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INTRODUCTION

Early in my high-school education, I remember thinking, “Sophists are the villains in the history of philosophy.” Immediately, I was hooked on rhetoric. Then some years later, I stumbled across a quotation from Martin Heidegger: “philosophers are the rightful sophists.”¹ That small phrase possessed me. What it could possibly mean? I found that it was originally from a series of lectures Heidegger gave on Aristotle. I read the lectures. Then I started writing.

Broadly, my thesis explores Heidegger’s conception of Aristotelian rhetoric. In doing so, I attempt to present rhetoric as an invaluable hermeneutic. Further, I contend that rhetoric may act as an antidote for monolithic metaphysics.

In the first chapter of my thesis, I discuss Heidegger’s characterization of Aristotle’s Rhetoric as a hermeneutic of everydayness.² I do this by demonstrating the ways in which rhetoric explicitly articulates the structures of everydayness. For example, the rhetor relies heavily on common opinion for persuasion which ultimately usurps the individuality of his audience. Further, the rhetor is extremely concerned with the structures of being-in and being-with because she requires an audience which can be affected.

¹ Martin Heidegger, Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009), 74.
² Ibid., 93.
In chapter 2, I explore the temporality of rhetoric and the possibility that it may be a response to monolithic metaphysics. Heidegger understands Aristotle’s rhetor as one who moves an audience into and out opinion through pathos. Rhetoric is then fundamentally a study of moods. For Heidegger, moods are a manifestation of throwness. Resultantly, the use of emotions for persuasion is a timely activity. Emotions are not atemporal. Rather they are contingent on a particular audience. That is to say that they are dependent upon a particular time and place. Resultantly, rhetoric becomes a study of the timely. Therefore, to examine something rhetorically, is to examine it as contingent within a time and place. In this section, I provide examples from rhetorical conceptions of science presented by Paul Feyerabend and Thomas Kuhn. Their work leads me to conclude that rhetorical hermeneutics allows one to be open to alternative modes of disclosure.

In my final and most controversial chapter, I suggest that rhetoric may be able to set up the initial conditions for the call of conscience. I argue that rhetorical hermeneutics has the ability to unravel interpretive frameworks causing a disruption in everydayness. In the end, I conclude that rhetorical hermeneutics is valuable because it perpetuates the question of Being.
CHAPTER 1

RHETORIC—AN INQUIRY INTO THE EVERYDAY

Cutting-edge rhetorical theory is at a cross-road. Is rhetoric valuable as a hermeneutic or not? Specifically, is rhetoric useful as a method of interpretation? Classicists like their rhetoric production-oriented and formulaic. Rhetoric conceived of as “production-oriented” means that rhetoric is valuable as a way of creating persuasive arguments rather than interpreting them. Conversely, post-structuralists present rhetoric as a universal but seemingly imprecise interpretive framework. So what do we do? Well, let us start with the problem.

In “Idea of Rhetoric in the Rhetoric of Science,” Dilip Gaonkar conjures up a frothing, beastly two horned dilemma for rhetorical hermeneutics. On the one hand, rhetoric can be conceived of so thinly that it is merely a production oriented art. In other words it becomes an assembly line process which is inadequate as a hermeneutic. On the other hand, rhetoric may be conceived of so broadly that it becomes meaningless and easily fused with another hermeneutic practice.

In the first horn of the dilemma Gaonkar articulates “First, in my view, neither Aristotle nor his contemporary followers view rhetoric as anything but a practical activity.”3 Gaonkar contends that Aristotle conceives of rhetoric as merely production

---

oriented and not useful as an interpretive framework. For Gaonkar, this is strange because historically the interpretive turn in rhetoric has been considered neo-Aristotelian. In support of this he presents a fairly standard historical narrative. He claims that rhetorical hermeneutics was born as the fraternal twin of rhetorical criticism. He attributes the original conception of rhetorical criticism to the Cornell school spearheaded by Herbert Wichelns’ interest in converting Aristotelian praxis into a method of interpretation. The results, “sough to integrate critical vocabulary derived from Aristotle with a program of historical research.” It is widely acknowledged that Wilchens’ project was a massive failure for two reasons: 1. His rhetorical vocabulary was too formulaic. 2. The fixation on historical research made rhetoric ancillary to historical inquiry. Now, as I said, Gaonkar’s archaeology of rhetorical hermeneutics is run of the mill. My purpose here will not be to challenge that academic leviathan of the lineage of rhetorical hermeneutics. Instead, in this chapter I make an amendment: What about Martin Heidegger?

Well, what about Heidegger? Gaonkar’s rhetorical scholarship places the birth of rhetorical hermeneutics at around 1925 with Wichelns’ publication “The Literary Criticism of Oratory.” However, scholarship generally neglects Heidegger’s lecture Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy delivered at Marburg in 1924. Is it coincidental that Heidegger delivered a groundbreaking lecture on Aristotle, rhetoric, and hermeneutics just before the ‘birth’ of neo-Aristotelian rhetoric? Only recently, through the work of Gadamer and the publication of the anthology Heidegger and Rhetoric has

---

4 Ibid., 31.
the resonance of Heidegger’s lecture been explored. I plan to expand that inquiry. I contend that Heidegger’s lectures present Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* as an inquiry into the everydayness of Dasein. It is a systematic hermeneutic of being-in and being-with. Heidegger himself notes, “rhetoric is nothing other than… the hermeneutic of being-there itself.”

Gaonkar claims that Aristotle’s restrained view of rhetoric is grounded in production and not reception. In other words, he characterizes Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* as a way to produce effective speech instead of interpreting speech. Further he contends that “despite the sophists attempt to promote an enlarged version of rhetoric, it remained as a cultural practice bound to the civil realm and later, with the erosion of the public sphere in the classical world, rhetoric migrated to the realm of art and aesthetics.” How accurate is that? Can Gaonkar characterize Heidegger as a sophist for using rhetoric as an interpretive framework for the everydayness of human beings? Before I can answer that, I challenge Gaonkar’s belief that Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* was relegated merely to political discourse. It is true that much of Aristotle’s rhetoric is geared toward political discourse. However, he also applies rhetoric to epic poetry. In that section, Aristotle analyzes the power of the Iliad. Specifically, he explains the power of a particular passage by appealing to the rhetorical device of ‘Degrees of Magnitude.’ In doing so, Aristotle makes it clear that rhetoric can be used for the analysis of a work as well as in

---

producing an effective speech. Also, in using an example of epic poetry it is clear that Aristotle does not confine rhetoric strictly to the political sphere.

However, the question still resounds: What is the subject of rhetoric? This is where Heidegger excels. Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* is a hermeneutic for the everydayness of Dasein. Now, in order to make this clear it is necessary to develop three points: For Heidegger, what is meant by interpretation? What is meant by the ‘everydayness of Dasein?’ How does the *Rhetoric* go about interpreting this everydayness?

For Heidegger, understanding is a primordial structure or existentialia of Being-in-the-World: “Understanding is this existential Being of Dasein’s own potentiality for being.”\(^8\) In other words, understanding is characterized by its capacity to project the possibilities of Dasein. Understanding allows for the disclosure of the “there.” In that way, Heidegger compares understanding to the “sight” of Dasein: “understanding goes to make up existentially what we call Dasein’s ‘sight.’”\(^9\) Understanding is a fundamental component of being-in-the-world because it is what allows objects to disclose themselves. This does not mean that the objects are seen in terms of “pure non-sensory awareness of something present-at-hand in its presence-at-hand.”\(^10\) Instead, understanding is developed through interpretation, involving objects which are ready-at-hand. Interpretation is “the working out of possibilities projected in understanding.”\(^11\) For example, one understands a hammer if they are able to project the possibilities of that hammer. In other words, a hammer is understood if you think, “that is a hammer I can

---

\(^9\) Ibid., 186.
\(^10\) Ibid., 187.
\(^11\) Ibid., 189.
use to build a house and shelter myself in order to maintain Dasein.” It is understanding’s development of itself through interpretation which allows you to see something as something. Understanding allows the hammer to disclose itself as a hammer. The development of understanding (interpretation of the hammer) is a specific articulation of understanding. I interpret the hammer when I project the possibilities for its use as a hammer. To clarify, interpretation is not merely the practical concern of understanding; rather, it is the coming to fruition of understanding that is inherent in understanding itself.

In interpreting, we do not, so to speak, throw a signification over some naked thing which is present-at-hand, we did not stick a value on it; but when something within-the-world is encountered as such, the thing in question already has an involvement, which is disclosed in our understanding of the world, but this involvement is something which gets laid out in interpretation. Interpretation explicitly lays out the fact that our understanding is grounded in a particular conceptualization. This act of interpretation is grounded in three structures, fore-having, fore-sight and fore conception. The fore-having is “something we have in advance.” It is the way in which this particular thing is in relation to the whole of experience leading up to it. We always bring experiences with us to an interpretation. In other words, we may have experienced a home improvement guy using a hammer on TV. Fore-sight is “something we see in advance.” It is the point of view by which we approach the hammer and it situates our fore-having. It is the context by which we experience this particular hammer. We have a previous fore-having of an experience of

12 Ibid., 85.
13 Ibid., 191.
14 Ibid.
the hammer and now our fore-sight focuses us on this particular hammer, for a specific task. Lastly, fore-conception is “something we grasp in advance.”\footnote{Ibid., 191.} It is the way in which fore-having and fore-sight are conceptually framed. Specifically, it is the concept of hammer which houses our for-having of hammers and the fore-sight of this particular hammer. In interpretation this conceptual framework is developed and made explicit. In that sense, for Heidegger, rhetoric as production and interpretation are not clearly demarcated. In other words, rhetoric as interpreting means that rhetoric is used to develop a conceptual framework. Heidegger claims that the conceptual framework laid out by rhetoric is the everydayness of Dasein.

In “interpreting everydayness,” rhetoric projects the possibilities of the conceptual framework of everydayness for the purposes of persuasion. Again, interpretation allows for Dasein to project the possibilities of a hammer for the purposes of hammering. Similarly, rhetoric elaborates the possibilities of “everydayness” for the purposes of persuasion.

What does it mean to say the ‘everydayness of Dasein’? The structures which lay the groundwork for everydayness are being-in and being-with. Dasein is always “in the world.” It is in the ‘being-in’ that Dasein engages in interpretation. What is meant by being-in? Dasein dwells in the world while entities different from Dasein are only within the world. Entities other than Dasein simply ‘belong’ to the world. The term to dwell recalls the word ‘dwelling’ and implies a sense of home. In “Building Dwelling Thinking,” Heidegger writes: “…not every building is a dwelling. Bridges hangars,
stadiums and power stations are building but not dwellings, railway stations and highways, dams and market halls are built but they are not dwelling places."\footnote{16} To dwell means to take shelter. Dasein can take shelter; other entities cannot. It does not make sense to say a chair is seeking shelter in a house. It is illogical to think of a chair as ‘making a home’ somewhere. A home, a shelter, implies that it cares for Dasein and Dasein cares for it. In other words, Dasein through gathering is able to create a home which is intimate and familiar. Dasein is able to dwell in a shelter because it encounters the shelter as a shelter. “Dasein not only comprehends the objects in its world, but also concerns itself with them…”\footnote{17} A chair may be in a shelter, but it does not encounter the shelter as such. Similarly a chair does not encounter a table or wall:

A table might touch a wall, in the sense that there may be zero space between the two entities, but it cannot encounter the wall as a wall. The wall is not an item in the table’s world. Only Dasein, the being to whom an understanding of Being belongs, can touch a wall in the sense that it can grasp it as such.\footnote{18}

Similarly, a chair cannot encounter shelter but Dasein can. Hence, Dasein is able to dwell in the world while entities other than Dasein simply belong to the world.

Dasein can touch, interact and affect itself and others. It makes no sense to say that a table and chair interact with each other. It is nonsensical to say that a table and chair are touching or affecting each other. Physical objects are reducible to geometrical relationships with one another; Dasein is not.

For Descartes space is essentially mathematicized; spatial location is fixed by imposing an objective system of coordinates upon the world and assigning a sequence of numbers to each and every item in it…On Heidegger’s view however

\footnote{17} Stephen Mulhall, The Routledge Guidebook to Heidegger’s Being and Time (Routledge, 2012), 41. 
\footnote{18} Ibid.
Dasein most fundamentally understands its spatial relations with objects as near and far, close and distant, and these in turn are understood in relation to its practical purposes.\(^{19}\) Dasein at the fundamental level does not understand space on a detached objective scale. Rather, Dasein understands space in relation to its own being. It understands space in regard to its practical application to the existence of Dasein. In that sense, Dasein interacts with spatiality rather than viewing it as a disinterested spectator. Dasein interacts with the world and other Dasein. Their relationships are not simply geometrical.

