought the foundation of existence came to such different conclusions in regard to what they found there? This is a question that we will broach at the end of this work. Heidegger and Bergson both found a form of the nothing as fundamental. The difference lies in that they posit different relationships to the foundation. We have seen how Heidegger proposed that humans come into nearness with the origin and maintain their resolve in the face of the horror of the abyss. Now we will turn our attention to Bergson and attempt to find out the relation to the origin (Absolute) that reveals the nearness of humanity to the foundation of being.

Having examined Heidegger’s conception of the nothing, its relationship to Bergson’s conception, and the links between their ideas of the nothing and their

¹⁰⁹ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 246

ontologies, we now move on to Bergson's ideas about joy as attunement. Bergson's analysis of joy provides an account of joy that exists apart from pain and suffering and offers a link between joy and the foundations of human existence. We have examined conceptions of joy that rely on darker tones and experiences in Heidegger's work, but have ultimately concluded that Heidegger's is a philosophy geared toward the negative and its foundation in the nothing. In contrast, we will find that Bergson gives an account of joy that is positive (not in relation to a negative attunement or experience) and that can found joy as primordial attunement that springs out of human being in the world and the natural relations that humankind has with nature, humanity at large, and its own creative work.

In the next section, we seek to elucidate joy and its relationship to that which brings into existence, not what allows for the abiding of existence. We desire the thing that is missing in Heidegger's ontology: that which brings out of nothing and creates (in a sense of acting against the forces that tend to disperse energy) on earth, the thing that is manifest is each of us when we take part in the creative process. Creativity is that comportment that rises against galling failure, and provides the impetus that drives humans to push past the anxiety of existence and affirm what makes them absolutely human, not that they are the shepherds of being, but that they are artists of existence.

CREATION AND JOY

In order to determine Bergson's ideas about joy, it is necessary to examine his ideas about creation. We saw in almost the whole of chapter three and then in the section on the nothing above that Bergson rejected the nothing as something non-existent and instead posited movement and change as fundamental foundations from which life emerges and in which life interacts. We will find that joy almost always emerges throughout Bergson's writings in relation to creation. Where Heidegger saw the nothing being constitutive of human experience, Bergson finds that creation is that which brings the realm of being into existence and allows for the vitality of life. Bergson will attempt to show us that the end of humanity is bound up in creation and that in taking part in bringing something new into existence humans unite with the foundation of reality and experience the attunement of joy.

In an address from May 24, 1911 called "Life and Consciousness," Bergson gives his most direct explication of joy and the emergence of joy in humanity. It is here that one achieves a greater understanding of how joy relates to the body of Bergson's work and is intertwined with his entire philosophical endeavor. In this lecture, Bergson attempts to show the difference between thought and matter. Matter is that which provides the images that arise in the mind and gives the material that allows for human perception of the world. To bring ideas into existence, one must come up against the substantial materials that actuate the object in one's thought. "Thought which is only thought, the work of art which is only conceived, the poem which is no more than a

dream, as yet cost nothing in toil...”¹¹⁰ In order to actualize these ideas and dreams, one must make the effort to shape and model objects in the world. “The effort is toilsome, but also it is precious, more precious even than the work which it produces, because, thanks to it, one has drawn out from the self more than it had already, we are raised above ourselves.”¹¹¹ In the effort of bringing something out of the realm of ideas and into existence, humans are able to move beyond themselves as they become the space for creation.

Matter is interesting in that it is obstacle as well as impetus. Matter provides resistances with which any builder, craftsman, or artist are familiar. It is not easy to shape objects, to move things, or to create out of things that share no form with the idea that one has of a final product. In this sense matter is an obstacle. However, at the same time, matter is an impetus in that it provides the foundation from which perception emerges. It is that which is necessary in order to have perception, and the instant that one encounters matter, one of necessity perceives the images one has of it. One cannot create if the impetus of matter does not allow the creator to perceive its shapes and sizes. In addition to being obstacle and impetus, matter is impressionable. It submits to manipulation and maintains the imprint of the creator. Because it is impressionable humans are able to imprint their ideas on it and create new forms that subsist within it.

According to Bergson, it has been too long that philosophers have not paid attention to the relationship between the act of creation and human existence. He says

¹¹⁰ Henri Bergson, *Mind-Energy*, trans. H. Wildon Carr (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1921), 831-832/28-29.

¹¹¹ Bergson, *Mind Energy*, 832/29.

that joy is the sign that humans have reached their destiny.¹¹² Joy is not pleasure. “Pleasure is only a contrivance devised by nature to obtain for the creature the preservation of its life, it does not indicate the direction in which life is thrusting.”¹¹³ Pleasure is always experienced in relation to maintaining life, i.e. pleasures arise when one has an experience that reflects his or her ideas of what it is to have a good and safe life. “But joy always announces that life has succeeded, gained ground, conquered. All great joy has a triumphant note.”¹¹⁴ Joy emerges when life does not merely maintain itself, but when it has overcome something or moved into a higher realm of creation. Joy is the result of conquering numerous obstacles. In creation the human breaks through the barrier of thought to bring something new into material existence.

We see here that for Bergson, joy is inseparably bound up with creation. He says: “wherever there is joy, there is creation; the richer the creation, the deeper the joy. The mother beholding her child is joyous, because she is conscious of having created it, physically and morally.”¹¹⁵ Bergson goes on to claim that “true joy is the feeling...of having brought something to life.”¹¹⁶ To those who would claim that artists and businessmen only create for riches or glory from society at large, Bergson counters by claiming that, “we cling to praise and honours in the exact degree in which we are not

¹¹² Ibid. 832/29.

¹¹³ Ibid. 832/29.

¹¹⁴ Ibid. 832/29.

¹¹⁵ Ibid. 832/29-30.

¹¹⁶ Ibid. 832/30.

sure of having succeeded.”¹¹⁷ It is only those who are not sure of the adequacy of their creations that seek approval and glory from society. “But he...who is sure, absolutely sure, of having produced a work which will endure and live, cares no more for praise and feels above glory, because he is a creator, because he knows it, because the joy he feels is the joy of a god.”¹¹⁸ In contrast to the insecure creator, the experience of the true creator is free from the need to reassure him or herself of the vitality of the creation. Instead, the superabundant creator is assured by the experience of joy that emerges out of the creation and the creative process and does not need the accolades of humanity to ensure that his or her creation is significant.

Bergson’s ideas about creation lead him to claim that the goal of each human life is the creation of something absolutely new. Each human is given a personality that he or she can shape into a work of art. Prefacing what he will later say in his *Two Sources*, Bergson claims that it is the moral creators that display the most harmony with the impetus of Life. These creators lead humanity to new heights because of the impulse that drives them from the depths of their being. They coincide with the élan in such a strong way that they are compelled to bring forth entirely new potentialities for existence on earth. Bergson masterfully elucidates his idea about the moral creators when he writes that, “to pierce the mystery of the deep, it is sometimes necessary to regard the heights. It is earth’s hidden fire which appears at the summit of the volcano.”¹¹⁹ For Bergson, these humans are the ultimate creators and they are the ones who establish new social attitudes

¹¹⁷ Ibid. 832/30.

¹¹⁸ Ibid. 833/30.

¹¹⁹ Ibid. 834/32.

about morality and human existence with one another. In an article about joy and living in the world, Alphonso Lingis echoes Bergson's sentiment when he writes about "heroes," those humans that escape from their social constraints and have the courage to pursue the freedom of thought over all things.

Heroes are those who live and die in high mountains and remote continents far from our comfortable and secure rooms in the urban technopoles where we meet to read to one another what we have thought out on our computers. They extend the radiant heights and remote horizons for our best thoughts, which long to stop serving the world of work and reason in the state universities that provide us with this comfortable and secure existence, and which long to know the exultation of a thought that is free and liberating.¹²⁰

Bergson's moral creators are those who constantly toil for a new world. They seek out the heights only because they are driven by the depth of the force of the world. They seek neither comfort nor fame, but the rest of humanity is tossed about by the ripples that emerge in the wake of their existences.

In order to understand the relationship between human action and reality, one must understand Bergson's ideas about creative emotions. In *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, Bergson undertakes an analysis of different types of emotions. Bergson claims that "a new emotion is the source of the great creations of art, of science and of civilization in general..."¹²¹ However, on the surface, it is unclear what Bergson means by emotion in this sense. Bergson claims that there are two types of emotions. One type of emotion affects only the surface of the body. The second type of emotion drives the soul. "The effect in the first case is diffused, in the second it remains undivided. In the one it is an oscillation of the parts without any displacement of the

¹²⁰ Alphonso Lingis, "Joy in Dying," *Graduate Philosophy Journal* 19, no.1 (1996): 105.

¹²¹ Bergson, *The Two Sources*, 1011/43.

whole; in the other the whole is driven forward.”¹²² The first type of emotion is what most would call the affective type and what most people think of when they try to find the causes of emotion. This type of emotion occurs as the result of a representation or perception that is given to the mind that causes some sort of disturbance.

In contrast to the commonly accepted idea of emotions, Bergson provides an image of another type of emotion that is not the effect of some stimulus but the driving force of representations. This type of emotion is, “pregnant with representations,” and it alone is “productive of ideas.”¹²³ The idea of the creative emotions is Bergson’s parallel to Heidegger’s concept of attunement. Just as attunement is something that is more primordial than the common conception of mood and pre-establishes Dasein in a perspective that must view the world through that attunement, those emotions that drive humans to create and that are ripe with inspiration and ideas are what Bergson calls creative emotions. Creative emotions are generative of ideas and they are more a mode of existence that is the underlying impetus of creative human action than the result of outer stimuli. It is important to note here that what Bergson calls a creative emotion is not something separate from action in the world. One must not think of creative emotions as only internal states of humanity that can change and fluctuate based on one’s experiences and environment. Creative emotions are not merely psychological states in which one finds oneself happy, sad, bored, etc. Instead, creative emotions are the rumblings that lie deep inside humans. They are not related to feelings so much as they are the driving force from which feelings, emotions, and the drives to create and act in the

¹²² Ibid. 1011/43.

¹²³ Ibid. 1012/44.

world find their origin. Creative emotions are related to what we might call the character of the human. However, they differ from Heidegger's attunements in that they are much more forceful than merely presenting the ground through which all human perception and experience takes place. Creative emotions are the impetuses that push humanity to create and to overcome obstacles that would arise in relation to what humans desire to be.

For Bergson, it is inadequate to degrade the emotions as something that have little or no importance in thought. Those who belittle emotion fail to realize that creation relies on emotion in all aspects of life, not merely the arts. "It is the emotion which drives the intelligence forward in spite of obstacles. It is the emotion above all which vivifies, or rather vitalizes, the intellectual elements with which it is destined to unite..."¹²⁴ For Bergson, there is not enough power in the intellect alone to have an idea and provide the force by which one can then work to bring that idea into existence. In addition to the intellectual idea, one must have the emotion, the mode of being that allows one to overcome barriers and that inspires the worker to continue on to finish his or her project. The work of genius is one in which a new emotion has arisen and demands expression through elements that have never expressed such a being before, and the one expressing this emotion finds himself or herself driven by an internal fire and a coincidence with this creative impulse. In this case, rather than feeling an obligation to perform a task, one driven by a creative emotion shall act "not from constraint or necessity, but by virtue of an inclination which (one) should not want to resist."¹²⁵ Bergson believed that those who work from an absolutely intellectual standpoint must

¹²⁴ Ibid. 1013/46.

¹²⁵ Ibid. 1015/48.

continually submit to laws of constraint and social demands. However, those who are pressed on by a creative emotion work not out of duty, but out of inspiration.

In order to elucidate the relationship between creative emotions and the realm of morality, Bergson draws a distinction between “pressure” and “aspiration.” He calls pressure [*pression*] the accumulated force of society that demands that one act according to certain principles that guarantee the harmonious functioning of the whole. In contrast, aspiration [*aspiration*] is that which drives humans to act morally in a way that promotes the progress of humanity as a whole.¹²⁶ There is a pleasure that arises in the first form of moral action (that which is based on pressure) as one is guaranteed that one will be safe in society with others. However, there is joy in the second form of action as one works to promote the progress of humanity as well as human moral action. Those who have been driven by the second form of emotion (the creative emotion) experience a form of liberation. “Well-being, pleasures, riches, all those things that mean so much to the common run of men, leave them indifferent.”¹²⁷ Bergson claims that the release from worldly comforts and material objects provides a sense of freedom and relief for those motivated by the creative emotions. Creative emotions provide an impetus that is encompassing and dynamic. In speaking of the great mystics, Bergson says that they “declare that they have the impression of a current passing from their soul to God, and flowing back from God to mankind.”¹²⁸ This feeling of union with God emerges because

¹²⁶ Ibid. 1018/51.

¹²⁷ Ibid. 1019/52.

¹²⁸ Ibid. 1019-1020/53.

these humans find themselves in a relationship with “the generative effort of life.”¹²⁹ It is the union of humanity with this generative effort that provides the impetus for aspiration and results in a morality that extends beyond that which is demanded by the pressures of society.

It is at this point that one sees the distinction that Bergson seeks in *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*. There are two forms of morality. In addition, there are two modes of existence in the human soul. The first is that which places demands on the individual in order to secure a society in which all are assured of their safety and ability to function economically in society. The second is that form of morality that is driven by a creative emotion that has never been expressed before. This creative emotion results in an impetus that creates something absolutely new. In the case of morality, Bergson claims that creative emotions were the inspiration of major religious figures that actually helped them bring about new ideals and produce followers throughout the ages. The morality that is the outcome of creative emotion is, “a forward thrust, a demand for movement; it is the very essence of mobility.”¹³⁰ In contrast to the morality that is dynamic and that seems to open the possibility for change in compartments of thinking for humanity, the morality based around duty and intellectual demands is one that will forever be static and rigid. It does not allow for the responsiveness that is needed in ethical action, and constantly attempts to place all examples into its molds. However, these forms fail in that they do not allow for the supple and subtle responses that are necessary in most human situations involving ethical demands or aspirations.

