

# Heidegger's Concept of the Spatiality of Dasein

## -The philosophical discourse on the localization in the global age-

Peter Ha (Inje University, Korea)

### I. Introduction

These days evermore we are living in a globalized world. In the global age, we are, on the one hand, exposed to different cultures and thereby enriching our daily lives, but on the other hand, our own culture might be dominated by more influential cultures in the world. Hence in the process of globalization, which stresses a uniform way of life, there is a tendency to erode one's own unique culture. In order to prevent the erosion of one's own culture, there has been a claim that we should think globally but live locally. But what does it mean to "live locally"? Is there a philosophical significance for this claim? The aim of this paper is to show that in Heidegger's concept of the spatiality of Dasein, one can find a philosophical significance for "living locally."

What Heidegger seeks to set up in his fundamental ontology is a new foundation of beings that is distinguished from the Cartesian *cogito*. He establishes this foundation on the basis of "Dasein." In the "Davos debate," where Heidegger disputes with Cassirer over the genuine meaning of Kant's philosophy, Heidegger makes a claim that a body represents a distinctive characteristic of Dasein.

"I believe that what I described by Dasein does not allow translation into a concept of Cassirer's. Should one say consciousness, that is precisely what I rejected. What I call Dasein is essentially codetermined—not just through what we describe as spirit, and not just through what we call living. Rather, what it depends on is the original unity and the immanent structure of the relatedness of a human being which to a certain extent has been fettered in a body and which, in the fetteredness in the body, stands in a particular condition of being bound up with beings."<sup>1</sup>

In this quotation Heidegger provides a concrete definition of Dasein that is not found in the existential analytic of Dasein in *Being and Time*.

In the determination of Dasein, Heidegger emphasizes that Dasein is essentially fettered in a body. This embodied Dasein indicates a departure from the Cartesian conception of the human subject. Descartes stresses that the human being is constituted in mind and body, which are two different kinds of substance. Accordingly, in his definition, mind is not fettered in a body but is

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Heidegger, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, translated by R. Taft (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 181.

independent of it. Moreover, for Descartes, a body is understood as a secondary entity, because it is grounded by mind. Since a body is regarded having only a derivative status, he argues that man can only be related to things only by mind (*cogito*). But against such a claim, Heidegger insists that man is bound up with beings not by mind but by a body. As such, the fact that Dasein is fettered in a body indicates the new foundation for the relation between man and beings.

But although the “bodily nature” (*Leiblichkeit*) is a decisive concept for determining the essence of Dasein, this concept, as A. de Waelhens points out<sup>2</sup>, was hardly discussed in the analytic of Dasein in *Being and Time*. As Heidegger states:

“(This ‘bodily nature’ hides a whole problematic of its own, though we shall not treat it here[Die Verräumlichung des Daseins in seiner >Leiblichkeit<, die eine eigene hier nicht zu behandelnde Problematik in sich birgt].)”<sup>3</sup>

At first sight, this deliberate omission of the “bodily nature” seems strange. Heidegger, however, provides a reason why he defers any consideration of it. In the existential analytic of Dasein, the explication of the embodiment of Dasein is deliberately omitted, because it is regarded as the “factual concretion [faktische Konkretion]”<sup>4</sup> that belongs to the ontical dimension. According to Heidegger, the concrete body presupposes the more primordial ground, and this ground is the spatiality of Dasein: “*Dasein is essentially de-severance—that is, it is spatial.*”<sup>5</sup> Dasein is defined as an embodied being, because it is already grounded in spatiality. Hence what is at stake in the analytic of Dasein is not a consideration of the “bodily nature” but an explication of the spatiality of Dasein, which represents the ontological ground.

In the analytic of Dasein, Heidegger is concerned to undermine the predominant Cartesian conception of subject. The difference between Dasein and the Cartesian concept of subject, defined as a thinking ego, can be clearly shown in the spatiality of Dasein. In the philosophy of Descartes, the thinking ego is essentially regarded as non-spatial. Contrary to this, Heidegger argues that spatiality is the defining characteristic of Dasein. However, what is important to see here is that although Heidegger speaks of the spatiality of Dasein, he does not intend to identify the essence of Dasein with extended things.