Further, Dasein is always with others. It is not simply next to others. Rather, it is with them. What does it mean to say that Dasein is ‘with-others?’ It means that Dasein is in the world and does not simply occupy it. It means that Dasein is with people in the world and not simply alongside of them. Dasein is in-the-world in the sense that its essence is constituted by the fact it is ‘in the world’ rather than simply occupying it. Dasein is not in the world as a chair sits in a room. A chair can be removed from the room and still be a chair. The chair’s essence is not designated by the fact that it is in the room. Dasein’s essence is that it is “in-the-world.” Stephen Mulhall writes: “the water in a glass might be poured out of it without affecting its watery nature, but the idea of a human life that is not lived ‘in’ the world is not so easy to comprehend… human existence is essentially Being-in-the-world.”\(^{20}\) Dasein is inextricably linked to the world. Mitsein is being-with. Dasein is always mitsein. For instance, even when Dasein sits alone in a room, it is made possible only because Dasein is normally with others. Ergo,

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 43.
\(^{20}\) Ibid., 40.
being alone is a mode of being-with. Dasein’s inherently social nature is further illuminated in ready-to-hand objects. In regard to a clothing-maker, Heidegger observes:

…the outcome was that along with the equipment to be found when one is at work, those others for whom the work is destined are “encountered too.” If this is ready-at-hand, then there lies in the kind of Being which belongs to it…an essential assignment or reference to possible wearers, for instance for whom it should be cut to figure. Similarly, when material is put to use, we encounter its producer or supplier….The Others who are thus “encountered” in a ready-to-hand, environmental context of equipment are not somehow added on in thought to something which is proximally just present—at-hand; such “Things” are encountered from out of the world in which they are ready-to-hand for others.²¹

In other words, a tradesman is working alone, but is usually making something for another Dasein, with supplies from a different Dasein, using ready-to-hand tools likely manufactured for every Dasein. In that way human beings are inextricably linked to being-with.

It is chiefly through “being-in” and “being-with” that Dasein differs from the ego-driven self. The meaning of Dasein’s being is inextricably linked to being in the world. It is also inevitably tied to other Dasein. The relationships are essential. Conversely, the Cartesian self is in-the-world as a disinterested spectator. In other words, Descartes approaches the world as “a detached observer of that world, rather than as an actor within it.”²² Dasein is inextricably in-the-world and with-others; “Heidegger’s protagonists are actors rather than spectators…”²³ In being-with Dasein is both an actor and acted upon. Heidegger writes: “Not only is being toward Others an autonomous, irreducible

²¹ Heidegger, Being and Time, 154.
²³ Ibid.
relationship of Being, this relationship of Being-with is one which Dasein’s Being already is.”

The rhetor develops the structures of being-in and being-with for the purposes of persuasion. The rhetor seeks to “see the available means of persuasion in each case.”

Because Dasein is always in the world and with others the rhetor must locate the means of persuasion in those structures. In a broad sense, rhetoric requires and interprets being-in and being-with. The rhetor seeks to move his audience into and out of opinion. Consequently, the rhetor requires an engaged audience which can be affected and moved. It then becomes the job of the rhetor to develop the structures of being-in/being-with that allow for human beings to move each other. Heidegger writes: “The orator is the one who has genuine power over being-there.” It is the rhetor which has “genuine dominion over the persuasion of human beings in the way that they are with one another.” In other words, the rhetor develops being in/being-with to find the most persuasive possibilities in a given situation.

The Rhetoric explicitly explores being-in and being-with in its utilization of mood. Consider that “Being-in has two elements-state of mind and understanding.” Mood is the most common existential manifestation of being-in. Consider that pathos is essential to Aristotle’s Rhetoric. In Book 2 he writes: “The emotions are those things through which…people come to differ in their judgments.” He goes on to explicitly lay

---

24 Heidegger, Being and Time, 162.
26 Heidegger, Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy, 74.
27 Ibid.
28 Ibid., 75.
out a method of utilizing moods for persuasion. In that sense the rhetor interprets being-in because they explicitly develop moods for persuasion.

In regard to being-with, Heidegger

…suggests three different senses in which other people are constituents of Dasein’s world. First, they form one more class of being that Dasein encounters within the world. Second, what Dasein works upon is typically provided by others....third, the readiness-to-hand of objects for a particular Dasein is not...understood as their readiness to hand for that Dasein alone...30

Aristotle’s Rhetoric lays out those three senses of being-with. First, the rhetor obviously encounters his audience. In fact, the rhetor is eminently concerned with the context of that interaction. Is it in a court of law (judicial)? Is it a celebration(epideictic)? Is it the people’s assembly(deliberative)? Further, the rhetor is keenly aware that what he works upon is provided by others. This is because the rhetor works upon others! Aristotle’s rhetoric consists of three major components: “a speaker and a subject upon which he speaks and someone addressed.”31 The rhetor ‘works upon’ her audience because her chief goal is the persuasion of that audience. Lastly, it is clear that Aristotle recognizes his Rhetoric as a method that can be employed by anyone. It is not unique to a single individual. In an overarching sense, Aristotle’s rhetoric explicitly engages those structures of being-in and being-with. Now how does all of this relate to everydayness?

How do the concepts of being-in the world and being-with others explain the notion of everydayness? It is because Dasein is situated in the world and with-others that it may fall into everydayness. Dasein, as being-with, typically maintains itself in the

---

30 Mulhall, The Routledge Guidebook, 64.
31 Aristotle, The Art of Rhetoric, 49.
being of the they-self.  

This means that in everyday being with Dasein is in subjection toward others. The they-self is not one person, or a group of particular persons in black suits. Rather, it is a faceless and impersonal construct to which one relinquishes their own individuality. Simply, giving into the they-self is a sort of giving into the ‘crowd’ or ‘peer pressure.’ It is an abrogation of one’s individuality. 

To summarize, rhetoric as a hermeneutic of everydayness is a way of developing the conceptual frameworks of being-in and being-with for the purposes of persuasion. This means that the rhetor sees the possibilities of persuading his audience through utilizing everydayness. The question arises: how does this relate to Aristotle’s Rhetoric? In two important ways: 1. rhetoric is not strictly relegated to the political realm; it is concerned with everyday existence. 2. Ethos, pathos and logos rely on common opinion which explicitly projects the persuasive possibilities that exist within the conformist nature of everydayness.

Although many commentators, including Gaonkar, have relegated Aristotle’s rhetoric simply to the realm of political discourse they lack historical context. Heidegger seeks to further elaborate that context. He contends that rhetoric is not strictly political but the concrete interpretation of being-with. He writes: “One can only understand the explicit emphasis on the connection between politics and rhetoric when the historical background is presented.” 

For Heidegger, the Greek polis is indicative of every aspect of Greek life. It is not merely for political decision making. Rather, it is the fundamental expression of being-with which is equiprimordial to speaking-being. Again, human

---

32 Ibid., 107.
33 Heidegger, Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy, 80.
beings do not bounce off of each other unaffected. Rather, they constitute themselves and each other through speaking and hearing, through their arguments and refutations. Heidegger asserts, "the Greeks see existence as existence in the polis." Heidegger defends this by noting that *Rhetoric* is

...not specific to a trade or occupation. Everyone is in the position of being able to speak with others in the people’s assembly, and everyone has the possibility of being brought into court. Everyone has the opportunity to hear a eulogy for example at the Olympic games. In this peculiar region, the everydayness of being-there becomes manifest through the right interpretation of the *Rhetoric.*

Clearly, for Heidegger, rhetoric is not completely subsumable within politics. For example, the hearing of a eulogy falls under Aristotle’s conception of epideictic rhetoric, and a eulogy is not explicitly political.

It is from everyday existence that the rhetor extracts the possible means of persuasion. The *entechnic pistis* (artistic proofs) require that the rhetor ‘see’ something persuasive in a concrete situation. Heidegger clarifies:

It [rhetoric] does not deal with this through description, by describing the matter that is given in a certain situation. It does not deal with the matters themselves, but with the concrete situation insofar as something can be extracted from it, that which speaks for something speaks for the conviction that the one discoursing wants to cultivate in others.

The rhetor locates something in a given situation which can be used for persuasion. This ‘finding’ is a projection of the possibilities of everydayness for the purposes of persuasion.

---

34 Ibid., 91.
35 Ibid., 93.
36 Ibid., 75.
The development of everydayness for the purposes of persuasion is illuminated by Aristotle’s conception of the artistic proofs. Consider the difference between *atechnic* (non-artistic) and *entechnic* proofs. Atechnic proofs are characterized by being descriptive and not created by ‘us.’ “I call atechnic those that are not provided by ‘us’ but are preexisting for example…contracts.” In other words, the non-artistic proofs are not produced by the audience or the rhetor, they exist outside both. The rhetor is not concerned with those proofs because they exist externally to the relationship between orator and audience. Rather, Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* as an inquiry into being-in and being-with, is concerned about the proofs which are constructed between audience and speaker. These are the artistic proofs.

Aristotle writes that the artistic proofs are “whatever can be prepared by method and by ‘us.’” What does it mean to say prepared by us? By ‘us’ does not simply refer to the rhetor. Again, the rhetor is not an ego-driven self; rather, he is a purveyor of persuasion strongly concerned/connected with his audience. The rhetor is concerned with proofs which are constructed in the relationship between rhetor and audience. In doing so, Aristotle appears to be offering an explicit conceptualization of being-with. He explicitly states: “...the persuasive is persuasive to someone.” The orator is constantly ‘with’ their audience in that sense. Consequently, because the persuasive is always persuasive to someone and about something, rhetoric is an investigation into being in and being-with. The rhetor seeks to understand his relationship to his audience and his world,

---

38 Ibid.
39 Ibid., 36.
in constructing his proofs. The specific proofs mentioned by Aristotle are ethos, pathos and logos.

Ethos, Pathos, and Logos

In what ways can we say that ethos, pathos, and logos produce everyday modes of being- with their audience? More specifically, how do they develop the fallenness into the they-self of their audience? In an overarching sense, the rhetor seeks to move his entire audience into the same opinion. On that level, the very goal of the rhetor is the assimilation of individuality. In the specific proofs themselves the rhetor appeals to common, everyday opinions. In enthymemes, the strongest premises are derived from common opinion (endoxa). Even ethos and pathos attempt to develop commonly held opinions. In ethos, the rhetor appeals to publicly held views of what are considered credible/spurious. In pathos, the rhetor appeals to concepts which commonly elicit a visceral response.

The Enthymeme as Idle-talk

In History of the Concept of Time, Heidegger gives an example of idle talk: “For example, nowadays one says and everyone hears it and has heard it, that Rembrandt is esteemed.” Consequently, that prescribes a framework for viewing Rembrandt. In other words, people enjoy the painting simply because they have always heard it is a great work. Their own experience is subjugated to common opinion. I contend that the enthymeme as conceived of by Aristotle is a form of idle talk because it relies on endoxa.

---

For Heidegger, language may be authentic or inauthentic. The form rhetoric generally falls into is the inauthentic or “idle conversation.” He notes:

One must take fully into account that the Greeks lived in discourse, and one must note that if discourse is the genuine possibility of being, in which itself plays out, that it concretely, and for the most part, then precisely this speaking is also the possibility in which being-there is ensnared. It is the possibility that being-there allow itself to be taken in a peculiar direction and become absorbed in the immediate, in fashions, in babble. For the Greeks themselves, this process of living in the world, to be absorbed in what is ordinary to fall into the world…became through language, the basic danger of their being-there.\(^{41}\)

Rhetorical language uses the ‘everyday babble’ in the form of developing common opinions. Because the goal of rhetoric is to engage the audience it is very effective to use speech which appeals to the public opinions of the audience. This babble is idle conversation.

How explicitly does idle conversation relate to rhetorical logos? Idle conversation is everyday chatter. It is talk which is concerned more with the claim than they object of that claim. Consequently, the talk is groundless, the object is lost. What precisely does that mean? Consider this: “Idle conversation, something gets communicated but in such a way that the parties cannot successfully participate in a shared orientation toward things in the world.”\(^{42}\) In idle talk, there is no real sharing of a particular viewpoint there is only the claim itself (in this case the argument). In idle talk, understanding appears to come very easily. This is simply because the being of the object is not actually communicated. “We concentrate upon what is claimed about it, taking it for granted what is said is so, simply because it is said and passing it on—

\(^{41}\) Heidegger, *Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy*, 74.
disseminating the claim, allowing it to inflect our conversations about the object and so on.”\textsuperscript{43}

How is this related to Aristotle’s \textit{Rhetoric}? First, the rhetor wants her argument to be understood as easily as possible even if the topic itself is lost. Aristotle writes:

\ldots the conclusion should not be drawn from far back, nor is it necessary to include everything. The former is unclear because of the length…This is the reason why the uneducated are more persuasive than the educated before crowds…Thus one should not speak on the basis of all opinions but those held by a defined group.\textsuperscript{44}

The rhetor is not concerned with giving an accurate account of a topic which includes everything. On the contrary, that could be counter-productive to the rhetor. Instead, the rhetor is concerned with developing the commonly held opinions of her audience for the purposes of persuasion. Heidegger writes that rhetoric “consists of basic opinions…those that life has cultivated in everydayness.”\textsuperscript{45} In other words, the underlying structure of rhetoric is common opinion which is cultivated in everydayness. Once again, consider the earlier example of idle talk, “Rembrandt is a great artist.” The statement can be used effectively in an enthymeme because it is a common opinion that Rembrandt is great.