¹²⁹ Ibid. 1020/54.

¹³⁰ Ibid. 1024/58.

In a similar manner to the way Bergson juxtaposes static and dynamic morality, he also distinguishes between the open and closed forms of the soul. Early in *The Two Sources* Bergson speaks of the difference between the open and closed society. The closed society is one in which there are relations of economy and obligations that are maintained between the individuals in the society to ensure the proper functioning of the group. The closed soul is that of the human who “is absorbed together in the same task of individual and social preservation.”¹³¹ This is the realm of utilitarian ethics for Bergson. The individual promotes some of its own good while at the same time attempting to uphold the social structures that allow for the goods of society so that the bonds of society do not loosen. However, this relationship is closed for Bergson because it limits itself to the individual states of humans and can only circle within a given societal framework.

In contrast to the closed form of morality and the closed soul, the open soul is able to embrace everything in a form of love that does not exist in the closed form of society. The open soul extends beyond the gates of the city and embraces all of humanity.

Suppose we say that it (the open soul) embraces all humanity: we should not be going too far, we should hardly be going far enough, since its love may extend to animals, to plants, to all nature. And yet no one of these things which would thus fill it would suffice to define the attitude taken by the soul, for it could, strictly speaking, do without all of them. Its form is not dependent on its content.¹³²

It is not by extending the closed form of morality that one is able to come to the second form. One cannot extend love to group after group and then come to the conclusion that

¹³¹ Ibid. 36-37.

¹³² Ibid. 38.

the open soul is merely the expansion of the closed soul. Instead, the two forms of morality are qualitatively different. For Bergson, it takes an absolutely different driving force to bring the idea of universal human love to the human mind than the morality that seeks to stabilize social relations and embrace all in a universal promotion of best interests.

Bergson distinguishes the closed and the open morality using various characteristics. Closed morality (that which is based around obligation) implies that one has a choice. This means that hatred is not excluded from one's potential for action. Open morality is all love.¹³³ In addition, closed souls focus on objects around them that attract them. Open morality is that which only focuses on objects because it sees beyond them and it must traverse through the objective realm in order to attain that which it sees beyond humanity. Finally, closed morality has its impetus in the evolution of humankind. Humans are bound to adopt closed morality because life moves in the direction of keeping groups of the same species alive through interactions that work to benefit the community, and thereby, a majority of the individuals in those communities. Because humans take part in nature, they have evolved in a similar manner. They live in society and act within their respective societies in order to work for the benefit of the group (in general and for the most part). The answer to the question of the impetus for open morality requires a different answer.

¹³³ Ibid. 39.

In contrast to the acquired nature of closed morality, open morality requires an effort.¹³⁴ Those who have undertaken the effort to unlock new potentials for morality in humanity have acquired followers not due to reason and intellect (the idea that it will be good for the society to follow these guidelines), but through feeling. Bergson uses the example of music to talk about being introduced into a feeling. When one hears music, he or she is not so much affected, but introduced into a realm of feeling. Depending on which type of music one hears, one will experience pain, joy, sadness, or love. The more enigmatic and genius the intuition that inspired the music, the more one will find oneself in a realm of feeling that one has neither experienced before nor even knew existed. Bergson uses this example to display how it is that feeling can be the impetus from which humans follow the ideas of those who are moral creators.

When music weeps, all humanity, all nature weeps with it. In point of fact it does not introduce these feelings into us; it introduces us into them, as passers-by are forced into a street dance. Thus do pioneers in morality proceed. Life holds for them unsuspected tones of feeling like those of some new symphony, and they draw us after them into this music that we may express it in action.¹³⁵

All humans are indoctrinated with the closed morality of their various societies as they exist and grow up in those societies. They learn it from their parents, teachers, and the gestures and efforts of their fellow countrymen. However, one cannot be taught the second form of dynamic morality. Instead, those who had the vision of the new morality present it as best they can, and those who are attracted to follow it are those who feel themselves introduced into a realm of morality that mimics the realm of music.

Alongside the notes and harmonies that make the music what it is flows the continual

¹³⁴ Ibid. 39.

¹³⁵ Ibid. 40.

inability to really say what makes it mournful or joyful music. However, there is the intuitive understanding that one is experiencing something beautiful or mournful and the more beauty one finds in the music, the more one will adopt its movements and rhythms.

In addition to the dissimilarity between the ways in which the moralities are spread, the outcomes for those who practice the two types of morality vary as well. Those who practice the first type of morality (that which occurs due to social pressure) know the feeling of well-being. However, those who feel the opening of their souls are caught up in joy [*joie*].

But the soul that is opening, and before whose eyes material objects vanish, is lost in sheer joy. Pleasure and well-being are something, joy is more. For it is not contained in these, whereas they are virtually contained in joy. They mean, indeed, a halt or a marking time, while joy is a step forward.¹³⁶

For Bergson, joy is not merely the form of ultimate pleasure. Instead, he finds that pleasure is contained in joy. Because joy is more fundamental, humans are able to experience pleasure. It is not that joy is the outcome of an overwhelming amount of pleasure. In this quote, we also see that the Bergsonian conception of joy is one united with movement. Well-being and pleasure are attained in the immobile and they subsist in relation to objects in the world. However, joy is that experience which creates new possibilities that allow humanity to move forward and results from a relationship to the generative principle of life.

Joy is ultimately related to the coincidence of the soul with the impetus that brought humanity into existence. Bergson says that as one plunges into the open morality, one “should find an impression of coincidence, real or imaginary, with the

¹³⁶ Ibid. 1024/58-59.

generative effort of life.”¹³⁷ In another place Bergson says that, “it has always been from the contact with the generative principle of the human species that a man has felt he drew the strength to love mankind.”¹³⁸ The closed form of morality arises from the pressures between individuals in society and the manner in which the intellect handles these relationships. This results in obligations on specific individuals within the group. Obligation takes on a different meaning in the open form of morality. “In the second, there is still obligation, if you will, but that obligation is the force of an aspiration or an impetus, of the very impetus which culminated in the human species...”¹³⁹ What we see Bergson saying here is that the impetus (*élan vital*) that brought about the chain of life that ends in the human species is that which acts to create “obligations” in the open form of morality. With the human being, the *élan vital* is no longer forced to interact in the world through the social obligations that arise out of scarcity of resources and protection against enemies. In humanity the *élan vital* can directly provide the impetus that introduces humans into the feeling of love for all of humanity. It is in this sense that humans are fundamentally related to joy. Joy lies at the foundation of this relationship and, for Bergson, the soul that opens is caught up in the fundamental joy characteristic of becoming a new creation as well as taking part in the creation of a new society that can extend beyond the closed form that has been the fundamental form of morality for humanity throughout time.

¹³⁷ Ibid. 54.

¹³⁸ Ibid. 54.

¹³⁹ Ibid. 55.

In the experience of joy, there is the experience of stepping beyond that which is given. Joy marks an existence that moves past the material, and in so doing comes into nearness with the generative principle of life. In order to further illuminate his ideas about joy and creation, Bergson focuses his attention on the “superabundant energy” [*énergie surabondante*] of the mystics and their ability to create new possibilities for human morality.¹⁴⁰ Here we see Bergson using a term that perhaps was influenced by Nietzsche’s ideas of creation out of “super-abundance” to describe those creators that are able to bring about new realities. Nietzsche claimed there were two forms of creation. One form (the form that he calls healthy) is that which springs from a super-abundance of creative energies. In *The Gay Science* section 370, Nietzsche reflects on the claims that he made in *The Birth of Tragedy* about the power of German music. He then turns to an analysis of romanticism and its place in the movement of life. He claims that all art and philosophy:

may be viewed as an aid in the service of growing and struggling life; they always presuppose suffering and sufferers. But there are two kinds of sufferers: first, those who suffer from *over-fullness of life* – they want a Dionysian art and likewise a tragic view of life, a tragic insight – and then those who suffer from the *impoverishment of life* and seek rest, stillness, calm seas, redemption from themselves through art and knowledge, or intoxication, convulsions, anaesthesia, and madness.¹⁴¹

Nietzsche immediately claims that he misunderstood Wagner and Schopenhauer when he was younger and that at this point he recognized them as those who suffer from the impoverishment of life. The idea of “over-fullness” is integrally related to super-

¹⁴⁰ Ibid. 1176/236.

¹⁴¹ Friedrich Nietzsche, *Gay Science*, trans. Walter Kaufmann. (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), 328.

abundance in that super-abundance would be a fullness that seems to burst forth from an individual. Nietzsche reflects on his change of view of romantic art and music in this section and claims that he now sees Romanticism as arising out of impoverishment rather than over-fullness. His experience in this regard has caused him to ask a new question whenever he confronts art or music. Nietzsche asks himself, “is it hunger or super-abundance that has here become creative.”¹⁴² Here we have the reference to super-abundance that we find in Bergson. It is the art that arises out of super-abundance that is true art for Nietzsche. It is the art that is able to confront the possibilities of a society and allow for the change and becoming of something new that is rightfully called art. In section 382 (*The great health*) from *Gay Science* Nietzsche claims that the audacious seekers have been shipwrecked on new worlds that provide satisfactions that make modern man insipid and unsatisfying to these “argonauts of the ideal.”¹⁴³ These humans are those that experience a great health and they focus on a new ideal, the ideal of a “spirit who plays naively – that is, not deliberately but from overflowing power and abundance – with all that was hitherto called holy, good, untouchable, divine...”¹⁴⁴ In this section we again see Nietzsche speaking of the abundance of one who is able to play with the things that society has held as having the utmost importance, ultimately in order to provide new possibilities for worlds that provide satisfactions that extend beyond the societies in which Nietzsche found himself.

¹⁴² Nietzsche, *Gay Science*, 329.

¹⁴³ Ibid. 346.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid. 347.

Perhaps Bergson's reference here is a mere coincidence. However, it is not unlikely that Bergson had read Nietzsche by the time he wrote *The Two Sources* (1932). The reference to the fact that those with super-abundant energy create new possibilities for humanity also hints that he took this term from Nietzsche, although he used it in a very different way. For Bergson, those who are compelled by superabundant emotion are driven by a coincidence with the generative foundation of life. Bergson believed that these individuals had reached the roots of their existences, "to the very principle of life in general."¹⁴⁵ Those who had reached this state of existence brought about moralities that have led to an increase in love for humanity and respect for humans. Only these individuals were capable of the great moral creations of history and their production emerged out of super-abundance rather than weakness, bitterness, or envy.

As one approaches the end of *The Two Sources*, one comes across a section on resources and war. Bergson talks about the causes of war and the elimination of war and the atrocities that are necessary components of war. In addition to population growth and lack of resources, Bergson also claims that a new form of life that requires material comforts is another cause of war. "We demand material comfort, amenities and luxuries. We set out to enjoy ourselves."¹⁴⁶ Industrialism was thought to be the great savior of humanity. However, the growth of industry has created conditions of extreme suffering and led to productions that have caused intense agony. In addition, industry has provided wide-scale luxuries that drive people to attempt frenetically to satisfy their desires. This frenzy is in direct contrast to an ascetic ideal that pervaded life in the Middle Ages.

¹⁴⁵ Bergson, *Two Sources*, 1187/250.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 1223/291.

During this time, there was “for one and all an absence of comfort which to us is astonishing. Rich and poor did without superfluities which we consider as necessities.”¹⁴⁷ Bergson contrasts the asceticism of the Middle Ages with the frenzy of acquisition in order to show how society moves back and forth between ideals of luxury and abstinence. He also points to the doctrines that emerged from Platonic thought (the Cyrenaic and Cynic) as an example of the dichotomy that emerges in human society in relation to ideas about how one ought to live. These doctrines developed into Epicureanism and Stoicism. However, Bergson is quick to point out that apart from the Epicureanism that sought all pleasures, there was the Epicureanism of Epicurus, “according to which the supreme pleasure was to need no pleasures.”¹⁴⁸ All these responses to the question of luxury and simplicity point to the idea of human happiness. There can be no happiness without conditions of security, and these can be attained, “either in the mastering of things, or in the mastering of self which makes one independent of things.”¹⁴⁹ Bergson saw a future day when people would live more simply and return to a more ascetic lifestyle. He believed that human life was cyclical and that there would be a reaction to the life that sought luxury and fortune, and that some time in the future humanity would turn away from the frenzy of accumulation.

It seems that today many nations have progressed far beyond the luxuries of the 1930s. We are far from the return to the ascetic ideal that Bergson predicted, but it may take hundreds of years for this turn to occur. Although the recent downturn in the

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. 1229/298.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid. 1230/299-300.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid. 1230/300.

economy has forced people to learn how to live more simply, this is merely the result of economic conditions and not a general ideal propagated out of humanity itself. As a society, we have not reached the point at which we have turned back to a more simple existence. In fact, many people who believe they live simply have lives of extravagance when compared to many around the world. This is a result of the mechanization that has made abundant the things that were once luxurious and limited. Bergson recognizes that industry provides comforts and leisure. However, he reproaches mechanization for “having too strongly encouraged artificial (needs), with having fostered luxury, with having favoured towns to the detriment of the countryside, lastly with having widened the gap and revolutionized the relations between employer and employed, between capital and labour.”¹⁵⁰ Bergson believed that humans had to learn how to master industry and use it to promote the satisfaction of the most necessary conditions for existence. For Bergson, humans needed to turn the power of technology towards the problems that confront them in terms of the scarcity of resources and the prevalence of disease. The power of machines to satisfy the needs of all humans has been used to manufacture the absurd and unnecessary. Technology has the ability to liberate humanity (provide for its basic needs and even some enjoyment) and allow it to reach a higher goal, but the inherent desire of humanity to create often travels down paths predetermined by markets and that which a society desires or creates as an emergent necessity. Bergson cautioned against the dazzling nature of technology and its ability to engross humanity, and he would have reproached those that used technology for creation of the absurd when the

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. 1236-1237/307.

problems of basic need satisfaction for humanity had not been addressed. However, societies do not change unless they are given an example, and for Bergson that example occurs in the form of what he calls the “mystic genius.”