The spatiality of Dasein is never reduced to the extension of things, because the way Dasein occupies space is fundamentally different from things. Concerning this matter, Heidegger states:

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. M. Merleau-Ponty, *The Structure of Behavior*, translated by A. Fisher (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1983), xix. “But in *Being and Time* one does not find thirty lines concerning the problem of perception; one does not find ten concerning that of the body.” D. F. Krell, *Daimon Life: Heidegger and Life-Philosophy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 52.

<sup>3</sup> M. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, translated by J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1962), 143 (hereafter cited as *Being and Time*).

<sup>4</sup> M. Heidegger, *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, translated by M. Heim (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 137.

<sup>5</sup> *Being and Time*, 143.

“It follows, moreover, that Dasein’s spatiality is not to be defined by citing the position [*Stelle*] at which some corporeal Thing is present-at-hand [*Körperding vorhanden*].”<sup>6</sup>

Whereas the space of things in the world is determined in respect of its “position,” Dasein does not occupy space in this manner. According to Heidegger, Dasein takes up space by its distinctive way, and he calls this the “situation (*Situation*).”

“In the term ‘Situation (‘situation[*Lage*]’—‘to be in a situation’) there is an overtone of a signification that is spatial. We shall not try to eliminate this from the existential conception, for such an overtone is also implied in the ‘there’ of Dasein.”<sup>7</sup>

As shown here, the inhabited space of Dasein must be understood in terms of the spatiality of “situation,” which is principally distinguished from the spatiality of “position.” And in the spatiality of “situation,” Heidegger seeks to establish a more primordial conception of spatiality, which was overlooked in the anthropological conception of space developed by the French phenomenologists, notably J. P. Sartre and M. Merleau-Ponty.

Sartre and Merleau-Ponty also consider the embodiment of man as the central theme in their philosophy, and they also make a distinction between the “situation” of embodiment and the position of things. According to them, the “situation” of embodiment is more fundamental than the position of things. Furthermore they argue that the space of embodiment, which operates underneath the position of things, discloses a more concrete and primordial spatiality than Heidegger’s concept of spatiality, which is only concerned with explicating the meaning of Being. But in opposition to their claim, Heidegger insists that the spatiality of “Situation” is not simply to be equated with the anthropological conception of space.

With the spatiality of “Situation,” Heidegger is not, as in the case of the French phenomenologists, concerned with the peculiar feature of the anthropological conception of space; he goes one step further. What he really intends to show with the spatiality of “Situation” is that it is distinguished from the inauthentic spatiality of “they.” Heidegger calls this inauthentic spatiality “situation” (*Lage*):

*“For the ‘they’, however, the Situation is essentially something that has been closed off [verschlossen]. The ‘they’ knows only the ‘general situation’ [Lage], loses itself in those ‘opportunities’ which are closest to it...”*<sup>8</sup>

The meaning of the spatiality of “Situation” is properly understood, when it is discussed in respect to the spatiality of “*Lage*”. In contrast to the spatiality of “*Lage*,” the spatiality of

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 142.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 346.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 346. Here one can see that an English translation of “*Lage*” as a situation is quite misleading, for in this translation the difference between “Situation” and “*Lage*” is not so transparent.

“Situation” reveals the condition of possibility for the cultural space of Dasein.

According to Heidegger, Dasein inhabits in the cultural space, but this cultural world is exposed to a great threat in the global age:

“What is happening here—with those driven from their homeland no less than with those who have remained? Answer; the *rootedness*, the *autochthony* [*Bodenständigkeit*] of man is threatened today at its core!”<sup>9</sup>

And with the spatiality of “Situation,” he wants to sustain the cultural space. But the cultural space of Dasein in Heidegger’s thoughts still remains an obscure concept. The reason for this is that in dealing with the spatiality of Dasein, the difference between “Situation” and “*Lage*” is often overlooked. Hence by focusing on this difference, we want to show two points; 1) the peculiar feature of the cultural space in respect to the “Situation,” 2) the “Situation” of spatiality as the philosophical ground for the global-localization.