For example, if I were promoting an artist and said “his work is reminiscent of Rembrandt” that would mean “his work is great” because common consensus is that Rembrandt is great. Let us now more specifically consider the form of the enthymeme.

Often, an enthymeme follows a logically valid formula. However, in rhetoric it is not really important if the argument is sound (if the premises are true). All that is

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 107.
\textsuperscript{44} Aristotle, \textit{The Art of Rhetoric}, 169.
\textsuperscript{45} Heidegger, \textit{Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy}, 90.
necessary is that the premises are probably true or if they conform to common opinion (endoxa), “Since few of the premises from which rhetorical syllogisms are necessarily true.”\textsuperscript{46} Again the premises do not need to be true. It is enough if they are commonly believed. If they are not commonly believed then “they are not persuasive because the premises are not agreed.”\textsuperscript{47}

In the formation of an enthymeme it is the most commonly believed premises which yield the strongest argument. Consider the following enthymeme: “Barack Obama is a socialist. Socialism is evil. Barack Obama is evil.” The first premise supported by common opinion is that Barack Obama is actually a socialist. The second underlying that statement is the commonly held view in the United States that socialism is an evil enterprise. Now, keep in mind that the above argument is valid. Although its premises may or may not be true it is incredibly effective because the premises are in line with common opinion. However, this is considered idle talk because it does not really disclose anything about socialism. Instead it develops a widely conceived notion of socialism to make its point. Further, it does not reveal anything about the character of Obama precisely because socialism is not made clear. In hearing that enthymeme one does not come away with a readiness to discuss Obama or socialism. They simply have their endoxa confirmed. That is the essence of idle chat.

Idle conversation, in short, is a mode of engagement with people and things in which a genuine readiness is not cultivated. Heidegger calls the result a kind of “floating”-a failure to be grabbed or disposed in any way by the things we
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encounter. We “keep ourselves in” the idle conversation, meaning: we have no “original” and “genuine” relationships to entities in the world.  

In interpreting the everyday mode of existence, the rhetor is concerned with forming arguments which are largely confirmed by common opinion. He is not interested in cultivating a new shared orientation but rather extracting a common everyday orientation which is already there.

In babble, the rhetor interprets commonly held opinions and uses them to strengthen their argument. In doing so, the rhetor is developing idle talk which is an essential component of everyday being-with. As Heidegger notes,

Heidegger sums it up nicely. In a concrete sense human beings exist in a mode of “encouraging, persuading and exhorting.” In rhetoric the most effective way to interpret persuasion is appealing to endoxa, which is a projecting the possibilities of falling into the public.

In ethos, the rhetor wants to appear credible to his audience. Also, the rhetor may seek to discredit his opponent: “…we believe fair-minded people to a greater extent and more quickly on all subjects in general…” Clearly, the rhetor must be aware of the way in which he is perceived. This species of proof relies heavily on the orator’s understanding of her audience. Are they academics? Lay people? Do I appear
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condescending? Heidegger describes this as “the manner by which the speaker offers and comports himself in his discourse.”

Clearly, in establishing their ethos the rhetor must be very concerned with the public. They must understand the conceptual frameworks under which they are characterized and develop them in a positive or negative fashion. In doing so, they may be perceived as credible. Consider Aristotle’s discussion of emulation in Book 2, Chapter 11. First he defines emulation as the positive corollary of envy. If a speaker can elicit the emulation of her audience she has achieved credibility. He writes:

What persons are emulated is also evident; for they are those who have acquired these things and things like them. These things are those mentioned, for example...public office; for public officials, including generals, politicians all having this kind of power...who many want to be...whom many admire...whose praises and encomia are spoken by poets and prose writers.

Aristotle’s examples of the credible include: politicians, generals and people who are admired by the masses. In that sense, the rhetor is meant to use the admiration of the masses (the public). It does not matter if the government is corrupt and the people are idiots. In an everyday mode of existence Dasein gives into public opinion. The point is this: the easiest road to credibility is to align one’s self with those that are credible instead of challenging the everyday notion of “those admired have credibility.” The rhetor generally develops that notion to the advantage of her argument. In Aristotle’s discussion of making the rhetor appear friendly he writes: “...a friend is necessarily one who shares pleasures in good things and distress in grievous ones...and are those whom the same
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things are good and bad and who have the same friends and the same enemies.”53 The rhetor, in seeking to win over the public must align herself with public opinion. She must present herself as sharing the same ideals of what is good and bad. Further, she must appear to share opinions of ‘who is an enemy and a friend’. Clearly, it seems that ethos is the development of credibility through consciously using the public conception of good and bad, the credible and spurious. It is in that way, ethos as outlined by Aristotle develops a form of being-with which falls into everydayness.

Let us now turn to pathos. In pathos, the orator is concerned with the emotions of his audience. Aristotle articulates this point: “through the hearers when they are led to feel emotion by the speech… we do not give them same judgment when grieved and rejoicing or when being friendly and hostile…”54 Heidegger clarifies: “The one discoursing must himself, in his discourse, have his eye toward…inspiring the hearer as to a matter.”55 The rhetor must approach his audience with an ‘eye toward them.’ What precisely does that mean? Once again, the rhetor must be attuned to the common opinion of his audience. In his discussion of the affect of anger, Aristotle observes: “Let anger be desire, accompanied by distress, for apparent retaliation because of an apparent slight that was directed toward one’s self.”56 Obviously, the rhetor does not want to be the focus of his audience’s rage. So how does the rhetor avoid anger or re-direct it toward his opponent? The answer is by capitulating to the public. He writes: “And people think they are entitled to be treated with respect by those inferior in birth, in power, in virtue,
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and generally in whatever they themselves have much of.\textsuperscript{57} To avoid anger it is necessary to treat those of superior birth with respect. What does that mean? It means that there is a commonly held opinion in place. At that time, it was a commonly held opinion that those who are of a noble birth should be treated more respectfully than slaves. Consequently, it is up to the rhetor to play into that. The rhetor develops the situation of the society she is thrown into in order to inspire the proper emotions.

Consider a modern example of a pathetic device which rests on common opinion. Consider the narrative presented by the Republican Party, “Barack Obama as an elitist.” Why is the response to this statement so visceral? Well, in the United States ‘elitists’ commonly elicit a negative reaction. There is a sense in the United States that the country was built by Joe the Plumber. In other words, the average person ought to be treated the same way as the most decadent oligarch. That is the situation in the USA we find ourselves in. Now, although this situation is radically different from Aristotle’s time the force of his claim holds. Consider, at the time of his writing, Aristotle’s culture recognized very rigid distinctions in classes of society. Those of noble birth expected to be treated better than slaves. Consequently, the rhetor treats those of noble birth more respectfully. Take a time machine to the present, and here we are in America, where the grand narrative contends that ‘all men are created equal.’ Consequently, all men (and ladies) expect to be treated equally. With that in mind, if a rhetor can portray his opponent as an elitist who scoffs at the middle class he can inspire anger against his opponent. The rhetorical narrative of “Barack Obama is an elitist” is incredibly effective
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because it presents Obama as viewing the middle-class as inferior. It presents him, as treating the middle class differently than the way they expect. In that sense, the rhetor appeals to the expectations of the public in order to inspire emotion. The rhetor must then interpret public opinion for the purposes of persuasion.

In summation, Gaonkar’s criticism that rhetoric was conceived of as a production-oriented art is really a pseudo-problem. For Heidegger, interpretation is a kind of production. This is because interpretation is the development of conceptual structures. It is not merely a passive form of reception. Consequently, the distinction between production and reception is not an insurmountable boundary. Gaonkar’s other prominent objection, namely that rhetoric is conceived of ambiguously and therefore seems to appear everywhere, is also mediated by Heidegger’s appropriation. This is because rhetoric is the interpretation of the average everydayness of human beings which is constituted by being-in-the-world and being-with others. In other words, rhetoric appears to be everywhere because it is the hermeneutic of an essential component of all human beings, so far as they constituted by emotion and language.
CHAPTER 2

THE TEMPORALITY OF RHETORIC

In chapter one, I presented rhetoric as a way of developing the concepts which underlie the everyday interaction of human beings. This everyday interaction is also known as an “inauthentic” mode of Dasein’s existence. It is called this because Dasein avoids its individuality in favor of the theyself. Now, does that inauthenticity reflect negatively on rhetorical hermeneutics? Well, to say that rhetoric is inauthentic because it interprets inauthenticity is to say that penologists are criminals because their object of inquiry is the prison-system. In this chapter, I contend that rhetoric is the interpretation of inauthentic living and as such it has the ability to disclose an authentic mode of living. In other words, a rhetor who understands rhetoric as an interpretation of the inauthentic mode of being also consciously understands when human existences fall into the everyday. In fact, the rhetor does it consciously. It would seem then that a careful inquiry into everydayness can open up a clearing from which the authentic mode of being may be disclosed. Simply stated: if rhetoric discloses everydayness, doesn’t it disclose authenticity through negation? Heidegger himself writes that rhetoric is “knowing-the-way around in everyday being-there.”\(^{58}\) This only becomes problematic in conjunction with the sophists. Heidegger writes: “The sophists on the other hand, who also pose as if they want to ascertain something, like the possibility of the rightful being-there… for this

reason sophists are connected with, and in conflict with, philosophers."\(^{59}\) Essentially, Heidegger is saying that rhetoric is problematic when it is understood as a guide for rightful being-there (authentic living) instead of "simply culling together what appears to be good to most people."\(^{60}\) However, lines later Heidegger calls philosophers "rightful sophists."\(^{61}\) What does that mean? Well it seems to imply that in some sense rhetoric can disclose authentic living even if it does so through a kind of negative barometer. The question becomes: If we interpret rhetoric as Heidegger suggests how is it valuable in disclosing the authentic life? I will present rhetoric as a way of identifying inauthentic modes of disclosure which purport to be authentic. In other words, rhetoric as a hermeneutic which emphasizes the everydayness of its critical object (whether it be science or politics) has the capacity to remind us of alternative modes of disclosure. Rhetoric does this by emphasizing that interpretive frameworks are always grounded in moods which are a manifestation of throwness. Consequently, interpretive frameworks and rational discourse itself are situated and contingent. For example, a rhetorical conception of science emphasizes that science is not the only mode of disclosing Being. In that way, rhetoric can act as an antidote to monolithic metaphysics.

For Heidegger, emotion provides the foundation for rational discourse. Further, he contends that Aristotle’s rhetoric is the first systematic analysis of the emotions. Consequently, because emotions are a necessary component of throwness, rhetoric
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becomes a way of interpreting throwness. In doing so, the rhetor has a particularly advantageous perspective from which to view interpretive frameworks.

Heidegger’s interpretation of Aristotle’s Rhetoric rests on two things: 1. The Rhetor is primarily concerned with utilizing moods to push the audience into and out of opinion. 2. Rational discourse and all interpretive frameworks are derivative of emotion.