Bergson’s idea of a “mystic genius” is one who will provide a path that will lead humanity out of its current state of being and into a new mode of existence. The mystic genius is one who is an ultimate creator on earth. The genius “will yearn to make of it a new species, or rather deliver it from the necessity of being a species; for every species means a collective halt, and complete existence is mobility in individuality.”¹⁵¹ What Bergson means about species being collective halts is that as organisms have developed and evolved over time, the transition that occurs between species in the path to a new species ultimately stops once the new species forms and stabilizes itself in the world. The process and movement of life as it brings about new species ultimately ends in a halt at the end of the creation of the new species. Bergson foresaw the need for a movement that could not only bring about a new species, but also bring about conditions in which humanity would never find itself halting, never stopping in front of obstacles as is characteristic of it and all other species in their states of being.

Unfortunately, humans tend to focus on pleasure and grasp desperately for material objects rather than seeking the deliverance that could free humanity to traverse into a new realm of possibilities. Bergson believed that the search for material objects and the desire for more represented a mere “ground gained over nothingness, a means

¹⁵¹ Ibid. 1240/311.

whereby we can snap our fingers at death,”¹⁵² what Heidegger would call inauthentic relations to the anxiety of the nothingness of death. However, Bergson wrote that if humans understood their relationship to life and the outcomes of life, their pleasures would be “eclipsed by joy.”¹⁵³ Joy would be the simplicity of the life of the mystics and it would flow from the vision of a better life beyond that which has been sought after thus far. Having given itself over to the tide of technological advancement, “Mankind lies groaning, half crushed beneath the weight of its own progress.”¹⁵⁴ However, Bergson believed that there was something more for humans than merely trudging along through existence in the pursuit of the material. Those who provide new conditions for existence and seek to embrace humanity in a love that emerges through the impetus that is the bringing into existence of life are creators that perpetuate the possibility for joy to exist for humanity. Bergson’s mystic genius becomes a god on earth. In these passages we see a striking similarity to Heidegger’s claim that only a god could save humanity.

Philosophy will not be able to effect an immediate transformation of the present condition of the world. This is not only true of philosophy, but of all merely human thought and endeavor. Only a god can save us. The sole possibility that is left for us is to prepare a sort of readiness, through thinking and poeticizing, for the appearance of the god or for the absence of the god in the time of foundering [*Untergang*] for in the face of the god who is absent, we founder. Only a God Can Save Us.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵² Ibid. 1245/317.

¹⁵³ Ibid. 1245/317.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid. 1245/317.

¹⁵⁵ Maria P. Alter and John D. Caputo, *The Heidegger Controversy : A Critical Reader*. (MIT Press: 1991).

Although there is an extreme difference between their ideas of a god, Bergson's mystic genius is the one who is able to become a god on earth. It is only this individual that can release humans from the manner in which they quantify and value the things that they find important in the world that lead them to give up their potential abilities to bring about something radically new and creative. The mystic genius creates out of the superabundance that is the outcome of creative emotion. The joy of the genius is complete in that he or she is able to coincide with the principle from which all life emanates (the *élan vital*). In so doing, Bergson claims that these geniuses can become gods in the sense that they can create new possibilities for the mass of people that do not find the inspiration of the creative emotions in themselves. The mystic geniuses bring about an earth that forever takes on a new shape after they have dispersed and propagated their knowledge.

Bergson's philosophy always comes back to the theme of creation and the relationship between joy and philosophy. At the end of both *Creative Evolution* and *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, he speaks directly about the role of philosophy and the joy that can emerge when one rejects common conceptions of happiness and strives to move past the fragmentation that comes from the intellectual analysis of the world. We saw in the previous chapter that a revolution of the mind with a view towards intuition is one of the steps on the road to the joy of being in harmony with the impetus of the real. In this chapter, we have shown that it is not only in relation to nature that Bergson calls humans to seek the joy that is the end of philosophy. For Bergson, creation in general is the end of humanity and when humans take part in authentic creation, they experience the joy of creation that emerges as they are united to the vital principle that

constantly brings forth life and allows for its abiding. The state of joy is the result of being in attunement with the foundation of reality. In the case of Bergson this foundation is the *élan vital*. Being in relation to the foundation of reality allows humanity to unlock new potentials for existence and experience the joy of a mind no longer encumbered by the loss of detail that occurs in generalization. For Bergson, it is in creation that humans experience joy, and the more adequate the creation, the more one feels attuned to being and the more one is able to experience the joy of existence that is often only reserved for those who experience the intuitive aesthetic raptures of existence.

Heidegger claims that Dasein's experience of angst is characterized by the *Unheimliche* (un-homely). In contrast, Bergson's conception of joy is that which provides a place for the being-at-home of humanity. It is because of the primordial attunement of joy and its relation to creation that humankind is able to find itself, in rare moments, absolutely at home in the world. This is not at-homeness in its normally accepted sense. We are not saying that being at home in the world is the result of one's possessions, house, mode of transportation, or entertainment interests. One can be homeless on earth in the normal sense of the word and still experience the being at home that is the result of joy. In fact, that which is considered happiness and being at home by the majority is an inversion of truly being at home in the world through the joy that emerges in creation.

The "American Dream" or some other social conception of the good life is merely the effect of the unhomeliness of the world. The *Unheimliche* drives humans to safeguard themselves and their possessions against all that would seek to destroy them and their security. They fail to realize that true security in the world involves releasing

oneself from ties to those material bindings and pushing the limits of one's power of creation. The authentic homeliness of the world is that experience that leads one to abide in being. It provides a vantage point from which one can continue on in one's being and face the emergence of being with strength and hope. This is not the hope for a more adequate revelation of being, but the hope that there is something on earth that provides a peaceful accordance with one's place in the world, the hope that rootedness exists and is attainable.

For Bergson, being at home in the world is being involved in the creative process that continually refreshes and instantiates when everything seems to be on the edge of looming destruction. The nothing lingers on the edge of being and the relationship between the two is tenuous. It almost seems as if being could be swallowed up in whatever lies on the edge of the ever expanding universe, as if there could be a contraction that would instantaneously compress everything into the initial point from which it began. However, the vital impetus is strong and it seems to do its work under the oblivious eyes of humanity that often see nothing more in the world than resources to be harvested or objects to be attained. A reversal of view, delving into the details of existence and the differences that are constitutive of reality, and creating one's life and shaping what one must become are the things that in Bergson's philosophy bring one into nearness with the creative impulse. That which brought humanity into existence could not help but bring it about that humans themselves would be the ultimate creators on earth. When they follow this genetic drive to create, bringing new forms into existence, they coincide with that which founds their existences. Joy is what Bergson would call the unification of humanity with that from which it emerges and in which it abides. It is joy

that is able to abolish the anxiety of the uncanny and replace it with the peacefulness of being at home on the earth. It is because humans arose out of life that they can abide in the becoming of life and take measures to counter the destructive forces on earth that result in death and degradation. It is also in this way that they can experience the joy that arises when one creates something absolutely new.

Joy is an excessive experience, but its primary attribute is not pleasure. One cannot find joy in stimulation alone. Instead, it is as if joy seeks the human (as if the human is introduced into the feeling). Joy emerges at times when one is neither thinking of it, nor searching for it. In addition, although the joyful experience is characterized by a limit sensation, one cannot rightly term this experience mere pleasure, for to do so would diminish the experience and fail to grasp the totality of it. The “pleasure” associated with joy is not related to the stimulation of the body. Instead, joy is characterized by the harmony of finding oneself in reality as a creator. It is also characterized by harmony of the body with its environment. One feels at home in one’s body as well as in the world, even if things in one’s environment are seemingly chaotic. Joy is the sensation of the accord of one’s internal being with the external as well as harmony with one’s natural and social environment. In joy one experiences a unity with oneself, nature, and others that does not seek to destroy that which is, but embraces all in a totality that is often lived for too short a time.

In order to extend Bergson’s ideas about joy and hopefully shed more light on the experience of joy itself, we will now turn our focus to ideas about the relationship

between joy and happiness.¹⁵⁶ When we place happiness in contrast to joy, we are talking about the conditions for which people strive to satisfy their desires and create a sense of well-being. However, one must remember that we are examining well-being in an ontic sense. To use Heidegger's language, one could call happiness the ontic manifestation of the ontological foundation of joy. Just as fear is the ontic manifestation of a more primordial angst, happiness is the manifestation of joy that has been inauthentically appropriated. Joy is primordial, happiness is an "inauthentic" experience that mimics joy and is derivative. Joy encompasses and pulsates in the existence of the joyful, happiness is fleeting and lost as soon as one finds new conditions one believes will bring the ultimate satisfaction towards which ideas of happiness point. Happiness is a set of conditions that is amendable according to taste and is often the result of what society finds most applicable and desirable in reality. Its ontic character leads to a socialization in which people agree about the use-value and importance of certain objects. Humans undertake their lives and tasks with a vision towards the fulfillment of what they believe is the best end for their lives, even when they destroy themselves. However, this vision is often guided by ideas about happiness that reflect a socialized understanding that can never reach a knowledge or experience of joy. This is the form of affect that we

¹⁵⁶ In our distinction between happiness and joy, we find it necessary to make a few remarks about the way in which we are presenting happiness. Just as Heidegger found the inauthentic attunements as arising in their possibilities out of the entanglement of Dasein in its world context, we begin from the entangled conception of happiness as attunement for humanity. Conceptions of happiness such as Aristotle's do not fall under our critique because it is one that meditatively seeks that which is fundamental and moves outside of the common (entangled) conceptions of happiness and pleasure. As one reads this section, it is imperative that one remember that our critique (just like Heidegger's) is focused on the ontic manifestation of conceptions of happiness that arise out of the being of society and its idle talk, curiosity, and honing down of possibilities.

call happiness, and it is this that we will explicate in relation to the authentic attunement of joy.

Happiness arises in response to things in the world. Those things that one believes will bring happiness appear to allow for security and comfort. There is a sense of hopefulness in the desire to achieve happiness, the hope that when one attains the desired object, one will experience happiness. It is here also that we see the relationship between happiness and desire. Humans desire to be happy. In addition, the desire to be happy leads to the desire for objects that are considered necessary in order to achieve this state of happiness. Ideas of happiness result in the desire for a life in which one has all one's desires met according to what one desires and how those objects are desired. This shows the relationship between happiness and Bergson's conception of the intellect. The intellect is integrally related to human desire. It initially dealt with problems of survival, and through its power, it sought ways in which it could create conditions and methods by which humans could satisfy their basic needs for survival. However, once society conceived of ways to provide for the necessities of existence, the desires that arose out of the need to survive then shifted to the world of material possession and quality of life. The intellect was not content to remain focused on continual basic need satisfaction. Instead, it turned its gaze outside of the realm of basic needs and because of its capacity to think of almost infinite possibilities, it desired the accumulation of more. Humans moved past the questions of how they could stay alive to questions about the quality of a life in relation to comforts, interests and enjoyment. The question of happiness then took the highest position in the everyday questions about existence.

“What will make me happy?” then becomes the most important question for human existence. The answer to this question varies drastically around the world and even in various strata of society. One constantly hears others claiming that they “just want to be happy.” What does this mean? I just want to have what I want to have. I just want to understand why I exist. I just want to get more attention from my partner. I just want a plate of rice to curb the pain in my stomach. The common thread that winds its way through all these statements is desire: the “I want.” Once the question of happiness moves beyond basic needs, it takes on various shades and intensities, and can even lead to ideas about destruction of one’s own body or others. One person’s happiness might be getting out of an abusive relationship or being able to go out for dinner once a week, while another’s might be buying a private jet or mansion on the beach. The infinite tones and images of happiness reflect its relationship to the seemingly infinite numbers of desires that lie in human being. In addition, the multiplicity of conceptions of happiness displays its derivative character. It takes as many forms as there are objects in the world, and its rapidly changing form and inability to be quenched indicate that perhaps it is not in happiness that humanity can find itself at home in the world.

In addition to its relationship to desire, happiness interweaves with the desires of society and its conceptions of happiness. It is impossible to extricate oneself from the conditions in which one is thrown. Societies place emphasis on certain objects and states that will bring happiness to their inhabitants, and the people in those societies tend to share a common conception of happiness. However, these terms do little to elucidate what true happiness might be and they tend to level down the possibilities that constitute happiness. The public conception of happiness is passed on from generation to

generation and society itself reacts violently when its ideals about happiness are challenged. Parents unknowingly pass their conceptions of happiness on to their children, and even if one attempts to pass on an idea of happiness that runs counter to society's notions, advertisements and word of mouth will do their work to indoctrinate the child. It is in this way that society maintains its hold on happiness. The United States even includes "the pursuit of happiness" as an inalienable right in its own Declaration of Independence. Our nation appears to be the country to which one can come from all the "oppressed" areas of the world in order to pursue what he or she finds will bring happiness. "Do what thou wilt" might be the theme of our nation if one were to turn a blind eye to all the legislation that counteracts such a creed, as well as the injustices that were and are perpetrated under the guise of one's personal pursuit of happiness. The concept of the American Dream can only exist in a nation that founds itself on happiness, and the multitudinous desires of the millions that compose this society lead to the continual pursuit of that which one does not have.