## II. The Concept of Space in Fundamental Ontology

In *Being and Time*, we can find an existential concept of space, by which Heidegger seeks to replace the traditional concept of space. Generally the traditional concept of space is determined by two different approaches. The first approach conceives of space as something receptacle of things that is out there in the world (Newton), and the second one understands space as the form of sensibility, which is situated in subjectivity (Kant). But in his existential concept of space, Heidegger rejects these traditional approaches. According to him, space is found neither in the objective world nor in subjectivity; rather, it is grounded on the “Being-in-the-world”: “Space is not in the subject, nor is the world in space. Space is rather ‘in’ the world in so far as space has been disclosed by that Being-in-the-world which is constitutive for Dasein.”<sup>10</sup> Thus, in his existential concept of space, Heidegger goes beyond the traditional dualism of “space in the subject” and “the world in space” and suggests a third term, namely, “Being-in-the-world.” In order to understand the existential concept of space, it is now necessary to clarify the “Being-in-the-world.”

Dasein is not a worldless ego but finds itself in the world. But When Heidegger speaks of the world, he does not mean it as the objective world grasped in a theoretical understanding; rather, the world is a place “‘*wherein*’ a factual Dasein as such can be said to ‘live’.”<sup>11</sup> In this ontical sense, the world signifies the environment (*Umwelt*) wherein Dasein resides. Because Dasein first *lives* in the world before it thinks, Heidegger also stresses that “to dwell” is an essential aspect of “Being-in-the-world.”

---

<sup>9</sup> M. Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, translated by M. Anderson and H. Freund (New York: Harper & Row Publisher, 1969), 48-49.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 146.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 92.

“‘In’ is derived from ‘*innan*’—‘to reside’, ‘*habitare*’ ‘to dwell’ [sich auf halten]. ‘*An*’ signifies ‘I am accustomed,’ ‘I am familiar with,’ ‘I look after something’. It has the signification of ‘*colo*’ in the senses of ‘*habito*’ and ‘*diligo*’.”<sup>12</sup>

It is in this dwelling environment of Dasein that Heidegger discovers a new ground for space.

The environment is the closest world to Dasein. Moreover according to Heidegger, the “environment” (*Um-welt*) already indicates that it is based on space: “The expression ‘environment’ [Umwelt] contains in the ‘environ’ [um] a suggestion of spatiality.”<sup>13</sup> However, this spatiality of environment is neglected in the traditional concept of space, because the traditional concept is only concerned with the thematic space. In contrast to the traditional concept of space, with its spatiality of environment, Heidegger seeks to set up the non-thematic space: “In accordance with its Being-in-the-world, Dasein always has space presented as already discovered, though not thematically [unthematische].”<sup>14</sup> In the spatiality of environment, which is prior to the theoretical world, Dasein comports itself toward the non(pre)-thematic space. And this pre-thematic space has its own distinctive characteristic that is not found in the thematic space.

In order to understand the spatiality of environment, we now need to clarify the difference between the pre-thematic and thematic space.<sup>15</sup> For Heidegger, when space is theorized, it becomes the “pure dimension”: “When space is discovered non-circumspectively by just looking at it, the environmental regions get neutralized [neutralisiert] to pure dimensions [reinen Dimensionen].”<sup>16</sup> The thematic space consists of “pure dimensions,” which are characterized as the “homogeneous space of Nature.”<sup>17</sup> In the homogeneous space of the thematic world, Dasein encounters objects that are positioned in space. In this sense, the thematic space is the condition of possibility for the position (*Stellen*) of objects.

But in contrast to the thematic space, the pre-thematic space is not defined as the homogeneous space. Consequently, the way things occupy space in the pre-thematic space is not to be understood as a position. Heidegger makes a distinction between a “position” and a “place [Platz],” and the “place” refers to the way things encountered in the environment take up space.