First for Heidegger, what is mood? To answer that question, it is necessary to explore Dasein’s tri-partite structure of care. Heidegger adopts an unconventional use of the word care. For Heidegger, care is the unification of the manifold of Dasein’s being:

Care is the term used to signify the wholeness of the ‘thrown possibilities’ of Dasein’s being. Care does not designate a feeling of tenderness. As Mulhall articulates, “The point is not that Dasein is always caring or concerned, or that failures of sympathy are impossible or discouraged, it is, rather, that, as Being-in-the-world, Dasein must deal with that world.” In other words, Being-in-the-world means that Dasein is always comporting itself toward entities in world. Dasein is always encountering the ready-to-hand, present-at-hand entities (concern) as well as interacting with other human beings. Being-in-the-world necessitates commitment to the world. Specifically, Befindlichkeit and Verstehen constitute care. First, Befindlichkeit constitutes the throwness of Dasein. Dasein always finds itself in a situation. Mulhall elaborates: “Dasein is always delivered
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over to the task of existing, placed in a particular situation that it did not choose to occupy, but from which it must nevertheless choose how to go on with life.”\textsuperscript{64} Dasein is always existing in a specific context. It is always situated. It is already in existence. Dasein is ‘thrown’ into a situation because it does not have complete control over it; “it has less than complete control.”\textsuperscript{65} Second, it is in Verstehen (understanding) which Dasein projects the possibilities of the situation. “Dasein must project itself on to one or other existential possibility; and this projection is the core of what Heidegger means by understanding.”\textsuperscript{66} In other words, I find myself here, writing this paper. Inevitably I must project the possibilities of it: What question will I answer next?; How should I phrase this?; and so on. We can now see that the three fundamental components of care are characterized by throwness, projection and concern (besorgen). Thrownness, as mentioned above, constitutes the finding of oneself in a given situation. Projection is characterized by projecting the possibilities of the situation. Lastly, concern is characterized by an engagement with objects within the situation. For Heidegger, these three structures are unified by care. He describes care as “ecstatic temporality.” It is a temporality which allows for the unification of the manifold of Dasein. Care implies that the subject is not simply a spectator in the world. Instead, Dasein is characterized by the subject’s commitment to the world.

Again, it is important to note Dasein’s ‘commitment’ to the world. The rhetor requires an audience which is engaged and can be affected. What does it mean to say
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affected? Well, Heidegger characterizes persuasion as moving an audience into and out of doxa (opinion). This movement occurs through emotions. As I stated previously, Heidegger characterizes Aristotle’s rhetoric as a hermeneutic of emotions. In other words, it explicitly lays out the conceptual frameworks of emotion for the purposes of persuasion. Further, this movement into and out of opinion is temporal because emotions are situated. In discussing the temporality of emotions it is useful to examine Heidegger’s conception of moods.

Mood is a manifestation of throwness. Mood can be experienced as happiness, sadness, indifference and so on. Mood is the state-of-mind we find ourselves in. For example, in the morning sometimes one awakes to find that they angry for no discernable reason. Mulhall writes: “We talk, for example, of moods and emotions as ‘passions’, as something passive rather than active, something we suffer rather than something we inflict.” Mood is then a very clear manifestation of throwness as it constitutes the finding of one’s self in an emotional situation. As thrown into a particular situation one finds themselves with others and in a particular sort of mood. Rhetoric for Heidegger and Aristotle is an inquiry into the moving into and out of those moods. Because mood manifests in throwness and throwness is a fundamental component of Dasein it seems that rational discourse for Heidegger is grounded in the passions. He sees a parallel to this in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*.
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is not distinct from pathos. In fact for Heidegger, pathos forms the foundation of logos. Consider Gross: “…Heidegger sees language neither as an ideally transparent means of communication between minds nor as an arbitrary system of differences, pace Saussure. Instead language is... rooted in shared moods, human institutions, and the nonchrono-
logical history these institutions compose.”

Aristotle makes it clear that shared moods do affect the success of rhetoric. But to what extent, for Aristotle, do these emotions found ethos and logos?

In Book one of “Rhetoric,” Aristotle seems to present pathos and logos as separate, as in the Platonic tradition. However, in Book two of the Rhetoric, Heidegger sees Aristotle’s conception of pathos as necessary for logos. Initially, Aristotle appears to create a clear distinction between logos and pathos.

Like Plato before him and like those who followed in the wake of Cicero and Quintilian, Aristotle condemns in the strongest possible terms an art of speaking that would neglect logical argument—the “body” of persuasion—in favor of “matters external to the subject” such as human emotion: “Verbal attack and pity and anger and such emotions of the soul do not relate to fact but are appeals to the juryman.” Aristotle appears to claim that such an emotional appeal warps the outcome of a court case or a debate in the assembly. As the famous Aristotelian analogy goes using emotion in judgment is “as if someone made a straightedge rule crooked before using it” (Rhetoric 1354a).

It appears that in Book 1, Aristotle’s understanding of pathos follows in the Platonic tradition. However, Heidegger argues that in Book 2 of the Rhetoric, pathos becomes the condition for the possibility for rational discourse. How can this be? In Book 2, pathos is interpreted as the condition for the possibility of judgment (krisis). “With the
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demonstration of the fundamental role that the pathē play...we realize at the same time the possibility of seeing more concretely the ground of logos itself."\textsuperscript{70} Emotions are necessary to move one toward logos. Without emotions logic would have no foundation. As Gross further articulates: “Finally, Heidegger characterizes pathos (variously ‘passion,’ ‘affect,’ ‘mood,’ or ‘emotion’) as the very condition for the possibility of rational discourse, or logos.”\textsuperscript{71} Without emotion, there would be no motivation for discussion, debate or judgment. It is moods which provide the foundation for rational discourse. “Broadly conceived, Aristotle’s \textit{Rhetoric} is the discipline that allows Heidegger to establish logos as a derivative mode of construing the world, a mode grounded in everyday, pathetic situations (‘\textit{der} ogos in \textit{den} selbst \textit{seinen} Boden hat’).”\textsuperscript{72} Consider the analytic statement $A=A$. Is this statement meaningful if the audience is completely apathetic? In other words, is the statement meaningful if people do not even have enough emotional engagement to form a judgment about it? To use logic it is necessary to be situated in a certain context. In being situated one is affected by moods. “Logos is nothing without a human body and a shared situation in which it can be heard, no matter how messy such practicalities may be.”\textsuperscript{73} Aristotle even acknowledges that calm is an emotion, the opposite of anger. It would seem then that, for Aristotle, even the apparent lack of emotion is in fact an emotion. Consequently, emotion is inescapable in rational discourse.
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To further explain the primacy of pathos, it is necessary to understand Heidegger’s connection between pathos and doxa. “Heidegger situates pathos in conjunction with doxa, a term usually translated into English as ‘belief.’ For Heidegger, only pathos can draw one out of doxa.”\textsuperscript{74} In other words, without emotions one would be unmotivated to ever change their opinions. Their beliefs would become stagnant. For Heidegger, it is clear that pathos is necessary to ground logos. This notion completely subverts the commonly held platonic view that pathos clouds logos. Instead, Heidegger contends that logos is intrinsically linked to pathos.

Heidegger recognizes emotion as foundational in Aristotelian thought.

A Greek does not see a line in itself—instead gramma is always the limit of a surface, surface the limit of a body. The surface has no Being without the body—here again we have inseparability. So also the eidos of fear draws primarily upon a body’s condition. The difference lies in the fact that the particular condition of the body (being, say, brown or scratched) plays no role in mathematical inseparability; while for the pathe— Being in such and such a condition is essential… This is the foundation upon which, in the Rhetoric, the pathe— are considered with respect to eidos. What is important is that Aristotle does not achieve the basic determination of a living thing from physiological considerations. The eidos of the pathe— is a disposition toward other humans, a Being-in-the-world.\textsuperscript{75}

Without passions there would be no desire to engage others in debate or conversation; “the passions are actually phenomena constitutive of social life.”\textsuperscript{76} Pathos is essential to social interaction. For Heidegger and Aristotle, rhetoric provides a mode of inquiry into pathos. Ergo, rhetoric provides a hermeneutic of being-with.
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It is clear that for Heidegger language is grounded in pathos. Consequently, pathos is the motivating force in rhetoric. How specifically does pathos move an audience into and out of opinion?

Pathos provides doxa with dynamism. Pathos pushes doxa to change and refine itself. “And it is pathos that provides doxa with dynamism.”77 Without pathos, the world, for Heidegger, would be left with apathy and unquestioned ideas. “…[W]ithout the dynamism that only pathos can provide, doxa would remain frozen and inarticulate. It is pathos and pathos alone that draws logos out of doxa.”78 In other words, for one to examine and inquire into their beliefs it is necessary that they first be motivated to do so. That motivation is pathos. “Pathos is a sudden change and hence a transformation... out of a previous situation, but not a sudden change that would take its own course. Instead, it is a way of disposing oneself toward the world that stands at the same time in a possible relation to hexis.”79 This move into ‘another condition’ is essential to rhetoric. Without it there would be no persuasion. This is because one could not be moved into and out of opinion.

It is clear that for Heidegger, emotion is the currency of the rhetor “who is trained in the art of making pathos immediate (kairos).”80 Further, it is also clear that for him, emotion founds rational discourse because moods are a necessary part of thrownness.

With that, it seems that the rhetor in interpreting emotions is also explicitly interpreting
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thrownness. In other words, the rhetor is keenly aware of the situatedness of his audience and himself.

What is the significance of all this? The rhetor explicitly explores language for the purposes of persuasion. Further, emotion provides the possibility for rational discourse. It seems then that the rhetor is in a particularly interesting place to interpret rational discourse. Specifically, rhetoric provides the possibility of viewing discourse as situated and essentially temporal. This is because emotions which ground rational discourse are contingent. Consider that Aristotle describes emotions as “states-of mind” rather than hexis.\(^8\) States of mind are situated in specific circumstances. Conversely, hexis is a habit or character trait which extends over a period of time. Consequently, the rhetor, in interpreting emotion is exploring the situatedness of rational discourse. Further, even the truth or apparent truth aimed at by the rhetor is temporally situated.

For Heidegger and Aristotle, rhetoric is temporal in two important senses. First, in an overarching sense, rhetoric relies on a constant flow of time. In rhetoric there are no unchanging, timeless truths. Instead, rhetoric focuses on truths (or apparent truths) which are contingent and in a state of flux. Secondly, rhetoric focuses on the movement of an audience into doxa. As we have said, this movement is achieved through appeal to the passions. This is temporal because “movement” only occurs within time. In this section I intend to elaborate on the temporal components of rhetoric. I will then demonstrated the value of this view in a rhetorical conception of science.

First, in an overarching sense, Heidegger’s concern with rhetoric represents his fascination with subverting notions of timeless unchanging truths. Heidegger’s fascination with time fits with his revisionary account of the staple Hellenic philosophical terms such as ousia, as being or essence, and, indeed, time becomes the essence, metaphorically speaking, of the SS 1924 project. Heidegger contrasts the philosophic obsession with the search for timeless truths, for eternal certainties…with rhetoric’s concern for Zeitlichkeit, the timely, the timeful.82

Much of philosophy is concerned with timeless truths. Rhetoric, on the other hand, is concerned with the “timeful” and “timely.” What does that mean? Well, primarily a rhetor is situated in a time and place with a particular audience. Rhetoric is not “some pure, monologic, theoretical usage. Because of its interest in Aussagen, articulation, speaking-out to someone, rhetoric develops an account of life in its dailiness, its timefulness, its radical specificity of time, its care for tense.”83 For Heidegger, rhetoric is not concerned with atemporal metaphysical truths. Rather, the rhetor is concerned with truths which are situated within time because his audience is situated in time. “The classical rhetorical shift in interest is toward people living in concrete situations (im eigentlichen kairos) as investigative object.”84 The rhetor must be keenly aware that they are “relentlessly time bound, embedded in specific problematics of context.”85 Consequently, Heidegger’s conception of rhetoric seems to sit with his anti-foundationalist leanings. Because the rhetor deals in the timely and not in unchanging truths, it can be said that temporality provides the condition for the possibility of rhetoric.

As Aristotle writes, “…no one debates things incapable of being different either in past or
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future or present…”86 In other words, the rhetor works with truths that are dependent upon a time and place. Consequently, without time, there would be no change and no need for the rhetor’s timely articulations.

The rhetor approaches his audience and community in a time and place. Ergo, the rhetor must move his audience with a concern for time. Once again, for Heidegger, “the rhetor’s purpose is to push Dasein in to doxa.”87 It is important to note that Heidegger defines doxa as ‘Orientierung,’ which is a kind of orienting task. It is doxa as orientierung which orients Dasein in time. Without an orientation, it would be impossible to have a life in time. Consequently, for Heidegger, doxa is how we have life in time.88 In other words, existing in time for Heidegger presupposes an orientation. Rhetoric is concerned with moving Dasein into a particular orientation. “The assertion that the rhetor’s purpose is to push Dasein into doxa is essential to the understanding of a continuous…engagement with time, Alltäglichkeit.”89 The rhetor is situated in time as is his audience. Consequently, he must have a nuanced sense of timefulness in order engage his audience in an appropriate way. He must be aware that the common opinions of his audience change over time. The rhetor is then concerned with

inappropriate nows, the right time or the wrong time to choose to act— within its authentic domain, its Alltäglichkeit, made public by rhetoric. And Dasein engages choices socially constituted in time by the community of agents with which Dasein shares a public world: they are coordinated social practices.90
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It is in the notion of kairos that the rhetor attempts to create the appropriate space in time to move their audience. Kairos focuses the rhetor’s timing. It reminds them of the importance of saying the appropriate thing at the appropriate time, which is essential when dealing within an audience situated in a particular context. “Kairos is in Hellenic treatises the primary canon of the rhetorically valuable. Kairos is both measure of time, the moment, and the response to the moment, the appropriate strategy, to prepon, and in Latin, what is fitting.”