It is not our goal to elucidate higher forms of happiness from lower. Instead, we seek to determine how it is that joy is not happiness and what distinguishes the two from one another. There is a tenuous relationship between life and happiness. Conceptions of happiness arise out of desire. Therefore, when one obtains that which makes one happy, one either experiences the calmness of a completed life or one finds new objects that one desires to obtain. In addition to the varying tendencies listed above, life itself can bring about conditions that obliterate one's happiness in an instant. It seems that life and humanity constantly bring about conditions in which no human could be happy. Bergson was a man who knew how fast things could change. The once celebrated intellectual of

Europe found himself standing in a line waiting to register with his Jewish brethren. Although he was offered asylum by the Vichy regime, he chose to register with his people, another number in a line that was millions of units long. Celebrated master and man of renown moved forward as each new unit was counted, awaiting his turn to be counted as nothing more than a number among the genus “Jew.” It is ironic that the intellectual tendency he had been critiquing his whole life ultimately swallowed him up in a massacre. Rather than seek asylum in the political structure that provided for exceptions, he became a single member in a genus that was set apart for destruction. He lost his personality, his renown, and his individuality, just as so many millions did along with him. The intellect conquered, lumping all into a mass in which there was no distinction except for a common name. Numerous examples from history display how quickly conditions in which many are happy can radically alter as these conditions and possibilities shift in an instant.

The pursuit of happiness is perhaps the common goal of all humanity, but this pursuit is impossible when the conditions for its possibility are shattered. A new political party, a strategically placed missile, and the blade of a mugger all display the tenuous relationship between humans and their happiness. Events rip one out of the conditions for the attainment of happiness and bring one back to a reality that is harsh, demanding, and unjust. We are not calling for the destruction of the conditions of human happiness or the pursuit of happiness. There would be nothing more futile or selfish. We only want to show that happiness is not joy, and that any equation of happiness and joy is a mixing of two qualitatively different experiences. It is interesting to note that it appears that society itself is created with a view towards creating the conditions for the possibility of

happiness. Governments are considered more democratic and caring to the extent that they provide different means for the attainment of happiness for their citizenry. Laws protect us from destructive powers that would kill us, maim us, or illegally seize our possessions. These conditions reflect the first type of morality in Bergson's *Two Sources* and represent the demands that provide hope for well-being and safety in society. However, these conditions can be replaced in an instant and the result is a new set of conditions in which happiness is impossible.

Living in a society such as ours that seemingly holds the conditions that attempt to allow for happiness, it would seem that more people would find happiness. However, few are they that achieve it for extended periods. Spinoza claimed "that emotional distress and unhappiness have their origin especially in excessive love toward a thing subject to considerable instability, a thing which we can never completely possess."¹⁵⁷ Humans attach themselves and their happiness to specific objects in the world that constantly change or are replaced by other objects. They feel the desire for joy in their hearts but they supplement this desire with objects that they believe will quench the pangs of desire. However, at some point, the satisfaction fades, expectations and demands qualitatively grow and one must go searching again for the next sublime object. The dissatisfactions that emerge out of all happiness are the result of both societal leveling as well as the emergence of the desire for joy through the intellect.

Happiness is the representation of joy through the lens of the intellect. Joy is intuitive and absolute. It encompasses the individual and protects the individual by providing a sense of at-homeness for him or her in the world. The initial ground in which

¹⁵⁷ Spinoza *Complete Works*, ed. Michael L. Morgan, *Ethics*, (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2002), 373.

joy resides rises to the surface of thought and in so doing it necessarily blends with desire. Nietzsche said that all joy wants eternity. However, he also recognized the seeming impossibility of being a Yes-sayer and the constant battle that one must wage in order to eliminate thoughts about happiness and the constant human desire for things to be different from the way that they are. Joy desires the infinite, but when it emerges from the deepest realms of human existence it is canalized by the intellect to seek the infinite in the objects that it finds readily available. This is the reason why happiness can never be complete and also why the objects of desire are infinite as well. In the search for happiness, humans can never attain to the infinite that is intuitively grounded in humanity.

Desire then appears to be infinite and shifts drastically because it desires the joy that can only emerge when one is submerged in eternity. The intellect modifies the absolute desire of humanity into multiple desires for individual objects or relationships. However, although it might appear so, the intellect is not the whipping boy of this work. The intellect is necessary in creating the conditions whereby humanity can coincide with that which it desires: the impetus that continually creates in the face of nothingness. It is through the impetus of life that humans come into existence and abide in being. They harmonize with the fundamental thrust of being when they take part in creative acts or interact with those things in the world that express the battle of the impetus against degradation. This is why humans are enraptured when they see birth and the young that proceed from their mothers into the world that is so harsh and foreboding. They would think that all hope was lost was it not for the fact that at the same time that the young might find themselves abandoned to death in the world, nature has provided ultimate

protectors that will die rather than see their young succumb to enemy or natural deficit. One experiences joy in the face of a work of art that seems to open up new possibilities for perception and understanding. Joy also surfaces when we feel that another human being harmonizes with our own being. We feel as if we have been doubled, as if against all previous experience, there could be another life that is capable of harmonizing with ours, share our dreams and fears, and move together with us in the world.

Joy also differs from happiness in that one does not desire joy, one experiences joy. It emerges out of experience. Whether it is when one is involved in creation or in the presence of nature, one experiences the awe, peace, and power of joy as something for which one was not searching. One cannot seek out joy and obtain it. One is given over to joy. One is immersed in joy when one is not looking for it (as if one could search for joy). In the joyful experience, one finds oneself at home and at peace even in the midst of strife and turmoil. The desire for happiness arises out of fear. Constant threats surround humanity, waiting to consume and steal that which is necessary for existence and subsistence. Happiness is the goal towards which we look to an ideal life that is free from the fears that constantly surround us. However, it is only in joy that fears fade away into the background and humans find themselves at home on the earth and enveloped in the abiding impetus of life.

Here we are not only extending Bergson's ideas on joy, but also attempting to use his philosophy to draw a demarcation between joy and happiness. Joy is the occurrence of one who is experiencing an intuitive emotion that drives him or her to create in the world. Happiness arises in response to pleasure and need satisfaction. Joy arises in relation to creation and being in relation to the origin that is the impetus of life. Life is

characterized by creation and the emergence of new forms and multiple generations. To use a Heideggerian term, happiness is inauthentic because it arises in relation to the conditions of social existence and it is tinted with the hue that the intellect paints on all representations. In general, people tend to find pleasure and enjoyment in things that are calculated by society to hold the most importance. These things also tend to keep people occupied and busy in life. The pleasures associated with sex, work and security against the forces of degradation promise well-being. However, when one transposes these satisfactions into the experience of joy, one will soon find disappointment. The pleasures of life fade and security is lost in an instant with the fluctuation of a market or the emergence of war. Happiness manifests itself as that towards which people aim. However, joy grounds the possibility of happiness. Joy does not emerge through accumulation or the enjoyment that arises in entertainment. The joy of Heidegger is always expressed in relation to negativity and seems to be more something hoped for than actually experienced. However, Bergson provides a positive view of a joy that is primordial and emerges when humans coincide with the fundamental impulsion that continually creates in the face of the nothing. It is not in courage that one is able to abide in the face of non-being. It is only because one senses the propulsion of being, humanity itself being a part of this propulsion, that one can stand at all.

For Heidegger, anxiety is primordial because it displays the foundation from which Dasein takes flight in its entanglement in the world. Dasein finds itself absorbed in the world of “the they,” but this absorption is not grounding. Instead, anxiety displays the ground of Being and reveals itself as more primordial than the absorption that is characteristic of everyday Dasein. In a similar manner, the happiness of everyday being

in its absorbed entanglement is that which is revealed as inadequate in the experience of joy. Happiness is given its character and ideal by everyday idle talk about money, property, and health. However, joy reveals a primordial happiness that is free from the entangled conceptions of happiness. In the experience of joy, one is engaged in the ontic world and in creation. However, one is not overcome and encompassed by the ontic manifestations, but by the being that is the source from which the ontic springs. Joy does not arise in relation to objects and acquisition, but in the process and birth of something absolutely new through the creative powers of humanity and nature. The joy of nature is one in which harmony lives and the individual objects are replaced by an overwhelming sense of unity and responsiveness. Art produces joy in those who coincide with the works not as analyzable objects, but as expressions of experiences that reveal what it means to be human. The artist has brought something forth that is an objectless object. This is why people often cannot explain the most moving pieces of art. They are overcome by a coincidence of their inner being with the expression that emerged out of the depths of the artist.

Joy points to the inadequacies of happiness as it is conceived in everydayness and unites humanity with the origin of being. This is why the joyful experience is so rare and flees as soon as one reflects on it. Heidegger was correct when he dedicated so much time to the way in which Dasein is distanced from the origin. This distance is manifest in joy and the reason why joy is so rare is because one cannot remain in harmonic relation to the origin. However, in joy one coincides with the origin and the ontological foundation of happiness shows itself as that towards which human action strives.

Bergson recognized the connection between joy and creation. He believed that joy could arise through the study of philosophy. For Bergson, the intellect was the veil that distorted the connection between humanity and the origin. The dominance of the intellect continued over time to the point where philosophical thought had been almost extinguished from the realm of truth, unless it shared the form of scientific examination. However, one who attempted to think through intuition and duration could restore to the mind the power of the philosophical thought that had been covered by the layering of the intellect. Bergson's hope was that a return to philosophical thought could lead to a joy that could unveil the origin and allow for perceptions and actions the likes of which humanity had not experienced in ages. Joy would re-emerge as that relation between humanity and the origin and would lead humanity into harmony with the earth as well as provide satisfactions that one can only attain in being in relation to the highest forms of creation.

For Bergson, humans can ultimately become participants in the absolute when they take part in the creative act, and it is in these moments that they experience the unveiling of the primordial joy of being united with the fundamental principle of life. Bergson's idea about the inner state of humans is that it is a unity that contains various multiplicitous shades of affectivity or moodedness. When one creates or is involved in the creative process, one is not affected in such a way that one experiences joy. Instead, one is introduced into the feeling of joy that arises when one comes into contact with what Bergson would call the Life of the real. For Bergson, humans have sprung from the line of evolution that is driven by the vital impetus. He believed that it was impossible to account for the heterogeneity of animals, plants, and compounds without positing a force

that fought against the entropy and aging process that are characteristic of the universe and life. The vital impetus was the movement of life against the entropic movement towards death. The tendency that humans followed in the evolutionary process was that of intellectual development. However, the supremacy of the intellect left humanity in a state of fragmentation in relation to its moods. This state of fragmentation has grown as the intellectual tendencies have gained strength by forming more and more of the objects in society and the relations by which humans are permitted to interact with those objects. Therefore, moodedness is often related to the state of the intellect and its uptake of the perceptual and relational environment. Humans find themselves in a mood. However, this mood is most often presented through the eyes of the intellect. This leads to an analysis of mood as it emerges from the inner being of humans. Analysis leads to group names under which various experiences are subsumed. Various shades of experiences are called sadness, depression, melancholy, happiness, and joy. However, this grouping tendency does nothing to elucidate the minutiae that contribute to the differences between certain moods.

Joy is a mood that extends beyond the scope of the intellect because it is impossible to fragment its expression into pieces that can be analyzed. The intellect immediately recognizes its inability to fragment this experience and it will then make certain claims about its inability to exhibit what it actually experiences in the moments in which it is immersed in joy. The same thing often occurs in examples of love, dread and depression. Humans tend to give an explanation of their moodedness to others in order to express these states. However, immediately following their articulations, they

immediately qualify what they have said by mentioning the fact that their experiences are incommunicable.

There are certain individuals throughout history who have been able to express love, joy, dread, and sadness with words that seem to coincide with the experiences themselves. These gifted individuals give an enhanced power of expression to the mass of common individuals, and they are at all times artists of language. Bergson's joyful moodedness emerges in an experience that is beyond the capacities of the intellect to comprehend. It is an intuitive emotion. In fact, all intuitive emotions of Bergson are those that Heidegger would call fundamental moods. This is because the intuitive emotions are those that ground existence. They are the atmosphere that surrounds us and for Bergson, we are introduced into them; they are not the outcome of our own existence.

In the first chapter of the dissertation, we spent the majority of the chapter outlining angst and then examining the relationship between authentic mood (angst) and inauthentic mood (fear). Just as fear is inauthentic angst for Heidegger, we now argue that happiness is inauthentic joy for Bergson. Bergson attempts to provide a method by which one can coincide more fully with the creative vitality of existence. Bergson's joy is open to all because his philosophical method requires the reformation of one's mode of existence, not an esoteric knowledge of conceptual schemata. Joy is the attunement that founds the inauthentic attunement of happiness. Happiness is fleeting because it is the outcome of a human experience that satisfies itself with objects and relationships that mimic creation but do not fulfill the promise that they will bring something new into existence or transform the human against that which seeks to destroy it. Joy occurs when one coincides with the creative impulse that founds the emergence of the totality of life

that constantly prevails against death and that also pervades the being of humanity as it continually creates itself and transforms itself.

Bergson first shows us the world as it appears through the eyes of the intellect. He does so in order to show us another side of human thought that has been covered over the course of time. When one crosses back into relationship with intuition, one then experiences the joy of a new world of perception and understanding. One awakens to the world, and the shades of death and destruction that have taken over the canvas of the earth finally show themselves as only one aspect of existence on the earth. That which seemed to be dead comes back to life and in intuition one finds that one is part of the current of life that flows back up the mountain that matter descends as it decays. This new world opens the possibility for the re-emergence of joy. In addition to the emergence of a new view of reality, one is able to be grateful to life and to have the opportunity to participate in the becoming of the real. One immersed in the joy of existence finds that the objects all interact with one another and interpenetrate in a multiplicitous unity that is characterized by the elimination of time in its simultaneous form. It is in this sense that one sees *sub specie durationis* as one grasps organisms and objects in terms of their histories that have led up to a moment of the present that continuously slides into a future that has the potential to bring about unimagined possibilities. One is overcome by Being, but one experiences no angst or unhomeliness in the experience of Bergsonian joy. Instead, it is here that one finds in the real a home and comfort from existence. The joyful experience is the event that provides hope against the seemingly continual injustices and absurdities of existence. It offers brief glimpses of the vitality that strains and presses on against the weights of the universe that

seek to undo it. It is in coming into nearness with the vital principle that humans, who are naturally the most creative beings, can most adequately be themselves and feel at home in the world. Joy is the experience of being in proximity to the origin. For Bergson, that origin is Life and the impetus of being. Bergson's intuition was that life existed as a constant creation that continuously renewed itself, and his philosophy was the attempt to bring humans back to a mode of thought that could coincide with the fundamental principle of Life, thereby opening all to the dawn of joy and providing new possibilities for creation and new vistas for human existence.