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 80.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 94.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 146.

<sup>15</sup> This pre-thematical space, however, is not first discovered by Heidegger. In the genetic phenomenology, Husserl also discusses the pre-thematical space. But although Husserl and Heidegger both speak of the pre-thematical space, they do not refer to the same space. To clarify this point, Heidegger argues that his concept of space is not to be equated with the concept of space based on the “intuition” in O. Becker’s philosophy. “When space is ‘intuited formally’, the pure possibilities of spatial relations are discovered. Here one may go through a series of stages in laying bare pure homogeneous space, passing from the pure morphology of spatial shapes to *analysis situs* and finally to the purely metrical science of space. In our present study we shall not consider how all these are interconnected.” Cf. *Being and Time*, 146-47.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 147.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 147.

“Equipment has its *places* [Platz]...; this must be distinguished in principle from just occurring at random in some spatial position [an einer beliebigen Raumstelle].”<sup>18</sup>

In this passage, we can now see that the difference between the thematic and pre-thematic space consists in the fact that the totality of place is distinguished from a multiplicity of position. Heidegger claims that the peculiar meaning of “place” can be shown in analysis of equipment, which constitutes the environment of Dasein.

As shown before, Dasein proximally finds itself in the environment. In the environment, Dasein is surrounded with equipment, which is encountered not in the theoretical comportment but in “concernful dealings [besorgende Umgang].”<sup>19</sup> Hence, equipment is not theoretical objects. In contrast to objects that are independent from each other, a piece of equipment essentially belongs to other pieces of equipment.

“Taken strictly, there ‘is’ no such thing as *an* equipment. To the Being of any equipment there always belongs a totality of equipment, in which it can be this equipment that it is.”<sup>20</sup>

This passage reveals the ontological structure of equipment. In order to be a piece of equipment, it must presuppose a context formed by other pieces of equipment. For instance, a hammer is encountered as a piece of equipment, only when it is related to other pieces of equipment such as a nail and a piece of board and so on. Here one can see that equipment essentially depends on the totality (context) of equipment. From this ontological structure of equipment, we can finally ascertain a peculiar meaning of “place” that is not reduced to a “position” of objects.

A “place” of equipment is distinguished from a “position” of objects in three senses. Firstly, if a “place,” which refers to the spatiality of equipment, is closely bound up with other “places,” it is not regarded as isolated space, as in the case of objects, but as an open space toward other pieces of equipment. Understood as such, a “place” is not concentrated on a particular piece of equipment, but it “lies around [liegt herum].”<sup>21</sup> Hence, it is by a “place” that the dwelling world of Dasein is determined as an environment (*Um-welt*). Secondly, a “place,” which depends on the whole context of places and thereby is directionally lined up with other places, always belongs somewhere. “In each case the place is the definite ‘there’ or ‘yonder’ [‘Dort’ und ‘Da’] of an item of equipment which *belongs somewhere* [*Hingehören*].”<sup>22</sup> This belonging to the totality of places then indicates that a “place” signifies *definite* space that is distinguished from indefinite space of position. Finally, since a “place” belongs to definite space in the totality of places, it is defined as “individual” space. By “individual” space of equipment, Heidegger means

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 136.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 97.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 97.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 136.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 136.

distinctive space that cannot be replaced by other pieces of equipment.

With these characteristics of the “place” of equipment, we can attain the new concept of spatiality. In contrast to pure dimensions of the traditional space, this new spatiality, in which a “place” is lined up with other places, consists of a network. And finding itself in the network of “places,” Dasein comports itself towards things and other Dasein. So in contrast to the spatiality of “position,” the network of individual “places” is the spatiality of “Being-with.” Here by the network of “place,” one discovers the condition of possibility for the social space that was neglected in the homogeneous space of nature in a traditional philosophy.

What Heidegger seeks to establish with the existential concept of space is the social space that is constituted in the network of “places.” In the social space, Dasein is not regarded as an isolated point but exists with other Dasein. This “Being-with” of the social space can be further shown in the spatiality of Dasein.