It is clear that for Heidegger, rhetoric is concerned with contingent truths. It does not fall into the “obsession for unchanging truths.” What then for Heidegger does fall into the latter? The answer seems to be the whole of western metaphysics which mistakes Being for a present entity. In other words, an obsessive quest for an unchanging conception of Being leads to mistakenly attributing what we see at a particular time and place as Being. It leads to the calcification of Being into idea. I contend that rhetoric can offer a solution to this.

First, what is meant by the calcification of Being into idea? In Being and Time, Heidegger mainly conceives of Being (Sein) as unconcealment. Being constitutes the intelligibility of beings. Being is the process by which entities become unhidden or disclosed. For Heidegger, Being is not a being. Being is the transcendental possibility of beings. It is “the Being of beings.” In other words, Being cannot be an entity.

Furthermore, it would be impossible to interact with entities if there were no Being.
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However, one cannot simply abstract the quality of Being from beings. There is an inextricable relationship between entities and beings. Examining beings and trying to abstract Being always involves Being. Ergo Being cannot simply be a being because Being it is the capacity for interacting and examining those beings to begin with. As Mulhall observes,

Heidegger is happy to accept that Being is not a being… He also accepts that our comprehension of Being is nonetheless bound up in some essential way with our comprehending interactions with being. Being is not a being but is not encounterable otherwise than by encounters with beings.\(^\text{93}\)

In other words, for Heidegger, Being is always the being of some entity. However that does not mean that Being is an entity.

To solidify Being is to mistake a single mode of disclosing entities for Being itself. A concrete example from 300 years ago would be to mistake Newtonian mechanics for the one and only way of disclosing the world. We now know that this conception of Newtonian mechanics would be a mistaken commitment to monolithic metaphysics.

Heidegger attributes the lineage of monolithic metaphysics to Plato. For Heidegger, Plato took being and solidified it into idea. “When Plato says of the idea that she is the mistress that allows unhiddenness, he points to something unsaid, namely that henceforth the essence of truth does not, as the essence of unhiddenness, unfold from its proper and essential fullness but rather shifts to the essence of the idea.”\(^\text{94}\) That transforms Being into an idea. Being as an idea makes it static. For Heidegger, Plato’s


conception of Being qua idea is derivative of a more primordial conception which is Being as the unhiddenness (intelligibility) of entities rather than Being as idea. In “Plato’s Doctrine of Truth,” Heidegger examines Plato’s allegory of the cave. The main theme is that Plato privileges the ‘idea’ over altheia (unhiddenness). “Plato’s ‘doctrine’ of truth for the ‘allegory’ is grounded in the unspoken even whereby ‘idea’ gains dominance over ‘althea’…” That is where Heidegger sharply diverges from Plato. For Heidegger, unhiddenness is more fundamental than the idea. For Heidegger, Being is the possibility of beings. In other words it is what allows beings to be seen.

It should be mentioned that Heidegger exhibits similarities with Plato in that his conception of Being parallels the ‘Platonic light.’ Like Plato’s sun, it is Being which allows for the possibility of entities to be seen as such. “Heidegger compares presence to shining…to use the Platonic metaphor, the sun that is conceived as the source of shining or illumination.” Being in a sense, forms the background for the visibility of beings. Heidegger departs from Plato because Plato has only one Sun. In other words, for Plato there is only one method of disclosure. Ergo Plato focuses on the dominance of the idea. Plato’s transformation of Being into ‘something static and rigid’ ends up “siring and legitimating the idea of truth as correctness.” As Heidegger articulates, “the priority of idea…results in a transformation in the essence of truth. Truth becomes the correctness of apprehending and asserting.” In other words, it cements the correspondence theory of truth. That sets the tone for Descartes’ scientific rationalism. “From now on this
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characterization of the essence of truth as correctness of both representation and assertion becomes normative for the whole of Western thinking."⁹⁹ Descartes explicitly states: “Truth or falsehood in the proper sense can be nowhere else but in the intellect alone.”¹⁰⁰ Ergo, sensations are misleading and the intellect is paramount. That is the foundation of rationalism. For Descartes, our feeling of pain is deceptive. This is because the feeling of pain does not correspond to the scientifically determined external cause of pain. Feelings are considered misleading and are instead conceived of as derivative of more ‘true’ external scientific causes. However, for Heidegger there are multiple modes of disclosing entities. Plato is hopelessly trapped in a single mode of disclosure. Heidegger on the other hand is open to multiple modes of disclosure in order to experience the ‘plentitude of Being.’

For Heidegger, monolithic metaphysics manifests itself in gestell (scientism). Heidegger is critical of scientism because he views it as just another incarnation of Plato’s monolithic metaphysics. As Kwang-Sae Lee articulates, “Scientism is a variation on the theme of the good old metaphysics.”¹⁰¹ For Heidegger, gestell blocks the open because it regards science as the only mode of disclosure. As Lee further notes, Representationalism claims “that the representation of beings exhausts the entire realm of what can be researched and questioned, and that apart from beings’ represented by the
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However, a rhetorical conception of science reminds us that the dominant interpretive framework can always radically change.

In what ways can rhetoric open up multiple modes of disclosure? Well, in an abstract sense rhetoric’s emphasis on historical situatedness reminds us of the prevalence of contingent truth. In a practical sense, a rhetorical conception of science ala Thomas Kuhn and Paul Feyerabend describes scientific frameworks not as unchanging monolithic structures but as culturally and historically situated frameworks open to change.

In examining the practical value of rhetorical conceptions of science it is worthwhile to examine Kuhn and Feyerabend. In this chapter, I have argued two major points: 1. Rhetoric presents rational discourse as grounded in emotion. 2. Moods are a manifestation of throwness which means that the rhetor deals in the timeful and timely. Consequently, rhetoric is concerned with truths that are contingent on time and place. In the work of both Kuhn and Feyerabend, science is presented as being grounded in time. Further, they both make explicit appeals to rhetorical devices such as metaphor and public opinion which shape scientific endeavors.

*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* takes a rhetorical approach to science. A theoretical shift in science is likened to an ideological shift in the wake of a political revolution. Recall, the rhetor is concerned with moving an audience into a particular orientation. That seems to parallel Kuhn’s conception of the paradigm. The paradigm moves its audience (community of researchers, the lay public) into a particular orientation. Further, Kuhn articulates that these frameworks (just like rhetorical truths)

---
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are contingent. In other words, they are dependent upon a certain set of historical circumstances. Lastly, in a very specific sense, Kuhn makes it clear that theory-choice (also like persuasion) is not grounded in wholly rational means.

In *Basic Problems of Phenomenology* Heidegger writes, “The basic concepts of the…sciences are in a state of flux.” It seems that Heidegger’s conception of science parallels Kuhn. Kuhn contends that scientific change is not cumulative. Rather, it is "Like the choice between competing political institutions that between competing paradigms proves to be a choice between incompatible modes of community life." Recall, the rhetor is concerned with the movement of an audience into opinion. Similarly, Kuhn is concerned with the ways in which audiences choose between competing scientific frameworks. Further, Kuhn observes historical situations which seem to indicate that shifts in scientific theory are radical and complete. The shift from classical mechanics to quantum mechanics is a primary example. For Kuhn, there is no theoretical overlap between classical mechanics and quantum theory. Ergo, the theory change was not cumulative. A rhetorical conception of science involves a communal choice between two different modes of interpretation. In other words, under Heidegger and Kuhn’s view, scientific frameworks are contingent. They are not atemporal.

Further, it seems that paradigm choice is in part determined by rhetorical devices. It is clear that the choice between competing paradigms it not wholly rational; “paradigm
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choice can never be unequivocally settled by logic and experiment alone.”¹⁰⁵ Instead, for Kuhn, science also appeals to classical rhetorical devices such as clarity in theory choice. Aristotle’s rhetoric places heavy emphasis on clarity. He presents clarity as a kind of simplicity or elegance. For Aristotle, clarity is essential for persuasion. Similarly, Kuhn sees simplicity as an important component of theory choice. Simplicity allows the theory to bring “order to phenomena that in its absence would be individually isolated and, as a set, confused.”¹⁰⁶ Similarly, in Book 3 of the Rhetoric, Aristotle presents the virtue of style as a way of preventing confusion: “…let the virtue of style be defined as ‘to be clear.’”¹⁰⁷ Further, Aristotle notes that clarity is a mean between poetic and flat prose. In other words, it achieves a kind of elegance by not being too complex nor too simple. Although science is generally conceived of as the exemplar of objectivity, it is also open to aesthetic considerations such as simplicity and elegance. Kuhn notes that in the battle between the heliocentric and geocentric theory, “Copernican theory was the simpler, a fact vitally important to the choices made by both Kepler and Galileo.”¹⁰⁸ The Copernican theory’s math was far more elegant for explaining the qualitative attributes of celestial movement. However, elegance and simplicity could be viewed differently: “…two men fully committed to the same list of criteria for choice may nevertheless reach different conclusions. Perhaps they interpret simplicity differently…”¹⁰⁹ Simplicity can differ among scientists because scientists are human beings. They bring all kinds of
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baggage to their decision making. Things considered include: What is their academic training? What are their professional goals? Do they hold any religious sentiment? As a result, “choice between competing theories depends on a mixture of objective and subjective factors.”\textsuperscript{110} Similarly, clarity within rhetoric is dependent upon its audience. “The use of nouns and verbs in their prevailing meaning makes for clarity…”\textsuperscript{111} In other words, clarity depends upon what language is familiar to that particular audience. It depends upon the ‘prevailing meaning’ of the words at that time and with that particular audience. Consequently, science just like rhetoric, must take into account their audience when considering simplicity and the overall persuasiveness of their projects.

The importance of clarity and simplicity in theory choice illuminates a specific connection between Aristotle’s \textit{Rhetoric} and Kuhn’s work. Broadly, it suggests that science, like rhetoric, must employ means which are not completely rational to reach their audience. Aristotle’s \textit{Rhetoric} presents emotion as necessary for persuasion. Clarity induces a positive feeling in the audience. Similarly, the ‘elegance’ of the Copernican theory lends it power. The elegance invokes a positive feeling from the scientific community. Further, Kuhn and Aristotle both recognize that clarity is dependent upon the audience. Consequently, science and rhetoric are timely activities because clarity and simplicity are both situated. In other words, both depend upon their audience and the time and place of their articulation.

Feyerabend, along with Kuhn, presents science as using rhetorical devices. He presents science as situated with a particular audience. He also presents the scientific
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community as relying heavily on common opinion. Further, he discusses the scientific use of rhetorical devices such as metaphor. Ultimately, he concludes that a rhetorical conception of science is not only necessary but beneficial to science. This is because conceiving of science rhetorically means that it is always open for debate.

Feyerabend argues that ascribing to a rhetorical view of science actually improves scientific progress. In other words, conceiving of the scientific enterprise becomes a rhetorical struggle “where anything goes” a kind of epistemological anarchism which leads to the survival of the most persuasive theory. Conversely, a conception of science as the ultimate mode of disclosure leads to stagnation. He asserts, “Science is an essentially anarchistic enterprise: theoretical anarchism is more humanitarian and more likely to encourage progress than its law and order alternatives.”

Feyerabend’s project is in many ways a practical example of the rhetor’s emphasis on historical situatedness. Further, it demonstrates that a rhetorical conception of science opens one to other possible modes of interpretation which ultimately has very positive consequences.

Feyerabend adopts a rhetorical stance which emphasizes counterinduction. It is done in an attempt to undermine the importance of induction which is widely considered a cornerstone of the scientific method. Feyerabend’s conception of counterinduction is an attempt to demonstrate that science is situated in a time and place. Specifically it contends the following:

1. Observations and facts are theory-laden.
2. Reason itself is historically situated.
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3. The development and acceptance of the heliocentric theory occurred counterinductively. Counterinduction is paramount to Feyerabend’s argument. To proceed counterinductively is to adopt “Hypotheses that contradict well-confirmed hypotheses and/or well-established experimental results.”\textsuperscript{113} It seems that counter-induction stresses the openness to other possibilities. In other words, it does not reduce science to what is presently (up until now) confirmed. Instead, it treats science as a form of rhetoric. In that sense, science is viewed as producing contingent truths.