As we come to the end of this section on Bergsonian joy and our own thoughts about the relationship between happiness and joy, we must examine a final problem that is fundamental to the juxtaposition of Heidegger and Bergson in relation to attunement. We have gone through both philosophers' methods and ideas about the foundations of Life/Being. Throughout the dissertation we have tended to show how the two practiced a philosophy that was focused around a return to Being or the Real. Having examined their conceptions of being in relation to the foundation of existence and the proper comportment that reflects authentic relation to the origin, we must now ask why their conceptions are so different. Bergson finds life, vitality, and creation at the foundation of Life (his counter-concept to Heidegger's Being). The soul attuned to the foundation will experience joy as it creates and coincides with the primary action of the *élan vital* itself. When Heidegger comes to the origin (Being), he finds nothing, horror, and solemnity. The Dasein attuned to Being must await an uncovering of Being in an absolute anxiety. The question we want to examine is how these two philosophers came to such different conclusions based on their analyses of the world. If Heidegger is correct, then it appears

that Bergson's ideas are mistaken and vice versa. In addition to the foundation of the world itself, there is also the difference in the two philosophers between the proper compartments and outcomes that result from being in proximity to the origin. Is it that Heidegger found anxiety after he searched for Being, or that he was primordially anxiety-laden and then found merely what drove him in the depth of his own being? Is it that Bergson found joy after he came into contact with the *élan vital* and experienced the joy of being united to Life, or was he merely a joyful person who found only what drove him to create his own philosophical writings? We will examine these questions through numerous streams that appear to feed into the river of the complexity of this question in the final section in the hope that we will be able to more adequately understand the force of attunement and its primordially.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ANXIETY AND JOY

Bergson's analysis of the nothing ended with a rejection of the nothing. He claimed that positive reality was upheld by an impetus that pushed life forward against death. However, death still exists. Heidegger recognized the severity of death, and began from that severity, ultimately working through that recognition to a foundation out of which one's relationship to death would be the underlying principle of one's authentic life. Bergson recognized joy as the attunement that resulted from approaching the origin, while Heidegger found that anxiety was that which arose when one approached the realm of the nothing. We have critiqued Heidegger's conception for making joy arise out of

negativity and anxiety. However, at least Heidegger mentions joy, bliss, astonishment, and creative longing as possibilities that could occur out of this experience. Bergson focuses on joy in itself and attempts to explicate what we have called a positive joy by relating the appearance of joy to creation and unification with an underlying metaphysical power. Bergson's recognition of anxiety and suffering as fundamental aspects of existence are seemingly nonexistent. Heidegger's passing remarks about joy are substantial compared to Bergson's silence on anxiety. So is it that anxiety is fundamental or is it that joy is fundamental? If one attempts to allow being to appear from itself (Heidegger) or to "see in order to see" (Bergson), being reveals itself in strange new ways. Does the mood come before the ontological demonstration of the mood, or is it that one finds oneself in a mood (attunement) that then influences the manner in which one outlines his or her ontology?

Heidegger's writings are filled with solitude and severity, Bergson's ring with joy and hope. Heidegger outlines anxiety and the freedom that comes when one separates oneself from inauthentic appropriation. Bergson examines the joy that arises when humans create. Heidegger believed that philosophy could lead to freedom and an unveiling of the layers that had been deposited over existence and had distorted the view of humanity. Bergson believed that the distortion was the result of the human intellect, but that humanity did have access to a more intuitive, pure vision of reality if it was able to move away from desire and quantification. As Heidegger approaches metaphysical foundations, he finds a liberating anxiety in the face of the horror of the abyss. As Bergson examines the fundament, he finds the end of humanity in joy as it unites with the

élan vital in the process of creation out of which life springs and in which humans alone can participate consciously and reflectively.

Each philosopher comes to such different conclusions that one wonders how such differing conceptions can arise. Does the mood come first, or is fundamental attunement found through analysis of the origin and the proper relation to that origin? Is it that Heidegger was an anxious man who ultimately let his anxiety form his ontology and Dasein's relationship to being? Did Bergson first feel the joy of creation and then go searching to find something that merely existed inside himself and not in reality? Are the varying formulations merely the result of the respective inner states of these men that then led to an elucidation of metaphysical reality that was polarized to one side or the other? The danger of saying that Heidegger was anxious and Bergson was joyful is that we then psychologize attunement and make it subjective. The foundations that Heidegger and Bergson then found would then be based on his internal psychological state (anxiety or joy) and then the philosophies that emerge would be relative to those states. We refuse to say that Heidegger was an anxiety laden man who found anxiety at the base of reality only because of his own anxiousness. In the same way we reject the same argument in the reverse direction for Bergson. Attunement is more than psychological state. In addition, it is important that we do not subjectivize fundamental attunement because then one could posit any attunement as being fundamental and constitutive of human experience.

Humans find themselves in a mood. Each one finds himself or herself mooded, and although affects change the qualities and quantities of moodedness, each recognizes his or her fundamental mood. We have names for this foundation: character,

comportment, or personality. We cannot escape our moodedness and this moodedness leads to the manner in which we act in the world (in general). We might say that someone is happy, negative, complaining, or annoying. All these states reflect the fundamental manner in which each finds him or herself, acts in the world, and then is recognized by others. What we see in Heidegger and Bergson's account is opposition at its most extreme. We have two opposed moods that have found opposite foundations. However, is it improper to say that both men are correct? If one examines one's own experience, does one not find moments of intense anxiety interspersed with times of elation and joy? Could it be that Being reveals itself in different measures to different people in different ways? We argue that being can only speak to Dasein through the moodedness in which Dasein finds itself. Dasein is not in control of this moodedness as it is in control of certain quantitative aspects of its life. Instead, it finds itself thrown into the world with a certain disposition or comportment. Bergson claims that each philosopher finds a diaphanous intuition in her or himself. It is this intuition that is the guiding thread of the philosopher's work. The rest of his or her life, the philosopher attempts to explicate that thread. The intuition is so simple that it is impossible to adequately express. However, this does not prevent the philosopher from trying. Perhaps one could say that Heidegger's intuition was that Being had been forgotten and that there was more that could be understood about Being than was given in everyday existence. One might also claim that Bergson's intuition was the same. Where Heidegger found an uncovering in patient waiting and courage, Bergson found it in a turning back to a mode of thought that had been covered evolutionarily. However, the two foundations these philosophers found represent the extremes of the reality that surrounds humanity. In

between these two moods and these two foundations lie all human experiences. However, when explicating foundations, one necessarily traverses into the realm of the extreme. Being presented itself as a nothing to Heidegger and as a vital impetus to Bergson. Was one mistaken? No. Neither was mistaken. Instead, both philosophers sought that which was the foundation of all reality. Being could present itself to each only in the manner in which it was given. For Heidegger, we see a polarization to the realm of anxiety, death and the nothing. For Bergson we see a polarization towards Life, *élan vital*, and creativity. Both go too far, but both do not go far enough. Both fail to adequately recognize the opposite realm. Heidegger fails to recognize the vitality and productive powers of life while Bergson even goes so far as saying that humans might someday overcome death.

In order to think through the dichotomy between Heidegger and Bergson further, we want to examine the different comportments that each proposes in relation to Being/Life. Earlier in this chapter we examined Heidegger's ideas of waiting and willing non-willing and their relationship to a more authentic understanding of Being that could then result in a form of joy for Dasein. Later in the chapter, we then examined the relationship that Bergson proposed in which humanity takes part in creative activity, and in so doing, experiences the joy of being united to the fundamental driving force of life. How is it that the two come to such different conclusions about the proper comportment that one should take up in relation to Being/Life? One claims that one should will non-willing and the other claims that one must will actions of creation in order to experience joy. We will use some ideas about joy from Nietzsche in order to further explicate the varying conceptions of joy in Heidegger and Bergson. The relationship to Nietzsche will

shed light on why Heidegger tends to make joy a derivative of anxiety whereas Bergson finds joy as primordial and integrally related to creation.

At the end of his *Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, Heidegger quotes a passage from Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*. This text was mentioned earlier but must be regarded in its full extent in order to help explicate Heidegger's conception of waiting. Earlier it was stated that Heidegger's course (*The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*) ends with him saying that it is in relation to the horror of being in a false relation to Being that Dasein can experience the bliss of astonishment that arises from philosophy. Heidegger then claims that this idea is captured best in the following lines from Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*.

Oh Man! Attend!
 What does deep midnight's voice contend?
 "I slept my sleep,
 "And now awake at dreaming's end:
 "The world is deep,
 "Deeper than day can comprehend.
 "Deep is its woe.
 "Joy – deeper than heart's agony:
 "Woe says: Fade! Go!
 "But all joy wants eternity,
 "Wants deep, profound eternity!"¹⁵⁸

What does Nietzsche mean when he makes the claim that all joy wants eternity? In order to understand Nietzsche's conception of joy, it is necessary that one examine Nietzsche's ideas about affirmation and its relationship to eternal recurrence. Walter Kaufman asserts that "Negatively, the doctrine of eternal recurrence is the most extreme repudiation of any deprecation of the moment, the finite, and the individual – the antithesis of any faith in

¹⁵⁸ Heidegger, *The Fundamental Concepts*, GA 29-30:532/366.

infinite progress...”¹⁵⁹ In speaking about Nietzsche’s idea of the eternal recurrence, Kaufman points out that Nietzsche had sought a justification for human existence, beginning in his *Birth of Tragedy* where he says that life is only justified as an aesthetic phenomenon. However, “it was not until August 1881, near Sils Maria, ‘6,000 feet beyond man and time,’ that the thought came to Nietzsche that the man who perfects himself and transfigures his *physis* achieves ultimate happiness and experiences such an overwhelming joy that he no longer feels concerned about the ‘justification’ of the world: he affirms it forward, backward, and ‘in all eternity.’”¹⁶⁰ In examining Nietzsche’s eternal return, Richard Schacht points to section 341 of *The Gay Science* where Nietzsche introduces this idea. Schacht believes that the eternal return is a challenge, “the ability to meet which is also the ability to live joyfully without any hope that life and the world will ever have a significantly different character than they do.”¹⁶¹ Schacht does not believe that the truth of this idea is what is important. Instead, the significance of eternal return is as a model for humans who could not only deal with such an idea, but embrace it and take joy in the idea of their lives occurring again in every minute detail.

In speaking of Goethe in *Twilight of the Idols*, Nietzsche declares that a spirit such as Goethe’s stands with “a joyous and trusting fatalism, in the faith that all is redeemed and affirmed in the whole – *he does not negate anymore.*”¹⁶² The trusting

¹⁵⁹ Walter Kaufmann, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, 1974), 321.

¹⁶⁰ Kaufmann, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*, 323-324.

¹⁶¹ Richard Schacht, *Nietzsche* (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983), 259.

¹⁶² Friedrich Nietzsche, *Twilight of the Idols*, trans. R.J. Hollingdale (New York: Penguin Books, 1990), 83.

fatalism of Nietzsche is manifest in his idea of *amor fati*. The love of fate is more than mere acceptance of that which occurs in one's life. It is the affirmation of all that fate brings into existence and all that emerges in the lives of humans and the existence of nature. In a passage from *Ecce Homo*, Nietzsche asserts that *amor fati* is the formula for the great human being. This human being "wants nothing to be different – not forward, not backward, not in all eternity. Not merely bear what is necessary, still less conceal it...but love it."¹⁶³ Kaufman alleges that "the Good Life does not consist in unconscious creativity but is crowned by what Nietzsche would call a Dionysian faith: the apotheosis of joy or – as Nietzsche sometimes call it – *amor fati*."¹⁶⁴ In his *Will to Power*, Nietzsche says that his is a philosophy that desires to cross over from negation:

to a Dionysian affirmation of the world as it is, without subtraction, exception, or selection – it wants the eternal circulation: – the same things, the same logic and illogic of entanglements. The highest state a philosopher can attain: to stand in a Dionysian relationship to existence – my formula for this is *amor fati*.¹⁶⁵

It is only a kind of absolute affirmation that displays the health of one who is able to love that which occurs by fate and this love is characterized by the joy of one who wills each moment with a will that could will it occurring an infinite number of times, even if this moment is the event of extreme suffering and destruction.

It appears then that Nietzsche believed that joy could emerge as one overcame one's desire to have a life or life experiences that were different from those given by fate.

¹⁶³ Friedrich Nietzsche, *Ecce Homo*, in *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York, Modern Library, 2000), 714.

¹⁶⁴ Kaufman, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*, 282.

¹⁶⁵ Friedrich Nietzsche, *Will to Power*, ed. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), 1041.