### III. The Spatiality of Dasein: a General Situation

As shown in the previous section, Dasein is not conceived of as “free-floating subjects [freischwebende Subjekte],”<sup>23</sup> but it is thrown into the social world and exists with things. That is, Dasein is not a placeless entity but is situated in the social world. The analysis of the existential conception of space must start from this point. With this concept of space, just as Kant tries to provide the condition of possibility for the homogeneous *space of nature* in his critical philosophy, Heidegger seeks to found the condition of possibility for the *social space* in his fundamental ontology. And in the social space that consists of the totality of an individual place, things are never indifferent to Dasein; rather, they are familiar to Dasein. Hence in contrast to space of nature, the social space discloses the familiar space.

In the social space of environment, Dasein is surrounded with familiar equipment; that is equipment lies close to Dasein. The closeness of equipment, however, does not mean that it lies so near to Dasein in the objective distance. An object measured by the objective distance can never become familiar equipment, even if it lies close to Dasein. Only equipment is familiar to Dasein, because it presupposes the spatiality of Dasein, which Heidegger calls “making room” (*Einräumen*). “This ‘giving space,’ which we also call ‘making room’ for them [equipment], consists in freeing the ready-to-hand for its spatiality.”<sup>24</sup> The social space is defined as the familiar space, because Dasein relates to space not by “intuition” but by “making room.”

The defining characteristic of the social space established in Heidegger’s philosophy lies in the fact that it discloses the different modes of occupying space by entities in the world. The way Dasein takes up space, which Heidegger characterizes as “making room,” is fundamentally different from the “place” of equipment and the “position” of objects. He calls this mode of spatiality of Dasein the “general situation,” which signifies that Dasein exists in the world not

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 172.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 146.

only with equipment but also with Others

Being situated in the everyday social world, Dasein finds itself with Others. Heidegger then argues that this “Being-with” is possible, because Others are revealed in the environmental context of equipment:

“When, for example, we walk along the edge of a field but ‘outside it,’ the field shows itself as belonging to such-and-such a person, and decently kept up by him; the book we have used was bought as So-and-so’s shop and given by such-and-such a person, and so forth. The boat anchored at the shore is assigned in its Being-in-itself to an acquaintance who undertakes voyages with it; but even if it is a ‘boat which is strange to us,’ it still is indicative of Others.”<sup>25</sup>

So, the social spatiality of Dasein is essentially the spatiality of “Being-with.”<sup>26</sup> But according to Heidegger, the spatiality of “Being-with” Others is distinguished from the way Dasein exists in relation to equipment. While comporting itself to equipment, Dasein makes room for equipment in terms of “de-severance (Ent-fernung).”<sup>27</sup> But in relationship with Others, “making room” of Dasein maintains a “distance.” With respect to this point, Heidegger states:

“In one’s concern with what one has taken hold of, whether with, for, or against, the Others, there is constant care as to the way one differs from them, whether that difference is merely one that is to be evened out, whether one’s own Dasein has lagged behind the Others and wants to catch up in relationship to them, or whether one’s Dasein already has some priority over them and sets out to keep them suppressed. The care about this distance between them is disturbing to Being-with-one-another, though this disturbance is one that is hidden from it. If we may express this existentially, such Being-with-one-another has the character of *distanciality* [*Abständigkeit*].”<sup>28</sup>

Dasein makes room for Others in respect to “distanciality.” However, what is important to see is

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 153-54.