Counterinduction is initially founded on the notion that observations and even facts are theory-laden. In other words, scientists make observations with theoretical frameworks already shaping their perceptions. Clearly, this component of counterinduction has Heideggerian import. Again consider Heidegger’s conception of an interpretive framework. It is what allows the world to be interpreted as a world. As Richard Polt points out, Heidegger's world is “a referential totality... a web of meaning... It is the arena in which things make sense to us and fit into our lives. It is the overall scheme in which we can act produce, think, and be.”\textsuperscript{114} It should be noted that pure description is not possible without a wider context of interpretive meaning. It is impossible to completely remove oneself from a cultural grammar and then simply make observations. Description becomes meaningless without a culturally constituted web of interpretation. Polt notes:

\begin{quote}
\textit{even the “objective” features of things, their present-at-hand attributes, reveal}
\end{quote}
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themselves only within a larger, significant context that cannot itself be explained in terms of what is present-at-hand. The geologist, for instance, measures the quarts and finds that it is 10 centimeters long. She is right: it is 10 centimeters long. But this fact would have no meaning for her, and she would never have bothered to find it in the first place, were it not for her larger world, the world in which she exists as a scientist, mother and Canadian.\footnote{Ibid., 58.}

In other words, describing the objective features of a thing is dependent upon a larger interpretive framework. In fact, being in a situation already suggests that there is something framing our observation. We have already carved out the ‘situation.’ We decide where the situation begins and ends and so on. Feyerabend further articulates: “…factual statements, either contain theoretical assumptions or assert them by the manner in which they are used.”\footnote{Feyerabend, \textit{Against Method}, 31.} The simplest ‘factual’ statement contains a whole host of assumptions. In other words, I say “The book \textit{Against Method} is red.” I assume first that I am not color-blind. That seems silly. However, 1 in 10 men are partially or completely color-blind and I have never been tested. Secondly, I assume that the light in my apartment is accurately illuminating the color of the book. Lastly, I assume that red is a concept independent of language. Is it? In English we have one word for red. In Hungarian there are two words, \textit{piros} and \textit{vörös}. How are they different? I do not know; I am not Hungarian. The point is that observations and even facts themselves are dependent upon culture.

Now, for Heidegger and Feyerabend it is clear that observations and facts are dependent upon interpretive frameworks. How about reason itself? The answer is yes. Recall that in Heidegger’s conception of the \textit{Rhetoric}, rational discourse is derivative of
mood, which is a manifestation of throwness. Consequently, rationality is situated. How does Feyerabend practically demonstrate this? Well, the situatedness of rationality is a major component of Feyerabend’s argument. He writes:

Now, if there are events, not necessarily arguments which cause us to adopt new standards, including new and more complex forms of argumentation…. and if the old forms of argumentation turn out to be too weak a cause, must not these defenders give up or resort to stronger and more “irrational” means? Even the most puritanical rationalist will then be forced to stop reasoning and to use propaganda and coercion, not because some of his reasons have ceased to be valid, but because the psychological conditions which make them effective, and capable of influencing others, have disappeared.\(^\text{117}\)

Clearly, Feyerabend is adopting a rhetorical conception of science. He is talking about the “influence” science has on people and adopting stronger forms of argument. In doing so, he is stressing that science and even rationality itself are contingent on their audience. Consider that human beings are finite. We are situated in a particular time and place. Our lives are not even the blink of geology’s eye. Can we really know all the factors weighing down on us? Certainly not. It is then possible that our ability to ‘reason’ is to some extent historically situated. After all, if the Nazis had won WWII would we have the same concept of ‘reasonable’ and ‘unreasonable’? The audience for the scientist would be wildly different. Feyerabend writes:

The teaching of standards and their defense never consists in merely putting them before the mind of the student and making them as clear as possible. The standards are supposed to have maximal causal efficacy. This makes it very difficult indeed to distinguish between the logical force and the material effect of an argument.\(^\text{118}\)

Consider the rhetorical argument in chapter 1 regarding Obama as a socialist. The
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premise ‘socialism is evil’ is clearly the result of an emotional appeal resonating from cold-war pedagogy. Consider an even more visceral example like Nazi Germany. In other words, it was not as if the Nazis said, ‘Are the Jews evil? Well, you decide.’ Children were flooded with anti-Semitic propaganda. They saw it in school, in the newspaper, on television. They had to participate in extracurricular activities like the Hitler youth. Consequently, their ‘reasonable’ approach to dealing with the Jews was contaminated. The Nazi analogy may seem extreme for a discussion of rhetoric in science. However, Nazi scientists had very clear ideas about breeding the perfect race. Now we look at eugenics with horror and disgust. But what if the Nazi’s had won the war? Which scientific ideas would be considered reasonable? Again, I am not morally equating quantum mechanics to Nazi propaganda. The point is that common opinion often dictates what is reasonable. Consequently, reason and facts themselves are fluid. They are situated in a time and a place with a particular audience. Consequently, to move an audience it is necessary to appeal to rhetorical devices which appeal to the popular beliefs of an audience. It may also be necessary to appeal to the audience through rhetorical devices such as clarity, or metaphor.

A rhetoric of science reminds us that facts and reason are determined by cultural contexts. Consequently, they are situated in time with a specific audience. Ergo, conceiving of science as the ultimate interpretive framework is to fall into everydayness. Feyerabend even refers to scientific methods as ‘masters’. Therefore the scientist becomes “a well-trained pet” who “will obey his master no matter how great the confusion in which he finds himself, and no matter how urgent the need to adopt new
patterns of behavior…and he will be quite incapable of realizing that what he regards as
the ‘voice of reason’ is but a causal after-effect.”¹¹⁹ That may look extreme to some
readers. However, consider high school science books. They always make it seem as if
the current scientific ideas inevitably occurred out of history. The books always weave
the narrative of ‘And this is clearly the logical conclusion to the facts and historical
circumstances.’ Initially that may not seem problematic. But consider this: the scientific
textbooks of 50 years ago took the same line. Now we know many of those ideas were
inaccurate. At the time, they seemed perfectly plausible. Similarly, 50 years from now
our conception of the ‘scientific method’ could seem totally irrational and absurd.

We are finite beings situated in space-time. As such, adopting a single rock-hard
mode of disclosure is arrogant. It assumes that we have conceived of a method that is
outside of temporality, cultural change and human endeavor. A strict methodology closes
off humanity from the process. That is why multiple methods of disclosure are a more
humanitarian route. It could be argued that the purpose of a method is to remove human
beings from the process. Well, who created the method? Human beings. Furthermore, it
is impossible to remove the ‘human’ element from science. Even if one wanted to they
could not do it.

For Feyerabend, reason, observations and facts are saturated in popular ideology
and historical circumstance. It would be impossible for a scientist to be completely
objective. How could they compartmentalize themselves so cleanly? They cannot. As a
result, the ‘scientific method’ itself was conceived by people who were stuffed with
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ideology and limited by finitude. Just like us. They were not omniscient figures, creating a perfect and timeless method of inquiry. How could they be?

Does all of this mean that Feyerabend thinks science is a crazy and worthless endeavor? Certainly not. In fact, the contrary is true. Feyerabend advocates the rhetorical “anything goes” because it will advance the enterprise of science. For him, one method, loaded with ideology, would cause science to run stagnant. He asserts: “There is no idea, however ancient and absurd, that is not capable of improving our knowledge. The whole history of thought is absorbed into science and is used for improving every single theory.” It seems that any situation, no matter how crazy, can yield some form of knowledge. The same could be said for theories. Sure, the hypothesis could be totally insane. But, refuting it causes one to refine their own position. Also, who knows? The theory may sound crazy but then yield incredible insights. The point is that conceiving of science rhetorically strengthens the enterprise because it encourages argument and refutation which ultimately strengthens theories.

A pragmatic reader may have the following objection: “The scientific method is there because it works. Allowing crazy ideas into the discussion is nice of you. However, it is a waste of time.” Feyerabend is not advocating a pluralistic methodology simply because it sounds good. He does not seem like he is doing this to be a nice guy. He asserts that there is real scientific value in adopting various methodologies. His argument is strengthened by a powerful historical example: the heliocentric theory.
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Feyerabend asserts that Galileo proceeded counterinductively in an effort to validate the heliocentric theory. Galileo had to overcome the plainly inductive ‘tower argument,’ originally conceived of by Aristotle. To do so, he had to proceed counterinductively. Specifically, he had to appeal to the concept of ‘relative motion’ and to his telescope.

It is often argued that the heliocentric theory encountered opposition because of strictly religious concerns. The narrative of science vs. religion is very popular in the educational system. However, the geocentric theory was around for two millennia. The theory was held in ancient Greece, throughout Europe and in the Middle East. The theory was widely accepted in various parts of the world regardless of religious or cultural practices. The power of the geocentric theory was that it was clearly confirmed by observations. One of the most popular of such observations is the tower argument.

The tower argument “is used against the motion of the earth in Galileo’s own Trattato della sfera ‘heavy bodies…falling down from on high, go by a straight line and vertical line to the surface of the earth. This is considered an irrefutable argument for the earth being motionless.”121 That is a strong argument in seventeenth century Italy. The observation is clear. It can be observed directly. It seems to draw obvious conclusions. “Galileo at once admits the correctness of the sensory content…”122 The question for Galileo then becomes: if the earth is moving, then why does the heavy body not whirl around? Even Copernicus acknowledges the power of the tower argument. “According
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to Copernicus the motion of a falling stone should be ‘mixed straight-and-circular.’”

In order to accept that the Earth is moving, the heavy body must not actually be falling straight down. That seems completely counterintuitive. How could we not see its actual movement?

The tower argument may seem silly to us. Keep in mind that we have been taught that the earth moves around the sun since grade school. In the seventeenth century, they were operating under a substantially different theoretical framework. “They speak the language of real motion in the context of 17th century everyday thought.” They have a naïve realism toward motion. In other words, there is often no distinction made between apparent and real motion in seventeenth century thought. How does Galileo overcome this? He appeals to metaphor:

...one may learn how easily anyone may be deceived by simply appearance...This event is the appearance to those who travel along a street by night followed by the moon...it looks like a cat running along the tiles...if reason did not intervene would only too obviously deceive the senses.

Galileo is comparing the movement of the earth to the apparent movement of the moon. This metaphor is incredibly strong because it demonstrates the possibility of ‘apparent motion’ while appealing to an everyday experience. For Aristotle, metaphor is a very powerful rhetorical device. “Metaphor especially has clarity and sweetness.” For Aristotle, the strength of metaphor comes from its everyday usage, “…for all people
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carry on their conversations with metaphors.”127 After all, everyone has had the experience of the moon ‘following them’ while walking. Consequently, the metaphor provided by Galileo is particularly effective. It is not simply effective for a skilled astronomer but rather for the everyday individual. However, it must be argued that this metaphor is not wholly rational. Galileo did not strictly rely on equations which explained celestial movement. Nor did he strictly rely on well-founded observations. Rather, he appealed to metaphor which developed the everyday experience of ‘the moon following us’ for the purposes of persuasion.

Because Galileo’s ideas were so counter-intuitive, it was necessary for him to employ other rhetorical devices in order to be effective. Consider that in seventeenth century thought, it seems absurd that one could not recognize the motion of the earth. “How could one possibly be unaware of the swift motion of a large bulk of matter such as the earth is supposed to be? How could we possibly be unaware of the fact that the falling stone traces a vastly extended trajectory through space?”128 Galileo’s theory runs contrary to the most simple and accessible observations. I see the stone fall straight down from the tower. I stand still. I do not feel like I am moving. I look at the sky and can see the stars and the sun moving around me. All of these are powerful observations which were used as ‘data’ to support the geocentric theory for two thousand years. Feyerabend suggests that Galileo overcame the tower argument, “not by reference to experiment or to observation…”129 Instead, Galileo sets up a dialogue between Salviati and Simplicio. In
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it, Simplicio is forced to concede to Galileo’s ideas: “I am so handy at picking people’s brains that I shall make you confess this in spite of yourself.”\textsuperscript{130} Consider the phrase, “I am so handy at picking brains.” Galileo does not, for example, say “I will demonstrate through observation or mathematical equations.” Instead, he admits to appealing to a form of persuasion. He is “handy at picking people’s brains.” In other words, he has the ability to persuade people, to change their opinions, even “in spite of themselves.” That does not sound like it matches up to our conception of the scientific method. It sounds more like an act of clever sophistry. Further, in setting up a dialogue Galileo is placing science into a conversational context. He is not appealing to complex equations or observation reports; rather, he is creating a dialogue written in everyday language. This use of language is paramount for Aristotle: “A word in its prevailing and native meaning… [is] alone useful in the lexis of prose.”\textsuperscript{131} Galileo is appealing to the everydayness of words and metaphor to make his conclusions persuasive. Consequently, it seems that Galileo through his own admission and stylistic choices is employing rhetorical devices.