True joy was neither the result of the accumulation of wealth nor the comfort of an omniscient judge, but the joy of one who was able to incorporate suffering into a life of affirmation that sought nothing other than what was given in each moment of life. Such a position does not provide the metaphysical comfort that emerges when one is able to posit God as impartial, absolutely just observer of that which occurs on earth. If one follows Nietzsche's ideas, one must confront the meaninglessness of suffering and destruction with no recourse to comfort from any source outside oneself. This position could ultimately lead to absolute despair and intense suffering. However, when one seeks affirmation of all that occurs, one is in a position that has harmonized itself with the existence of the world as it is. One is able to wish the eternal return of all that happens, even the most chaotic and destructive events. This leads to a joyful state from which one can affirm all that exists, as it exists in nature. "Nietzsche's practical teaching is that difference is happy; that multiplicity, becoming, and chance are adequate objects of joy by themselves and that only joy returns. Multiplicity, becoming and chance are the properly philosophical joy in which unity rejoices in itself and also in being and necessity."¹⁶⁶ In order to attain joy in Nietzsche's philosophy, one must learn how to embrace all that existence offers and brings into being.

If one could burden one's soul with all of this – the oldest, newest, losses, hopes, conquests, and the victories of humanity; if one could finally contain all this in one soul and crowd it into a single feeling – this would surely have to result in a happiness that humanity has not known so far: the happiness of a god full of power and love, full of tears and laughter, a happiness that, like the sun in the evening, continually bestows its inexhaustible riches, pouring them into the sea,

¹⁶⁶ Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson (New York: Athlone Press, 1983), 190.

feeling richest, as the sun does, only when even the poorest fisherman is still rowing with golden oars!¹⁶⁷

It is certainly the joyful one who would achieve such a state of existence. However, according to Nietzsche, people do not believe that it is possible to live out extended elevated moods. “But to be a human being with one elevated feeling – to be a single great mood incarnate – that has hitherto been a mere dream and a delightful possibility; as yet history does not offer us any certain examples.”¹⁶⁸ Although Nietzsche does not believe that any humans have reached the state of becoming a single great mood, he hopes for the day when the conditions of reality will be able to produce such individuals and he also believes that his ideas about affirmation indicate the attributes of such an individual.

Going back to Heidegger and his appropriation of the text of Nietzsche, we see at the end of *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics* that Heidegger is relating Dasein’s joy to its ability to experience pain. At the end of this work, Heidegger claims that Dasein is unique in that it can stand outside of its immediate temporal context and examine past and future. This ability is also what provides the possibility for Dasein to “be seized by terror.”¹⁶⁹ However, “only where there is the perilousness of being seized by terror do we find the bliss of astonishment – being torn away in that wakeful manner that is the breath of all philosophizing...”¹⁷⁰ Heidegger then goes on to say that Dasein’s

¹⁶⁷ Nietzsche, *Gay Science*, 268.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid. 231.

¹⁶⁹ Heidegger, *Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, GA 29-30:531/366.

¹⁷⁰ Heidegger, *Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, GA 29-30:531/366.

relationship to the world is characterized by the drunken song of Nietzsche that is quoted above. There is a parallel between Heidegger's ideas about terror and the bliss that resonates in Nietzsche's "drunken song." Heidegger claims that Dasein is able to be seized by terror. However, this terror is the precondition for the bliss of astonishment that is the foundation of philosophy. What Heidegger is saying is that bliss is reliant on the human ability to experience the horror of confronting Being.

In Nietzsche's song we have a similar relationship. The woe of the earth spreads its power and seems to indicate that the earth is without meaning and unjust. Woe tells the earth to fade into nothingness, "to go!" Those that examine the earth and see the woe could be overcome by a rejection of the meaning of the earth and a desire that the earth should fade into non-being. It would seem that at the foundations of the earth is the woe that encompasses humanity, and that this woe is the most primordial and powerful force on earth. However, Nietzsche claims that there is a joy that is deeper than the earth's woe. This joy desires eternity. We have related the idea of eternity to the will that wills the eternal return, and we believe that for Nietzsche, willing the eternal return of the same is necessary for the emergence of joy. This idea is related to his conception of *amor fati*, and in his conception of *amor fati* we find a coincidence with Heidegger's understanding of waiting and willing non-willing in relation to the origin.

Nietzsche equates joy with the compoment that wills that all should continue in eternity. Woe is that mode of existence that wills that the earth should be different from the way it is. This woe cannot will that all should occur in an eternal cycle of the same. Heidegger latches on to these ideas of Nietzsche's and then attempts to account for woe in such a way that one can then experience joy in this primordial pain. In his ideas about

willing non-willing, Heidegger is expressing a desire to be open to all aspects of existence that are free from the will that would destroy the opportunity for the unveiling of Being. At the same time, one can see that this awaiting is characterized by anxiety, terror, and the pain of holding oneself out into the nothing. It is integrally related to the woe of existence and it attempts to live in relation to that woe in a non-willing that wants nothing other than that life should present itself as it does.

We have shown earlier that Heidegger believed that one must await being in meditative thought with a willing that wills non-willing in order to approach the foundation of existence. Heidegger's awaiting mirrors Nietzsche's will that wills that all should continue in a cycle for eternity, for the will that wills eternity is one that actually does not will change on earth. Therefore, in a certain sense it is non-willing. If one thinks about willing the eternal return of the same, then one could conclude that one should not act to change anything that occurred in one's life. One must learn to will it that one's life should be lived again an infinite number of times in every detail. This mode of being would be one in which one had totally accepted and affirmed all that had happened in one's life, and the comportment that would emerge alongside this mode would be one of non-willing in a sense that one does not will that life should be different. One instead wills that all should be the same and so wills a form of non-willing that would not change the details of one's life. Changing some attribute of one's life would arise out of a will that willed that something should be different and then sought to alter that aspect to create something new. Heidegger's ideas about awaiting and willing non-willing coincide with Nietzsche's ideas about eternal recurrence in one's life, the idea

that one should will that all aspects of one's existence could occur again in the exact same order and detail an infinite number of times in the future.

Nietzsche's words on the pain and agony of existence indicate that one who experiences joy is one who can will that all the pains and woes of the earth continue in their existence and as they emerge. In becoming absolutely joyful, one finds oneself in absolute affirmation of the present. That necessarily means that one would have to affirm all the injustices and woes that are occurring across the face of the earth at that instant. This is a seemingly delirious and frightening view of reality that brings forth a number of questions. How can one be just and affirm the injustices of existence? Must one then not only accept violation, murder, and rape, but also affirm that they return in the same manner for eternity? Is such a view sustainable without being a sociopath, and does Heidegger's philosophy then fall into question in its attempts to will non-willing?

All these questions seem to indicate that Nietzsche's view is untenable. However, there is another way in which one can think of Nietzsche's willing the eternal that provides the space for joy in creation, thereby strengthening Bergson's focus on the joy of creation. The problem one has here is that if one must will that all things should revolve in an eternal return, then one would seemingly have to move away from creative action as this action would bring about a reality that is different from that which is brought about by fate. It is in this idea that we see Heidegger's interpretation of Nietzsche, and this provides insight into why Heidegger would promote a willing that wills non-willing. He seems to fall into line with this view of the affirmation of the eternal, and then determines that it is in awaiting, and not creative action, that one can come into nearness with the origin and experience the uncovering of the truth of being.

Although it might seem that one must reach a form of acceptance of fate and move away from creative action, there is another interpretation of the will that wills eternity that provides a space for creative action and revolutionary action on earth. In saying that all joy seeks eternity, Nietzsche is claiming that in order to experience joy, one must get to a point where one could will that all occurs as it does on earth. If one is not at the point where one can affirm all that occurs (including injustice and suffering), then one is not at the point where one can experience absolute joy. Absolute joy is the experience in which one is not affected adversely by anything that occurs in one's environment or internal being. If one is affected by the sufferings and injustices of the world, then one cannot experience absolute joy because then one will experience some privation or negativity that will then prevent one from obtaining that joy. It is only the overman that is to come that is able to affirm all that occurs on earth and take up such a position, and this is why, I believe, Nietzsche recognized that he was not the overman. He recognized that he was all too human, meaning that he was unable to shake his own pains at the recognition of the injustices that occurred on earth and the pains of existence. In addition, Nietzsche is said to have had his final collapse after he saw a stagecoach driver beating a horse. Depending on the account, Nietzsche either tried to confront the stagecoach driver or he wrapped his arms around the horse's neck before mentally breaking down and ending up in an asylum. Why would one who wished to will the eternal return of the same run to the aid of a horse? This is certainly not the culmination of a state of being that could accept things as they are and will that they eternally return as they have occurred. Or is it?

If one stands outside of Nietzsche's works and reads his passages on willing that all things should occur (including the agonies of existence) as they are and in the same measure as they have been, then one could come to the conclusion that Nietzsche presents a fatalism that must affirm injustice. At the same time, one could say that the joy Nietzsche claims as the offspring of this comportment is a falsified joy that does not reflect true joy, but merely a total acceptance of the horrors of existence. However, there is another way in which one can approach Nietzsche's words and protect his idea of joy against such claims, a way that also protects his ideas about the importance of creation and the necessity of destructing social ideals. If one finds that in one's own life, one is a creator and that one seeks to create new conditions for those that suffer, then one does not necessarily run up against problems with Nietzsche's account of joy. It is not necessarily incompatible with Nietzsche's views that one could work to create new conditions for humanity and strive against the suffering of humanity and experience a Nietzschean joy. If one is thrown into the world with an intense desire to eliminate suffering and to release humanity from bonds of injustice and false ideals, then one can spend one's life working to create new conditions fighting against the sufferings of existence. One has first of all become a creator, one who brings about something new on earth. At the same time, one can be a creator and still will that the earth be as it is and affirm the earth as it is, including the way in which one lives one's own life (as a creator). In this sense *amor fati* then is the love of the creative desire that has been placed in the creator by fate.

Affirming the world as it is does not necessitate that one live a mode of existence that waits for things to happen or reveal themselves. Instead, it is just as possible that one searches for new meanings, works to eliminate poverty and hunger, or attempts to bring

about the end to suffering. The life of this individual is still a part of the emergence of reality. It is not necessarily contradictory to Nietzsche's view that one can live this type of existence, *as long as* one wills that his or her existence could be lived in every detail in a cycle for all eternity. One would will that his or her life should continue for all eternity and that his or her battles in the world and attempts to create should cyclically battle against the prevailing conditions and the suffering of humanity (the woe of the world). In order to experience the joy of affirmation, it is not necessary to wait for being and to accept the suffering of the world without taking creative actions against it. All that is necessary is to will that one's life be lived over in every detail. In this sense, one can look back over every experience and say that one could will that he or she lived that experience over and over again for eternity. In fact, it would seem much easier to look back over a life lived attempting to create new conditions for reality and affirm it than look back at a life lived in apathy or the attempt to accept all that occurs on earth. This is also how one can harmonize Nietzsche's ideas about the eternal return with his focus on becoming creators and overcoming humanity in its current state.

One can create on earth and still not fall into the realm of willing a change in the way the world is, for in creating one is taking part in the emergence of the world *as it is* and one's life becomes an integral portion of the emergence of the world. Working to eliminate aspects of the earth that currently exist or structures that work to keep people in bondage is not a rejection of the world as it is, it is necessarily related to the emergence of the world as it is in its emerging. One is part of the becoming of the world that works to undo certain conditions of human existence. This does not mean that one rejects the world. Instead, it merely means that in this instance, the life that is lived is affirmed as

one that seeks revolution and creation of new possibilities. These lives are just as much a part of the emergence of the world as the lives that seek to harmonize with all that occurs without working to change things on earth. The only necessary condition of the eternal return is that one wills everything that occurs on earth and in one's own life to return for eternity. One can easily will that a life of creation and struggle to eliminate the woe of the earth be one that occurs in an eternal cycle. In fact, this might be the most satisfying life to affirm in such an eternal manner.

In taking up a position against the woe of the earth, one is actually affirming that woe. One says "Yes" to agony in the sense that one confronts it as actually existing, as powerful, and as something worthy of battle. Although one might wish that all suffering fade and that injustice was replaced by absolute justice, it is necessary that such ideas do not become the centerpiece of one's life. When these ideas do become that around which one's life circles, one is in danger of experiencing disappointment in every corner of one's existence. However, if one maintains a perspective that recognizes the power and pervasiveness of the atrocious, one is able to affirm its existence and also affirm that one should spend one's entire life fighting against these conditions. It is only in affirmation of woe that one can then take the step to dedicate one's life to the elimination of that woe. It seems that the point of difficulty would be in the acceptance of the anxieties and horrors of the world, for most people who fight against these conditions would wish for eternity that they be eradicated. However, in the wish for eternal justice and peace, these people would also bring about the end of the lives of people who attempted to fight against injustice because these lives are spent in the fight against the prevailing conditions of injustice. In this sense then, one must affirm pain and suffering as being the

necessary conditions from which one can then live a life that battles against those conditions. It is then necessary for these conditions to exist and also necessary for one to affirm their existence. If one would seek that all pain and suffering would end on earth, then one would ultimately be creating a world that is no longer our world, no longer our earth, no longer our human experience. This would be the ultimate rejection of not only life as we know it, but of the conditions of pain and suffering that lead to the development of individual humans both physically and mentally. In contrast, one can work to create on earth and not fall into a contradiction with the joy that arises in willing the eternal return of the same. This could be what one experiences when one looks back at a life lived well, when one has no regrets about not only what one has done, but what one has sought to undo on earth. All humans have memories that they wish they could erase and actions they wish they would not have committed. It is in this way that we are, along with Nietzsche, all too human as well. Perhaps it is not a terrible thing that we are all too human. However, it is important to recognize that one who affirms all of existence is one who is not swayed by desire and regret. This mode of existence is open to joy as harmony with the being of the world as well as internal harmony with one's own existence. We have sought to show that the necessary response to the world is not one that waits, but that creation is a possible response that is able to accept the being of the world but that would also allow one to experience joy.