<sup>26</sup> Although the spatiality of “Being-with” plays an important role in Heidegger’s concept of space, this concept of spatiality hardly received any attention from scholars. Even Maria Vilella-Petit, a renowned Heideggerian scholar, insists that Heidegger never treats the spatiality of “Being-with” in his analysis of space. Cf. Maria Vilella-Petit, “Heidegger’s conception of space,” in *Critical Heidegger*, edited by C. Macann (London: Routledge, 1996), 142.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 139. Here one can see that “de-severance” of Dasein also provides a foundation for the “globalization.” The “globalization” means the age, in which a distance between nations has become so close by the rapid transportation and the network of information that all nations are closely interconnected. And Heidegger makes a claim that all these are possible on the basis of “de-severance.” “*In Dasein there lies an essential tendency [Tendenz] towards closeness [Nähe]*. All the ways in which we speed things up, as we are more or less compelled to do today, push us on towards the conquest of remoteness. With the ‘radio,’ for example, Dasein has so expanded its everyday environment that it has accomplished a de-severance of the ‘world’—a de-severance which, in its meaning for Dasein, cannot be yet be visualized.” Cf. *Being and Time*, 140.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., 163-64



that the character of “distantiality” signifies not the distance in the realm of nature but the social distance. With “distantiality,” we can see the distinctive feature of the “general situation” of Dasein in the social world.

The “general situation” of Dasein suggests that Dasein exists in the communal world with other people. This communal world of Dasein, however, is distinguished from the collective world formed by animals. In other words, “Being-with” of Dasein is not to be understood as a herd of cattle. In contrast to the collective existence of cattle, there presupposes “the *unsocial sociability* of men”<sup>29</sup> in the “Being-with” of Dasein. The “unsociality” means that a member of society intentionally resists assimilating to normative rules in society. So without “unsociability,” Dasein would live like sheep, which are in perfect concord with their natural instincts. Since Dasein is constituted in “unsociability,” it can break away from natural instincts and posits its individuality. Hence the communal world of Dasein consists of an individual Dasein.

However, in the communal world of an individual Dasein, where every Dasein posits its right, it is inevitable to see conflicts and a continual antagonism among its members. So for Heidegger, this continual antagonism or mistrust unveils the essential characteristic of “Being-with” of Dasein:<sup>30</sup>

“A Being-with-one-another which arises [entspringt] from one’s doing the same thing as someone else, not only keeps for the most part within the outer limits, but enters the mode of distance [Abstand] and reserve. The Being-with-one-another of those who are hired for the same affair often thrives only on mistrust [Mißtrauen].”<sup>31</sup>

As shown here, in contrast to a collective animal world, the distinctive feature of “Being-with” of Dasein lies in the fact that the communal world of Dasein consists of mistrust, and this mistrust is based on the “distantiality” of Dasein.

In the “general situation” of Dasein, upon which the communal world is founded, there is a distance. Since the distance constitutes “Being-with” of Dasein, Dasein is not cohesively united with Others but is dispersed. In this sense, the “general situation” is the grounds for the dispersed state of an individual Dasein. And in our modern age, the communal world of dispersed individuals is defined as the “civil society” (*Gesellschaft*). Here one can see what the “general situation” of Dasein represents. It represents the **spatiality of the “civil society.”** There is a continual antagonism in the “civil society,” because the spatiality of “civil society”

---

<sup>29</sup> Cf. I. Kant, *Kant: Political Writings*, edited by H. S. Reiss (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 44

<sup>30</sup> Here one can see that Sartre’s interpretation of “Being with” of Dasein as a “crew” without any conflicts is an inaccurate understanding. J-P Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, translated by H. Barnes (New York: Washington Square Press, 1956), 332. Also cf., E. Levinas, *Time and Other*, translated by R. Cohen (Pittsburgh: Dusquesne University Press, 1987), 41. “It is thus an association of side by side, around something, around a common term and, more precisely, for Heidegger, around the truth.”

<sup>31</sup> *Being and Time*, 159.

presupposes a distance among its members. But for Heidegger, Dasein is not always dispersed by maintaining a distance. In contrast to this kind of communal existence, Dasein is also bound up together with other Dasein. Heidegger argues that a cohesive unity with Others requires a new spatiality of Dasein, which he calls the “Situation.”