The reader may argue that celestial observations were made which confirmed the heliocentric theory. The story taught in elementary school goes: “Galileo proved the heliocentric theory with his telescope.” It is never mentioned that Galileo offered no theoretical reasons to explain the validity of his unusual device. Also, Galileo’s understanding of optics was elementary at best. Lastly, observation reports made with the telescope were inconsistent and wildly inaccurate.
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The first practical telescope was created in the Netherlands in the early
seventeenth century. At the time of Galileo’s observations, the telescope was still a new
and strange device. Still, Galileo offered no theoretical proof that his telescope was
reliable. It could be argued that theoretical justification was not necessary. After all, one
could plainly see that the telescope worked absolutely perfectly on the earth. In other
words, the telescope illuminates a tree that is half a mile away. I walk up close to the tree
and see that the telescope’s observation is confirmed. That seems like common sense.
However, it is extremely problematic.

There is the problem of telescopic vision. This problem is different for celestial
and terrestrial objects…It was thought to be different because of the
contemporary idea that celestial objects and terrestrial objects are formed from
different material and obey different laws. This idea entails that the result of an
interaction of light…with terrestrial objects cannot…be extended to the sky.132

In order to justify the use of the telescope in celestial observation, it would be necessary
to conceive of a theory which articulated the behavior of light within a telescope. Galileo
did not have an adequate theory; “the theories that were available at the time …were unfit
for the task and refuted by plain and obvious facts.”133 In terms of the current scientific
method, induction is paramount. It is also important that the observations are not
distorted. Galileo gave no proof for the viability of his telescope. It could be argued,
“Well, they may not have been able to accurately articulate a useful theory of light in the
telescope but it still worked.” First, we know now in hindsight that the heliocentric
theory is correct. Secondly, there is considerable evidence that Galileo barely had a basic
grasp of seventeenth century optics.
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Feyerabend observes: “…there exists serious doubts as to Galileo’s knowledge of those parts of contemporary physical optics which were relevant for the understanding of telescopic phenomenon.”\textsuperscript{134} Galileo found Kepler’s \textit{Optics} incredibly difficult to understand. It appears that he constructed his own telescope from trial and error instead of using calculations. From the perspective of the contemporary scientific method, that sounds unscientific. It can still be claimed that although Galileo lacked theoretical mastery his device was still effective. It seems that the opposite is in fact true.

Galileo’s telescope yielded results which were inconsistent, inaccurate and extremely vague. Galileo took his telescope to the house of his opponent…to demonstrate it to twenty-four professors of all faculties… Horky, Kepler’s overly excited pupil, wrote on this occasion, “…below it works wonderfully; in the heavens it deceives one…I have as witnesses most excellent men and noble doctors…and all have admitted the instrument to deceive.”\textsuperscript{135}

That has two probable explanations. The first is that the telescope was poorly constructed. Considering that the telescope was in its infancy that is possible. The other possibility could be that the human capacity for observation was exerted by abnormal and strange circumstances. Consider it: the telescope is this new craze. People are nervous and excited about it. They are also probably a little bit frightened. After all, who really knows what they were going to find in the heavens? The tensions must have run very high. In that context, it makes perfect sense as to why some of the initial discrepancies occurred. Perhaps some people were very skeptical and did not want to see anything. Conversely, maybe some observers were desperate to see anything. Therefore, the
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slightest spec confirmed or disconfirmed their expectations. It would seem logical then if
the telescope caught on slowly. That was not the case.

Instead, the telescope caught on like the iPhone. “[One] is rather astonished at the
speed with which the reality of the new phenomena was accepted.”136 Even more
strangely, most of the observation reports from the telescope were contradictory or just
totally inaccurate. Galileo’s observations of the moon were particularly strange.
Feyerabend includes some of Galileo’s sketches. One of them shows the moon to be
half-jagged mountains and half-smooth. Maybe Galileo was a just a bad artist? No, his
observation reports were also inaccurate. He writes that the inner boundary has “vast
protuberances, deep chasms, and sinuosities…while the outer boundary, appear not
uneven…perfectly round and circular.”137 That does not seem to correspond to our
conception of the moon. The wide ranging and conflicting accounts of celestial
observation demonstrate that the telescope was unreliable or that the human observer was
not prepared to use the telescope.

Feyerabend paints Galileo as an incompetent optician, poor astronomer, and
heavily concerned with persuasion. The point is that Galileo employed rhetorical devices
to radically alter science. In spite of all the observations and ‘common sense’ against
him, he still won out. The historical example of Galileo serves to illustrate that science
cannot be bound under one single method. If Galileo stopped his inquiry simply because
observations falsified his hypothesis, it would have been to the detriment of scientific
endeavor. If the telescope had been disregarded because observations with it were
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conflicting and unreliable, science would have suffered.

Now, the result of all of this is two-fold. First, a rhetorical conception of science views it as historically situated because it appeals to a particular audience. In other words, it does not present the enterprise of science as an atemporal, ultimate mode of disclosure. This seems to avoid Heidegger’s concern with regard to monolithic metaphysics. Secondly, it seems that, in an overarching sense, conceiving of science as rhetorical opens it up for debate. Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* is always persuasive to a particular audience. It is always in a constant state of struggle and change. Lastly, it seems that true scientific revolutions take place not in spite of rhetoric, but because of it. Illuminating rhetorical devices in scientific frameworks opens them up for change and revision. Rhetoric provides the possibility for scientific revolutions because it provides a way to demonstrate the contingency of the dominant interpretive framework.

In summation, a rhetorical conception of science suggests that scientists are situated historically like anyone else. They have an audience. Consequently, scientists often appeal to rhetorical devices such as clarity and metaphor in order to persuade their audience. Recognizing the rhetorical devices in science allows one to realize that scientific frameworks are situated historically because they appeal to audiences. In other words, scientific frameworks are not atemporal. To be fair, one might develop an incredibly persuasive scientific framework like Newtonian mechanics. However, that does not mean that it is the ultimate mode of disclosure. To regard Newtonian mechanics as the ultimate mode of unhiddeness is to exist inauthentically. In other words, it can solidify dogmas and prevent openness to other possibilities. As we now know with the
innovation of quantum mechanics, conceiving of Newtonian mechanics as the ultimate interpretive framework would be a terrible mistake. Interpreting science rhetorically is to understand it as something situated with a particular audience in a particular time and place. In short, a rhetoric of science leaves one open to the possibility of other modes of unconcealment.
CHAPTER 3

THE DEATH OF AN INTERPRETIVE FRAMEWORK

In my final chapter, I will build upon my previous chapters in the following manner: 1. rhetoric interprets everydayness. 2. As such rhetoric reveals the contingency of interpretive frameworks (including science) opening one up to other possible modes of disclosure. 3. Hence, I conclude that rhetoric can have the capacity to open human-beings to the call of conscience.

First what is the call of conscience? In its average everyday mode of being, Dasein falls into the they. In order to be authentic, Dasein must find itself. It does this through the call of conscience. Mulhall writes: “In its average everyday state of inauthenticity Dasein is lost to itself. So, for it to achieve authenticity, it must find itself. But it can only begin to do so if it sees it has a self to find…Heidegger claims that what bears witness to this possibility is the voice of conscience.”138 In order to explore the voice of conscience which opens up Dasein for authenticity it is necessary to first explore the “authentic.”

In understanding authenticity, it is necessary to examine the concept of mineness. For Heidegger, Dasein is ‘mine’ because a human being’s existence is a personal enterprise. As Michael Zimmerman points out in Eclipse of the Self, “human existence is always personalized…[E]ach human life is a project which must be taken over by a

particular human being.” In other words, Dasein is always given the task of interpreting its own existence. One “is always assigned the task of being someone…the task is hers as long as she lives.” A human being may interpret her existence any way she decides because it is her existence; “my existence is mine to understand as I choose.” Mineness is a fundamental component of Dasein. For example, one would not say that a rabbit’s life is his in the same way we would say Dasein is hers. That is because a rabbit does not have the task of interpreting their own life. “Birds and rabbits live out their lives in ways determined by…behavior patterns.” Consequently, birds and rabbits cannot choose to exist authentically or inauthentically. Conversely, mineness is a fundamental component of Dasein and as such, “Dasein is in each case essentially its own possibility, it can, in its very Being ‘choose itself and win itself.” Dasein is able to choose to exist authentically or inauthentically.

The notion of ‘mineness’ establishes the foundation for the notions of authenticity as well as inauthenticity. Mineness is a fundamental trait of Dasein. In accepting her mineness, one accepts “her existence as her own to take over.” In doing so, one owns up to her Being, which is the basis of authenticity. Conversely, one can abrogate their responsibility and indebtedness and “exist inauthentically, avoiding owning up to the task of Being.” Ergo, without ‘mineness,’ one could not choose to be authentic, nor could
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one choose to be inauthentic. It is because, “my Being is mine, it is always an issue for me.”

For Heidegger, the call of conscience is ontological. It is a mode of discourse which “may not be heard as offering any communicative content” and instead performs the “discursive function of meaning articulation.” The call of conscience discloses the strife between authentic and inauthentic existence. It is a disruption of everydayness. “Heidegger thinks of the voice of conscience as a mode of disclosure—a form of communication that attempts to disrupt the idle talk of the they-self.” The call of conscience may be interpreted as a religious or social calling but for Heidegger that presupposes an ontological structure which allows one “to be able to hear it.” The call of conscience illuminates the conflict between authentic and inauthentic existence.

The call of conscience alerts Dasein of the guilt associated with indebtedness and responsibility. Indebtedness and responsibility are derived from the past and future.

I am indebted because I have a past which must serve as a foundation for my existence, but which I cannot control…I have to work with what I have been in order to be someone…I am responsible because on the foundation of my past, I project possibilities that are not other possibilities. That is I cannot be everything at once, but am forced to choose an approach…Heidegger’s concept of guilt, then offers us a new way of looking at the past and future dimensions of our Being.

Heidegger defines repetition as ‘authentic temporalizing.’ It is a process by which Dasein “must wrench itself away from its distraction by the present objects of its
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concern” in order to anticipate the future. Also, Dasein must recognize the present as the solid moment of the choice. Lastly, “no such visionary moment is possible without an authentic relation to Dasein’s throwness.” In other words, Dasein must accept the way in which the past has influenced the present. Through engaging in repetition, Dasein can experience authentic temporalizing. Heidegger’s repetition is similar to Nietszche’s eternal recurrence. “Nietzsche’s great test for those on their way to being Overman was whether they could affirm that all of life returns again and again just as it was, is now, and will be.” In accepting the notion of eternal return, the Overman accepts their past as well as their future, just like in Heidegger’s repetition: “Eternal Return of the Same: to will is to say ‘yes’ to what has been and ‘yes’ to what will be.” In order to exist authentically, it is necessary to accept the inextricable relationship of past, present future, which is illuminated in Nietzsche’s eternal return of the same as well as Heidegger’s notion of repetition. In repetition as well as eternal return, authenticity is illuminated as an infinitely ornate tapestry of past, present and future. In other words, the past traditions are revitalized by projection into the future through repetition.

In owning up to the call of conscience, one becomes resolute. “When one owns up to guilt, one becomes resolute.” Resoluteness opens the world and allows for “authentic relationships to others…” Resoluteness does this by accepting the possibilities which are guiding our existence. Specifically, resoluteness involves
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understanding our indebtedness and responsibility and thereby “seizes one’s throwness and interprets it in terms of an explicit choice.” In doing so, one becomes aware of his finitude and is able to act authentically.

Recall, Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* is “extracting something from a given situation.” The phrase denotes two things. The first is that the rhetor is situated. We have explored that notion at length. The second implication is that the rhetor is given the task of doing something with that situation. The rhetor is indebted in the sense that he acknowledges he is in a given time and place with a particular audience. He is responsible in the sense that he must make his argument immediate (kairos). At this point, I am not obliged to say that the practice of rhetoric is an authentic mode of existing. Rather, it seems possible that the rhetor’s situation could illuminate aspects of authentic temporalizing, by owning up to one’s situatedness and projecting a project based upon that situation.

In *The Call of Conscience: Heidegger and Levinas*, Michael Hyde explores the ontological status of the call of conscience. He asserts that rhetoric can be a method of authentic temporalizing. Specifically, he contends that rhetoric gives one the ability to own up to her situation and project the possibilities of her life from that situation. I agree with Hyde that rhetoric does set up the initial conditions of the call of conscience. However, I disagree that it does so through allowing one to articulate their life project. I will now lay out Hyde’s argument as well as my own conclusions.