The whole point of the above section is to show how Heidegger responded to the origin (waiting and willing non-willing) and that creation is also a viable alternative interpretation of the eternal return of the same. As he approached Being, Heidegger found that one should wait in meditative thought and attempt to will non-willing. This is

the reason that he points towards Nietzsche's ideas about joy in relation to the woe of the earth and the longing for eternity. We have seen that Nietzsche's longing for eternity is the longing of one who is able to will that all should occur in an eternal cycle of being. This is the eternal that all joy desires. It is only in this mode of affirming all that occurs that one is able to experience the joy of eternal longing. If one rejects aspects of being or desires that things be changed, then he or she cannot experience joy on earth. However, we have attempted to show that one can still affirm all of existence (including one's own actions) and work to change things and conditions on earth, i.e., create something new. It is not necessary that one come to the conclusion that joy arises out of a mode of being in which one awaits. Creation is a plausible relation to the origin, and this is the point from which Bergson begins.

Bergson concurs with the Nietzschean view that emerges in the drunken song that joy is more fundamental than woe. Bergson's conception was not focused so much on accepting the conditions that are given on earth. Instead, he promoted the idea that joy emerges when one acts as a creator on earth. Bergson believed that the fundamental mode of being of humanity had been covered over. It is not that Life is covered over, and that a more authentic relation to truth would occur in the uncovering of Being. Instead, it is the case that certain primordial modes and compartments of humans have been covered over through the evolution of the intellect in relation to the needs that must be fulfilled in order for life to abide. He called for an uncovering of the human being in the hope that when one had chipped away at the shell that covers aspects of the human mind and human existence, one would emerge into a new realm of perception and understanding

that was not so much “new” as it was a remembering of that which had been shadowed for centuries of human existence.

Heidegger ultimately was able to explicate anxiety because he was given a vision of life that could only become free if it could maintain a relationship to the origin characterized by angst. Joy was merely an afterthought or an after-mood that emerged when Dasein most authentically maintained itself in relation to the Being of beings. Therefore, Heidegger’s conception of joy is strange and is never fully explicated because it can only be derivative when one begins from the point of anxiety and the nothing that is beyond being. Heidegger gives us an image of life that is polarized towards the negative in such a way that it cannot escape into the realm of creation and joy. What Heidegger does give us is an image of the conditions out of which joy shows itself. Joy is not a derivative of anxiety and horror, but it is integrally related to them. This is what Bergson failed to realize in his conception of joy. We do maintain that Bergson is correct that humans experience a harmony with life and inner peace that then leads to joy when they partake in the creative process. However, one can only experience peace when one has tasted bitter regret. At the same time, if humans did not primordially recognize the realm of joy that is the foundation of their happiness, they would expect nothing more out of life than the pains they have been given and the injustices that occur. They desire more because they have had a taste of joy, both in primordial understanding as well as physical experience on earth. One can only hope to be free from anxiety when one understands that there is some other state of being that is peaceful and joyful.

Heidegger and Bergson give us the two sides of the experience of joy. Heidegger’s philosophy begins from the primordial manifestations of the nothing in

stinging rebuke and regret, and focuses in on anxiety as the proper relation to the origin of existence. His passing remarks about joy and bliss indicate that he saw that there had to be something that could come out of the severity of holding oneself out into the oblivion of being. What he failed to realize was that this joy was the opposite side of fundamental attunement, and that anxiety can only occur when one recognizes a realm of peace that is threatened by that in the face of which one is anxious. One holds oneself out into anxiety in order to allow for a more authentic revealing of Being, and this ultimate revealing ends in “unshakeable joy” and “the bliss of astonishment.” What one has here in Heidegger is something hoped for. We have mentioned earlier that just as soon as Heidegger mentions these positive aspects that come out of the arduous process of holding oneself in relation to Being, he moves back to an analysis of negativity or a neutral matter of human existence. It is because he does this that we say that his positive outcomes are hoped for rather than believed to be obtained. Heidegger will not let himself go into the realm of that other side of existence. Having flamed up for a few seconds, the ideas about joy and bliss are extinguished and one falls back into previous analysis. Why does Heidegger refuse to let the flame burn and potentially blaze up? This is the question that has haunted my analysis. I wish that Heidegger would have turned inward and focused on the spark of joy that arose out of his analysis of anxiety and negativity to see where his mind would have taken Dasein, to see what joy and peace could lie ahead for Dasein that had passed through the refining fires of anxiety and been made ready for the realm of bliss and joy. However, something inside Heidegger would not let him follow those paths. Some wave would crash over the smoldering fire that was attempting to break through into the surface of his intellect and onto the page, and the

flames would be washed away by the oceanic abyss of Being. Heidegger was given a vision. Being provided his attunement and the intuition that he found in his innermost being was that Being had been forgotten and that it was Dasein's place in the world to be that being that in its being could allow for a retrieval of Being. Dasein could be the space in which Being once again revealed itself authentically. Heidegger attempted to express his ideas about this retrieval in all his works and whether one is reading *Being and Time* or *Pathmarks*, one constantly sees the struggle of a philosopher attempting to traverse into the realm of forgotten Being.

We have attempted to show that joy is the grounding concept of Bergson's ideas about the philosophical method and what it can provide for humanity. What we have ended up being given is an explanation by Bergson of joy as fundamental attunement and end of humanity. Bergson explicitly talks about joy throughout his works. His ideas about joy often emerge at the end of his works as he is trying to elucidate the outcomes of philosophy or the effect of an understanding of the foundations of existence. Bergson might not have realized how he continually came back to the idea of joy. What do we find in an adequate Bergsonian philosophical method? Joy. What emerges as we attempt to release ourselves from the intellect to perceive reality as it shows itself to us? Joy. What is the outcome of creative human action on earth? Joy. What is the gift bestowed on those that intuitively comprehend art? Joy. Bergson's works resonate with joy and an almost indecipherable whisper. Although full of references to scientific discourse and research of his day, the *élan vital* always hovers in the background, and the intuition that Bergson had of the vitality that brings about life and provides its abiding power inserts itself into his writing. Human experience today is often scientific, calculated with a view

toward utility, and acted in order to promote interests. However, as we work through our days, attend meetings, buy groceries, and take care of the minutiae, there are experiences that burst forth and seemingly shatter the walls of the intellect. We remember a lost friend, we are overcome by the bees flitting from daisy to daisy in search of nectar, or we get lost in an embrace from our lovers. We lose touch with the quantification of the mind and experience things in unity and harmony. We thank existence, God, the earth, or the other. What we have in Bergson is a man who reveals the two sides of human experience (intellectual and intuitional) and then gives us a model of this experience in written form. The intellectual writings proceed through the knowledge of his day and attempt to logically argue for certain positions, but then intuition emerges and Bergson seems to effortlessly flow into a passage inspired by creative emotion. He gives us a taste of his intuition, and when it fades he picks up again with the intellect from the point where he left off. Bergson shows us that there are two aspects of existence, two modes of perception. Heidegger shows us angst, horror, and reticent awe in the face of being, and he provides insight into the courage that one must have in order to undertake a confrontation with Being. However, on the opposite side we have a man whose words reverberate with the vitality of existence. Bergson reminds us that the earth is our home, and that we must remain diligent in our recognition of all that is beautiful and creative. As one reads Bergson, one finds that there is a common thread that winds its way through the intuitive passages that are scattered throughout his work. This common thread is joy, a joy that is open to all. Even the most callous doubter of joy cannot help but hope that Bergson might be right. And anyone who has had a glimpse of joy will immediately comprehend Bergson's masterfully crafted attempts to elucidate its power.

In the end we could say that joy and anxiety are integrally related. They are both fundamental, and they both interact in a never-ending tidal sway. They can both only exist as they do because of the other. The joy and peace of life are only experienced when one has tasted the injustice, anxiety, and regret of life. At the same time, one experiences rebuke and regret with the desire for something else because one primordially recognizes a realm in which rebuke is replaced by praise and regret is replaced by the peace that comes from a life lived well. With Heidegger and Bergson we have a battle between both of these worlds. Each man went as far as he could, one towards anxiety and the other towards joy. Each refused to let the opposite realm intrude in upon his projects, and when that other realm, in its primordial power, was able to emerge into the surface of thought, each was quick to snuff out its light. Both claimed that they wanted to return to being in order to see for the sake only of seeing, of having a vision of something that had been lost. When each was granted that vision, one saw horror and the other saw joy. It appears that for two people who wanted to explicate and understand reality and existence in a more authentic manner, that each failed to recognize the opposite realm of human experience. One must not think of the dichotomy between Heidegger and Bergson as a battle, but as the manifestation of the boundaries of attunement that lie on the edge of the origin. Each was given an internal vision (intuition) that each attempted to express. However, the analysis of both philosophers leads to an understanding of the extremes of human attunement. In this analysis one also recognizes that although they each lie at the limit of human experience, they are integrally united in the primordial understanding of humanity. Bergson speaks of the visions of the great mystics in his *Two Sources*. One could say that what one has with

Bergson and Heidegger is the vision of two philosophical mystics. Each was given a special vision into the extremes of reality and human experience and each attempted to explicate that reality in his own way. In understanding the extremes, one also understands the range of human experience as humans experience life. It is only because some special individuals have limit experiences of being that those who follow can experience something similar to those philosophers. In their efforts to explicate Being, Bergson and Heidegger truly did cut paths to the origin. Their works allow one to move deeper into realms that one could not express oneself, and their visions of reality harmonize with those who have had the experiences of joy and anxiety of which they speak. Heidegger and Bergson draw philosophers in their wake because of their abilities to take us further than we can go on our own. In understanding the extremes of attunement, one can then see how those extremes work in one's own life, and one can then work to promote the life that he or she desires to live. At the same time, one can also recognize the times that one is on the precipice of moving into relation to the origin. The foundations of human experience are anxiety and joy. Each is recognizable only because of the other, and human life would not be what it is without these attunements. This is the reason that we undertook this project. We desire to come into contact with the origin. Heidegger and Bergson provide visions of how one can approach the origin and the outcomes that await the human that attempts to live in relation to the origin. One problem (from a specific viewpoint) with our analysis is that it relies on internal reflection to see if what we have said corresponds to one's own experience. Having found that anxiety and the desire for happiness are two of the most important human

experiences, it was necessary to analyze these experiences in order to more fully understand not only if they are possible, but how they interact in human life.

With Heidegger and Bergson we have the examination and elucidation of the most primordial attunements of human existence. Heidegger recognized the angst that is characteristic of all human life. This angst is manifest primordially in the mode of fear. However, as one moves past fear that is fear in the face of some recognized object, one traverses into the realm of angst. Fear is the primordial, inauthentic manifestation of angst. When one recognizes angst, one can then recognize the angst that arises in being in the world as well as being towards one's death. It is the fundamental understanding of death and its severity that predisposes Dasein to live in an attunement of angst. Death is the possibility that is most authentically individual to Dasein and it arises because Dasein recognizes (even if in an inauthentic manner) that death is the end of all possibilities for the creation of one's projects and one's own existence.

Although anxiety is a primordial attunement of Dasein, anxiety can only arise when one is anxious about losing something. But one must necessarily ask, what is this something? Heidegger believed that it was in losing the potential for possibilities that Dasein experienced anxiety. However, this pronouncement is too general. Bergson presents a more detailed picture of what is at stake and the mode in which this other side of attunement is revealed. Bergson recognized that in addition to anxiety, joy is also fundamental attunement in humanity. It is that which provides the foundation for happiness and pleasure. Just as anxiety is primordially revealed in fear and privation, joy is first revealed in pleasure and happiness. Fear is the inauthentic form of anxiety because it focuses on objects in the world in the face of which Dasein is fearful. Pleasure

maintains the same relationship with joy. Arising from objects in the world and the experiences that humans have with those objects, pleasure is the inauthentic manifestation of joy on earth. Because humans are sensitive creatures, they equate sensations with psychological states, and because pleasure often leads to an internal state of well-being, it is often equated with happiness. However, this form of happiness is inauthentic in that it focuses on objects (ontic beings) on earth and fails to recognize the ontological structure of joy from which all these other experiences can emerge. Its lack of maintainability and the search for new objects that will bring happiness also points towards the inauthenticity of pleasure and happiness.

Just as Dasein is fundamentally fearful (anxiety laden), Dasein is fundamentally creative. This foundational creativity was what Bergson recognized when he proposed in *Creative Evolution* that humans should have the scientific name *Homo faber*. Bergson calls humans *Homo faber* because, from the beginning of their conscious lives, they are able to manipulate their worlds and they spend most of their time doing so. Children love to draw, paint, stack blocks, connect train cars, build sandcastles, and dig in their yards to create miniature cities where ants are kings and sticks become sky-scrapers. One could say that the human mind begins with an innate ability to not only create in the physical world, but to even generate vast imaginary realms that extend far past the material creations that they bring about on earth. The ability to create changes shape as one grows from child to adult, but almost every occupation in society, when seen from a specific viewpoint, involves some sort of creation. Whether it is crafting a building, bringing about conditions for a cleaner environment, transmitting knowledge, or manufacturing,

humans are constantly creating. Creation is then primordial in that it is manifest most strongly in humanity and emerges from the beginning of conscious existence.

The problem that one faces in the realm of happiness and pleasure is that the focus on these moods results in what one could call inauthentic creation. We have seen earlier how Bergson approached those people who had created not out of abundance, but out of insecurity. Those creators that create most authentically for Bergson are the ones that need no affirmation of their works. Their works are purely affirmative in that creators are assured of their works' place and meaning on the earth. Inauthentic creation is that which is manifest most plainly on earth. Just as humans tend to move away from an authentic understanding of being and the anxiety that reveals being, they also tend to create the absurd and destructive instead of making the effort to bring about something absolutely new. We do not deny that some inauthentic creations make the world more variegated and provide some entertainment. However, in creating inauthentically, humans remain lost in the realm of unfulfilled joy.