#### **IV. The Spatiality of Situation**

The existential conception of space based on “Being-in-the-world” of Dasein is concerned with the spatiality of the social world. The social world presupposes the collective existence of Dasein. In the collective existence, the spatiality of Dasein is not thought as the static receptacle of an entity but as a sort of network of individual “places.” However, in the collective existence in the social world, the “Being-with” of Dasein is manifested in the two different modes. On the one hand, there is, as shown in the previous section, mistrust in the collective existence, but on the other hand Dasein is intimately bound up with Others in the social world. With respect to this point, Heidegger states:

“The Being-with-one-another of those who are hired for the same affair often thrives only on mistrust. On the other hand, when they devote themselves to the same affair in common, their doing so is determined by the manner in which their Dasein, each in its own way, has been taken hold of. They thus become *authentically* bound together [Verbundenheit], and this makes possible the right kind of objectivity [die rechte Sachlichkeit], which frees the Other in his freedom for himself.”<sup>32</sup>

Here in the concept of *Verbundenheit*, one can see a new mode of the collective existence that is distinguished from the collective existence based on mistrust.

In the social world, Dasein is also intimately bound up with Others. This is possible, because they devotedly pursue the same affair in common. Heidegger then contends that this kind of a cohesive unity with Others in the social world demands a new spatiality of Dasein, which he calls the “Situation.”

“For the ‘they’, however, the Situation is essentially something that has been closed off [Dem Man dagegen ist die Situation wesentlich verschlossen]. The ‘they’ knows only the ‘general situation’ [die allgemeine Lage], loses itself in those ‘opportunities’ [Gelegenheit] which are closest to it, and pays Dasein’s way by a reckoning up of ‘accidents’ which it fails to recognize, deems its own achievement, and passes off as such.”<sup>33</sup>

Thus, in order to form a cohesive unity with Others in the social world, Dasein must go beyond the spatiality of the “general situation” and find itself in the spatiality of “Situation.”

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 159.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 346-47.

The genuine meaning of the social space, which Heidegger seeks to establish with the spatiality of Dasein, is finally attested in the spatiality of “Situation.” But according to Heidegger, this “Situation” is proximally closed to Dasein in the everyday world, which he characterizes as the “uprooted” world:

“Ambiguity hides nothing from Dasein’s understanding, but only in order that Being-in-the-world should be suppressed in this uprooted [entwurzelt] ‘everywhere and nowhere’.”<sup>34</sup>

When the “Situation” is closed, Dasein finds itself in the uprooted space and thereby is deprived of the traditional heritage.

Heidegger insists that existing in the uprooted world, which represents the social state of Europe in the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century, Dasein is cut off from the heritage and is dominated by “unrestricted organization” (bodenlose Organization):

“This Europe, in its ruinous blindness forever on the point of cutting its own throat, lies today in a great pincers, squeezed between Russia on one side and America on the other. From a metaphysical point of view, Russia and America are the same; the same dreary technological frenzy, the same unrestricted organization of average man [der bodenlosen Organization des Normalmenschen].”<sup>35</sup>

However, Dasein does not always exist in the uprooted world. Dasein also breaks away from this world and finds itself the traditional world, insofar as it is constituted in the spatiality of the “Situation.” But how does Dasein encounter the “Situation”?

According to Heidegger, the “Situation” is unveiled in “resoluteness” of Dasein:

“Just as the spatiality of the ‘there’ is grounded in disclosedness, the Situation has its foundations in resoluteness. The Situation is the ‘there’ which is disclosed in resoluteness—the ‘there’ as which the existent entity is there.”<sup>36</sup>

But what is important to see here is that when Heidegger speaks of “resoluteness,” he does not mean any voluntaristic will. Rather by “resoluteness,” he refers to a “distinctive mode of Dasein’s disclosedness,”<sup>37</sup> which means that Dasein is opened not only to presence but to past and future. Thus, in “resoluteness,” the spatiality of Dasein defined as the “Situation” is not confined to presence but is expanded to the past and the future.

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 221.

<sup>35</sup> M. Heidegger, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, translated by R. Manheim (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), 37

<sup>36</sup> *Being and Time*, 346.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 343.