Anxiety in the face of the nothing manifests the most extreme privation that Dasein can face. However, this privation is thought in such a manner only because Dasein also recognizes the primordial joy that is experienced inauthentically in happiness and pleasure. Creation and fear spring out of humanity naturally and they work to reinforce one another. Humans are primordially creative because they are primordially related to the anxiety and privation of existence. At the same time, they can only experience the horror of this poverty because they sense the joy that is also possible on earth. Heidegger shows us that Dasein gets lost in its projects and turns toward inauthentic appropriations of its life in order to make sense of it and to make meaning in

it. The creative power tends to work inauthentically in that humans are satisfied with creating things that bring short term happiness. However, Bergson calls us to create in our lives not out of the need to eliminate anxiety, but with the hope of coinciding with the creative impetus that drives life along, on which each of us is dependent. There is something that keeps humans alive without their thinking about it. There is an impetus that runs through life that allows for replacement, rejuvenation, and healing. Even the most violent wounds are mended by the internal power of rejuvenation of human bodies. When humans create with the power of the creative emotions, Bergson claims they are driven along by that which keeps life vital. They are no longer satisfied with inauthentic creation, and they experience an impulsion to create that brings something absolutely new into existence. As they take part in the process, they experience the joy of creation, of becoming a creator that is absolutely sure of the significance of his or her work. This joy is that which is most primordial, and it is the joy of one who holds oneself open to that which does not merely provide for the abiding of being, but that which gives birth to Life and whispers to humanity that it is at home.

We have used Nietzsche's ideas from the drunken song because of its subtle treatment of the relationship between joy and woe. Bergson shared the intuition that although the earth cries out in suffering, its affliction could be eclipsed by joy. Nietzsche recognized that all joy seeks eternity. We have attempted to show that waiting in non-willing is not the only way to understand the affirmation of eternity. Deep is the woe of the world, and the woe demands that the earth should be sucked up in oblivion. It rejects that which exists with a view to eliminate it all. However, deeper than the anguish of life is the joy of existence. No two aspects of humanity are more eternal than the suffering of

humanity and the joy of creation. Heidegger sought the eternal (Being) and found it through the eternal human experience of anxiety and pain. Bergson sought the eternal and found it in the joy that arises from the primordial experience of creation. Both philosophers sought the eternal and each found the two eternal attunements of human existence. Anxiety is the encounter with the painful and horrific aspects of existence that are eternal aspects of human experience. Joy is the foundation of the experience of human creation that has its origins in the primordial existence of humanity. When one seeks the eternal in waiting for the understanding of being and attempting to affirm all that occurs on earth, one cannot twist free from the power of anxiety and the suffering of the earth. In affirming the woe of the earth, one is actually promoting its fall into non-being and destruction. However, when one seeks the eternal and finds it in the constant renewal of the absolutely new, one then finds the power to affirm reality by creating in the face of the woe that would have it that all life should cease. This creation is the key to unlocking primordial joy. This is Bergsonian joy, the only joy that can authentically seek deep, profound eternity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Chad. "Smith's *The Felt Meanings of the World* and the Pure Appreciation of Being Simpliciter." *Journal of Philosophical Research* 21, no. 0 (1996): 69-79.

Ansell Pearson, Keith. *Geminal Life: The difference and repetition of Deleuze*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

———. *Philosophy and the Adventure of the Virtual: Bergson and the Time of Life*. New York: Routledge, 2002

Bataille, Georges. *On Nietzsche*. Translated by Bruce Boone. New York: Paragon House, 1992.

Bergson, Henri. *Œuvres*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1970.

———. 1889. *Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience*

———. 1896. *Matière et mémoire*

———. 1900. *Le Rire*

———. 1907. *L'Évolution créatrice*

———. 1919. *L'Énergie spirituelle*

———. 1932. *Les deux sources de la morale et de la religion*

———. 1934. *La Pensée et le mouvant*

Bergson, Henri. *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*. Translated by R. Ashley Audra and Cloudesley Brereton. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.

———. *An Introduction to Metaphysics: The Creative Mind*. Translated by

- Mabelle L. Andison. Philosophical Library, 1946; Helix Books, 1983.
- . *Creative Evolution*. Translated by Arthur Mitchell. New York: Henry Holt, 1911.
- . *Matter and Memory*. Translated by Nancy Margaret Paul. New York: Zone Books, 1991.
- . *Mind Energy*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1920.
- . *Time and Free Will*. Translated by F.L. Pogson. New York: Dover Publications, 2001.
- Bett, Richard. "Nietzsche, the Greeks and Happiness (with Special Reference to Aristotle and Epicurus)." *Philosophical Topics* 33, no.2 (Fall 2005): 45-70.
- Chevalier, Jacques. *Henri Bergson*. New York : MacMillan Company, 1928.
- Ciaramelli, Fabio. "The Loss of Origin and Heidegger's Question of 'Unheimlichkeit.'" *Epoche* 4, no.1 (January 1994): 13-33.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *L'Image mouvement*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1983.
- . *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson. New York: Athlone Press, 1983.
- . *Bergsonism*. New York: Zone Books, 1988.
- . *Desert Islands*. Translated by Michael Taormina. New York: Semiotext(e), 2002.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L. *Being in the World*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991.
- Flewelling, Ralph Tyler. *Bergson and Personal Realism*. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1920.
- Gale, Richard M. "Bergson's Analysis of the Concept of Nothing." *The Modern Schoolman: A Quarterly Journal of Philosophy* 51 (May 1974): 269-300.
- Guerlac, Suzanne. *Thinking in Time: An Introduction to Henri Bergson*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- Gunn, J. Alexander. *Bergson and His Philosophy*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1920.
- Green, Richard. *The Thwarting of Laplace's Demon: Arguments against the Mechanistic*

World-View. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Gunter, Pete. "Bergson's Reflective Anti-Intellectualism." *Personalist*. 47 (1966): 43-60.

Haar, Michel. "The Joyous Struggle of the Sublime and the Musical Essence of Joy." *Research in Phenomenology* 25 (1995): 68-89.

Heidegger, Martin. *Gesamtausgabe*. Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann.

———. *Gesamtausgabe 5. Holzwege*, Edited by Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977.

———. *Gesamtausgabe 7. Vorträge und Aufsätze*, Edited by Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann, 2000.

———. *Gesamtausgabe 9. Wegmarken*. Edited by Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann, 1976.

———. *Gesamtausgabe 16. Reden und andere Zeugnisse eines Lebensweges*. Edited by Hermann Heidegger. Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann, 2000.

———. *Gesamtausgabe 29/30. Die Grundbegriffe der Metaphysik. Welt – Endlichkeit – Einsamkeit*. Edited by Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann, 1983.

Heidegger, Martin. *Discourse on Thinking*. Translated by John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

———. *The Question Concerning Technology: And Other Essays*. Translated by William Lovitt. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

———. *Nietzsche II: The Eternal Recurrence of the Same*. Translated by David Farrell Krell. New York: Harper and Row, 1984.

———. *Nietzsche III: The Will to Power as Knowledge and as Metaphysics*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh, David Farrell Krell, and Frank A. Capuzzi. New York: Harper and Row, 1987.

———. *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*. Translated by William McNeill and Nicholas Walker. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.

———. *Being and Time*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.

- . *Pathmarks*. Edited by William McNeill. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . *Introduction to Metaphysics*. Translated by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- . *Sojourns*. Translated by John Panteleimon Manoussakis. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.
- Hicks, Steven. "Suffering, Nihilism and Beyond. Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Foucault." *Skepsis* 15, no. 1 (2004): 268-290.
- Hoffman, Paul. "Three Dualist Theories of the Passions." *Philosophical Topics* 19, no. 2 (Spring 1991): 153-199.
- Jaspers, Karl. *Nietzsche: An Introduction to the Understanding of his Philosophical Activity*. Translated by Charles F. Wallraff and Frederick J. Schmitz. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 1965.
- Johnston, James Scott and Johnston, Carol. "Nietzsche and the Dilemma of Suffering." *International Journal of Applied Philosophy* 13, no. 2 (Fall 1999): 187-191.
- Kaufman, Walter. *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, 1974.
- Kelly, Michael R. "What's Phenomenological about Bergsonism(?): Critical Notice of Leonard Lawlor's 'The Challenge of Bergsonism.'" *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 13, no. 1 (March 2005): 103-118.
- King, Magda. *A Guide to Heidegger's Being and Time*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.
- Kolakowski, Leszek. *Bergson*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Lacey, A.R. *Bergson*. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Lapoujade, David. "Intuition and Sympathy in Bergson." Translated by David Reggio. *Pli: Warwick Journal of Philosophy* 15, (2004): 1-17.
- Lawlor, Leonard. "Bergson Revisited." *Symposium* 10, no.1 (2006): 35-52.
- Lawlor, Leonard. *The Challenge of Bergsonism*. New York: Continuum, 2003.
- Lazzarato, Maurizio. "Machines to Crystallize Time." *Theory, Culture & Society* 24, no.6

(2007): 93-122.

Lindsay, A.D. *The Philosophy of Bergson*. New York, Kennikat Press, 1911.

Lingis, Alphonso. "Joy in Dying." *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 19, no. 1 (1996): 99-112.

———. "The World as a Whole." *Research in Phenomenology* 25, (1995): 142-159.

Maritain, Jacques. *Bergsonian Philosophy and Thomism*. Translated by Mabelle L. Andison. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955.

McGuirk, James. "The Sustainability of Nietzsche's Will to Affirmation." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, 82, no. 2 (2008): 237-263.

Morris, David. "Bergsonian Intuition, Husserlian Variation, Pierceian Abduction: Toward a Relation between Method, Sense and Nature." *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 43, (2005): 267-298.

Mullarkey, John. *The New Bergson*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

———. "Life, Movement, and the Fabulation of the Event." *Theory, Culture and Society* 24, no.6 (2007): 53-70.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*. Translated by Walter Kaufman. New York: Modern Library, 2000.

———. *The Birth of Tragedy*, in *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*, Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Modern Library, 2000.

———. *Beyond Good and Evil*, in *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*, Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Modern Library, 2000.

———. *On the Genealogy of Morals*, in *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*, Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Modern Library, 2000.

———. *The Case of Wagner*, in *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*, Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Modern Library, 2000.

———. *Ecce Homo*, in *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*, Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Modern Library, 2000.

———. *Will to Power*. Edited by Walter Kaufman. New York: Vintage Books, 1968.

- . *The Gay Science*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Books: 1974.
- . *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Translated by Graham Parks. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2008.
- . *Twilight of the Idols*. Translated by R.J. Hollingdale. Penguin Books: New York, 1990.
- Parisi, Luciana. "Biotech: Life by Contagion." *Theory, Culture & Society* 24, no.6 (2007): 29-52.
- Reginster, Bernard. *The Affirmation of Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Richmond, Sarah. "Sartre and Bergson: Disagreement about Nothingness." *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 15, no. 1 (March 2007): 77-95.
- Ruse, M. Scott. "The critique of the intellect: Henri Bergson's prologue to an organic epistemology." *Continental Philosophy Review* 35, (2002): 281-302.
- Russell, Bertrand. *The Philosophy of Bergson*. London: Macmillan and Company, 1914.
- Schacht, Richard. *Nietzsche*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983.
- Smith, Joseph. "Why is there something rather than nothing?" *Eidos* 3, (December 1984): 135-162.
- Smith, Quentin. "On Heidegger's Theory of Moods." *The Modern Schoolman* 58, (May 1981): 211-235.
- Solomon, Robert C. "What Is Called Thinking? Teaching the Joy of Philosophy." *Teaching Philosophy* 24, no.3 (September 2001): 205-217.
- Spinoza, Benedictus de. *Spinoza Complete Works*. Edited by Michael L. Morgan. *Ethics*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2002.
- Sullivan, Keith. "The Relation between duration and the critique of the idea of nothing in Bergson's thought." *De Philosophia* 4, (1973): 75-86.
- Wingo, Ajume H. "Joy in Living Together: Toward a Civic Appreciation of Laughter." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 14, no. 2 (June 2006): 186-202.
- Winkler, Rafael. "Nietzsche and l'élan technique: Technics, life, and the production of time." *Continental Philosophy Review* 40, (2007): 73-90.

Wirth, Jason M. "Nietzsche's Joy: On Laughter's Truth." *Epoche* 10, no.1 (Fall 2005): 117-139.

Witherall, Arthur. "The Fundamental Question." *Journal of Philosophical Research* 26, (2001): 52-87.

VITA

Justin Harrison was born in Marion, Indiana and grew up in a town called Upland. He attended Taylor University where he received a B.A. in Biology. After completing his undergraduate degree, he then entered the terminal Master's program at the University of Toledo in Toledo, Ohio. While at Toledo he was introduced to the thought of Henri Bergson and Martin Heidegger. His studies culminated in a thesis (*Identifying Perception/Perceiving Identity*) that sought to uncover how Bergson's ideas related to personal identity and perceptual experience. Over the last five years, Justin has continued to study the history of philosophy in addition to focusing his attention more on the ideas of Bergson and Heidegger. His dissertation (*Joy as Attunement and End in the Philosophies of Martin Heidegger and Henri Bergson*) is an analysis of joy as fundamental attunement and the relationship between desire, creation, happiness, and joy.

Justin was recently married to his wife Carla Alegre-Rosas and is excited to begin their life together. He enjoys sports, being in nature, and thinking about the foundations of reality. In addition to his adjunct teaching at Loyola University Chicago and Harper College (Palatine, IL), Justin also tutors kids of all ages in the suburbs of Chicago. Justin hopes to continue to research Bergson and Heidegger in the future as well as enhance his knowledge of the history of philosophy.

DISSERTATION APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Justin Harrison has been read and approved by the following committee:

Andrew Cutrofello, Ph.D., Director
Professor of Philosophy
Loyola University Chicago

Adriaan Peperzak, Ph.D.
Professor of Philosophy
Loyola University Chicago

Hugh Miller, Ph.D.
Professor of Philosophy
Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Date

Director's Signature