In contrast to the spatiality of the “general situation,” which is exclusively concerned with what is given in presence, the spatiality of the “Situation” is closely bound up with the historical past and future. Insofar as the “Situation” of Dasein grounded in “resoluteness” is opened to the past, Dasein does not forget its past but is able to repeat it.

“The resoluteness which comes back to itself and hands itself down, then becomes the *repetition* of a possibility of existence that has come down to us. *Repetition is handing down explicitly* [Die *Wiederholung ist die ausdrückliche Überlieferung*]...”<sup>38</sup>

Since in the “Situation” Dasein repeats what has been in the past, it can also inherit its past heritage. Here one can ascertain a distinctive characteristic of the “Situation.” In contrast to the “general situation,” the “Situation” signifies the spatiality of the social world that is rooted in the traditional heritage. And Dasein is bound together (*Verbundenheit*) in the “Situation,” because the “Situation” provides a condition for possibility for certain shared (common) ways of dealing with things in the world.

The communal world formed in the “Situation” is, however, not to be equated with the collective world of the “general situation” defined as the “civil society.” According to Heidegger, the communal world of the “Situation”, in which members of society share the common ways of life inherited from one’s own past, is characterized as a “particular community” (*Gemeinschaft*). Hence, the “Situation” of Dasein refers to the **spatiality of a “particular community.”** Understood in this sense, the difference between the “general situation” and the “Situation” is revealed in the two different modes of the communal world, namely, the “civil society” and a “particular community.”

Heidegger insists that the social space of Dasein based on “Being-in-the-world” is the situated spatiality. And the situated spatiality is only possible on the basis of a certain context. That is, it is a context-bound spatiality. This fact can be clearly shown in the authentic world of Dasein, in which Dasein inherits the traditional heritage. In the traditional world of Dasein, the “reality” (*Wirklichkeit*) experienced in present time in the communal world is actually the “effect” (*auswirkend*) inherited from the past tradition. Thus, in the traditional world, the space of “reality” is possible when it already presupposes a context of the traditional heritage. Understood in this sense, the situated spatiality of Dasein means that Dasein participates in the inherited life of the historical community. In this historical community, in which Dasein is essentially situated, we can finally identify the ground for the “global-localization” of Dasein.

## V. Conclusion

In the traditional philosophy, the concept of the situated (social) space is absent, because the analysis of space is exclusively limited to space of nature. In contrast to this, Heidegger’s

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 437.

concept of the spatiality of Dasein is concerned with the situated space. The situated space is determined by the network of individual “places,” by which Dasein comports itself towards Others. Hence, it provides a condition for encountering Others. However, it is only by the “Situation” that Dasein is bound together up with Others.

The cohesive unity of Dasein taken place in the “Situation” is an important concept, for it reveals a difference between Heidegger’s concept of Dasein and French existentialists’ conception of “lived body.” In contrast to “lived body” that simply exists in the world and is in conflict with Others, the incarnated Dasein is rooted in the traditional world and is harmonized with Others. Heidegger then insists that as plants get their nourishment from the soil, Dasein’s thinking is influenced from its own tradition.<sup>39</sup> This cohesive unity of Dasein in the traditional world, however, is greatly threatened in the process of globalization.

According to Heidegger, the globalization means that life of Dasein is uprooted and dispersed; consequently Dasein is alienated from its own tradition and culture. He was already aware of the problem of globalization when he experienced a rapid development of technology that makes possible contemporary European men to go beyond their cultural boundaries. He then makes a claim that although the development of technology may signify a progress in the civilization, it brings, at the same time, the forgetfulness of the primordial space. When the primordial space, namely, the “Situation” is forgotten in the emergence of technology based on the objective space, it is inevitable that our native soil also will erode. Thus, in order to sustain the traditional community, it is necessary to rehabilitate the primordial spatiality of “Situation.”

---

<sup>39</sup> M. Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, translated by M. Anderson and H. Freund (New York: Harper & Row Publisher, 1969), 47.