Regarding the call of conscience, Hyde presents an eye-opening comparison. The call of conscience is a kind of interruption which occurs in everyday life. Hyde likens
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Consider Heidegger’s famous analogy which was cited in chapter 1. One interprets a hammer in the sense that they explicitly lay out the structures which allows a hammer to be seen as a hammer. Now consider Hyde’s analogy: what if the hammer breaks? He characterizes this as an interruption of one’s everyday comportment with the hammer. There is a moment in which the hammer was a hammer, now it is not. What is it now? Hyde likens this to the voice of being in the sense that it is a moment in which the everyday interpretive framework of the hammer, literally and figuratively breaks down, it is disrupted. In the call of conscience, the interpretive frameworks guiding everyday life are interrupted. Once they are broken down, Dasein is momentarily free from everyday modes of disclosure and open to mineness. When the hammer breaks, the everyday engagement with the hammer is interrupted. There is then a moment in which the carpenter is free to interpret it in a more personalized manner. Hyde suggests that at this moment rhetoric is paramount because it gives an individual the necessary tools to develop her life project.

In a practical sense, Hyde contends that the call of conscience can occur on a small scale (a hammer) or on a large scale (a broken political system). Consider the following. Joe the plumber grows up in the United States. The values of the USA constitute his entire interpretive framework. He uses those values to guide his entire existence. He regards the United States as the ultimate mode of disclosure. Now one day the government breaks down and everything is in chaos. He realizes that the system is
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faulty. For Hyde it is at this moment that Joe the plumber is freed from his dominant interpretive framework and able to actualize his mineness in an authentic fashion. At this point, rhetoric, for Hyde, comes in as a way to realize his new life project. In other words, now that the dominant form of interpretation provided by the public is dead, Joe can project his own values. In order to project those values effectively, Joe appeals to rhetoric. For Hyde, rhetoric provides a way to struggle against the they. It provides the possibility that the individual can struggle against the system and win.

Now, I do think that there is value in Hyde’s characterization. However, he and I sharply diverge. First, rhetoric is not (for Heidegger) a way to authentically actualize one’s life project. I say this because Heidegger characterizes rhetoric as an interpretation of everydayness. It is not an interpretation of the authentic. Part of the reason for this, for Heidegger (especially later Heidegger), is that authentic temporalizing is not will-based. It is a being-open. The concept of ‘using’ rhetoric to realize one’s authenticity implies that rhetoric is a tool of the rhetor. That means the mode of existing is not authentic because it is geared around ego.

Consider what Heidegger says about being-open and letting be. For Heidegger, letting-be occurs “when we station ourselves in the storm of Being.”161 In releasement (Gelassenheit), one listens to Being. One does not impose one’s will on beings. Instead, one allows beings to express their essential nature. A human being’s essential nature is determined by her finitude. Ergo, accepting one’s own finitude is letting the essential nature of Dasein be and thus being authentic. Letting be stands in stark contrast to
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representational thinking. Being open begins with “a leap out of the framework (gestell) of representational thinking.” Representative thinking focuses on manipulating, while letting-be allows things to express their essence. It does not force them to occur via an act of will. “At the deepest level, our way of being allows the everyday world to happen—our will does not make it happen.” In doing so, the “golden gleam of the lightning’s invisible shining” can be experienced. The practice of rhetoric is manipulative in the sense that it utilizes common opinions of the public in order to persuade an audience. Resultantly, it seems unlikely that rhetoric would be the proper method for authentically realizing one’s life project.

Is rhetoric valuable at all for disclosing an authentic existence? I contend that it is, for the following reasons. First, rhetoric seeks to lay out the structures of conformity and, as such, it can illuminate which interpretive frameworks are explicitly derived from the public. This is imperative because the call of conscience is a disruption of everydayness. Rhetorical analysis has the capacity to demonstrate which interpretive frameworks are built on common opinion. Therefore, rhetoric can disrupt everydayness by illuminating which modes of disclosure are founded upon inauthenticity.

Secondly, to examine something rhetorically is to assert that it is contingent on a particular audience and therefore also a time and place. A rhetorical interpretation then encourages us to re-examine our opinions and decisions. It is in the authentic mode of existence that one must challenge each decision that they have made. Rhetoric pushes

one into the position of asking “Is this true or have I been swept up by a rhetorical device?”

Now, how does this relate to Hyde? Again consider his hammer analogy. The call of conscience is the moment when the hammer (everyday interpretive framework) breaks. After that, rhetoric is useful in building one’s own authentic existence. I agree with Hyde’s analogy (the call of conscience is the moment when the hammer breaks). For Heidegger, the call of conscience is to “stand in the storm of Being,” which is to experience the disjunction between presence and absence. In other words, it is to stand in the moment in which the interpretive framework is present and then no longer present. In a concrete sense, the hammer was present as a hammer, then suddenly no longer present. Now my contention is the following: rhetoric has the capacity to break the hammer. In other words, it reduces the interpretive framework to nothing. This moment can be further articulated by Heidegger’s notion of the Nothing.

Heidegger’s notion of Nothing is derived from Plato’s notion of Chora. As Lee articulates, “Heidegger transforms Platonic Nothing into what is not present here and now…”165 For Plato, chora is completely antithetical to reason. In other words, it is totally unknowable. However, for Heidegger, Nothing is not unknowable but rather it is simply a what has-been and what is to-come; “by the dexterous hands of Heidegger chora is transformed into Heideggerian absence.”166 To say ‘the water is cold’ does not mean that hot water has vanished. Rather, it means that the water is no longer warm or not yet warm. Similarly, in the winter, one does not believe the summer has completely
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disappeared. Instead, it is known that the summer has ended or has not yet begun. In other words, nothing and being are no longer mutually exclusive binaries. They become necessary compliments to one another. Presence becomes the withdrawal of absence, concealment is the withdrawal of un concealment, and so on.

For Plato, the essence of truth resides in the idea. For Heidegger, the essence of truth is Being. Later, Heidegger conceives of Being as ‘beyng’ in order to illuminate that is both presence and absence. For Plato, chora is the bastardization of truth. For Heidegger, chora, reformulated as Heideggerian absence, is a necessary component of truth. In a particularly apt metaphor Heidegger cites the work of Rilke. In “What Are Poets For,” Heidegger refers to the fullness of Being.\textsuperscript{167} Rilke provides the notion of a globe. The moon is half concealed in darkness and half opened and illuminated. The dark half of the globe can be conceived of as Heideggerian nothing/absence. The dark side of the globe still constitutes the fullness of the moon even though it is concealed. It is absent because it is no longer visible or not yet visible. In other words, only the light and dark sides together, fully constitute the globe. Similarly, only presence and absence taken together constitute the plenitude of Being. For Heidegger, that illuminates the sway of beyng. It becomes the disjunction between presence and absence, the disruption between Being and Nothing. The dark side of the globe may seem completely unknowable. However, in the future it may eventually be disclosed. That metaphor opens Heidegger to multiple modes of disclosure. Conversely, Plato is trapped in a monolithic metaphysics which is not open to alternative methods of unconcealment.

How can rhetoric illuminate the strife between presence and absence? It does so by illuminating the contingency of interpretive frameworks. Consider my previous chapter on the rhetoric of science. To view science rhetorically is to see it as dependent upon an audience and, consequently, a particular culture. It is historically situated. Rhetoric conceives of science as presenting something “at the moment.” Similarly, Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* focuses on kairos, the making immediate of an argument. Rhetoric is concerned with using present public opinion to persuade. But what does this ultimately do? Examining something rhetorically presents interpretive frameworks as something made immediate at a particular moment. The framework can change just as public opinion changes. Consequently, one realizes that her interpretive framework could be absent in the future. It is not atemporal but rather subject to the sway between presence and absence.

As I have stated, rhetoric is not a method for authentically realizing one’s own life project. It cannot do that because to utilize rhetoric to fulfill one’s project is to appeal to an inauthentic mode of being. This is because rhetoric cashes in on everydayness. However, rhetoric is valuable in the sense that it can demonstrate that modes of disclosure are rhetorical. In other words, they rely on everydayness. Thus they are contingent and open to absence even though they may be present.

Rhetoric has the ability to completely destroy the force of a framework concocted by the “they.” Simply, it reveals that the method of disclosure in question relies on common opinion which is usurps mineness. Further, rhetoric makes it clear that methods of disclosure are contingent. They are contingent so long as they exist in a time and
Consider again Joe the Plumber. He views the American way as the only way of Being. But then realizes that the system is laden with all sorts of rhetorical devices. Politicians constantly appeal to emotions, common opinion and metaphor. In acknowledging that the American way is rhetorical, he acknowledges that it is an everyday mode of disclosure. This means that it relies on persuasive techniques which lead to conformity with the public. With that realization, it becomes clear that the American way may have inspired conformity in Joe and usurped his mineness. In doing so, it illuminates the disjunction between the authentic and inauthentic by making it explicit that Joe’s everyday mode of being is inauthentic. In this example, the system does not simply break down but rather it is broken down by rhetoric. This is because the system is recognized as a contingent everyday practice which impedes upon individuality.

Anxious Rhetoric

I contend that the use of rhetoric to unravel inauthentic modes of disclosure is a fundamental starting point for the call of conscience which can then lead to Heidegger’s conception of anxiety. For Heidegger, what is anxiety?

It is important to note the distinction between anxiety and fear. Fear is fear of something. It is fear of an object. Consider Mulhall’s observation: “fear is a response to something specific in the world (a gun, an animal, a gesture).” Conversely, anxiety is objectless. Anxiety is not anxiety about something. Mulhall writes:
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the anxious person is anxious not toward anything in the world...the distinctive oppressiveness of anxiety lies precisely in its not being elicited by anything specific...anxiety confronts Dasein with the knowledge that it is thrown into the world always delivered over to situations of choice and action which matter to it but which it did not itself fully choose or determine.169

In what sense can we say that rhetoric illuminates the knowledge that one is thrown into the world? Recall, rhetoric explicitly interprets throwness in terms of explicitly developing emotions. Emotions are a fundamental component of throwness. Aristotle’s Rhetoric as conceived of by Heidegger is the first systematic hermeneutic of emotions. In other words, rhetoric is also offered as a hermeneutic of throwness itself. Rhetoric makes one aware that they are always subject to emotion, persuasion and conformity. In so doing, one is also aware that one finds themself in a situation which one cannot fully control.

Does rhetoric lead to anxiety? Consider that anxiety is related to being-in-the world in the sense that one does not fully determine his circumstances but is expected to project the possibility of those circumstances. Now, Dasein could exist inauthentically. In other words, one could ignore his responsibility to project those possibilities. He could do so by hiding behind an ideology concocted by the public. In that sense, he hands over his mineness to the masses. His life is in the hands of someone else and he does not even realize it. That is the person who is affected by rhetoric but does not realize that it is rhetoric. In other words, the inauthentic person is moved into opinion by rhetoric but does not understand that her movement is one into conformism. She may believe that her ideas are her own. She believes that she has decided to believe this thing or that thing.
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Instead, she has fallen into everydayness because she has been persuaded by rhetoric. However, she does not experience anxiety because she is not aware she has been given over to a situation which is out of her control. Now, how can awareness of rhetoric illuminate this situation? Recall, anxiety has no object. Instead it is anxiety about oneself and one’s responsibility to make one’s own choices. Knowledge of rhetoric can lead to anxiety through the unraveling of interpretive frameworks. In other words, a rhetorical analysis illuminates when someone has been taken in by a rhetorical device. Resultantly, he realizes that his decisions were not really his own but rather motivated by rhetorical devices cashing in on conformity.

Consider the following example. Tom is a scientologist. Tom structures his entire life around scientology. Then Tom realizes that scientology utilizes rhetorical techniques. How does Tom feel? Would we say Tom is afraid? That does not seem quite right because what would he be afraid of? In lieu of the unraveling of his interpretive framework, Tom is left with Nothing. Tom cannot fear Nothing because fear requires an object and Nothing has no object. So how does he feel? Tom feels anxiety. In the strictest Heidegerrian sense, he feels anxiety because he is forced to confront all the decisions he has made up until then and all the ones he’ll make after. In realizing that scientology is rhetorically constructed, he is forced to ask: “What have I been doing with my life? How did I pour all of this money into something which is just a seductive money-making machine? Where will I go from here? What will I do or believe?” In other words, Tom is forced to authentically consider his choices.
Now, to be fair, Heidegger considers anxiety as a being-toward-death and not only the breakdown of a conceptual scheme; “one’s own Dasein is always already dying, that is, it is in a being-toward-its’-end. And it conceals this fact from itself…” In order to exist authentically, Dasein must understand its death. In other words, Dasein is then fully understood in terms of its finitude. To understand death is to understand your own finitude, which is to understand Dasein. Understanding finitude is understanding that your projection of possibilities is limited. One can only do so many things in a finite existence. Each choice then takes on greater significance. Therefore, it is anxiety and dread that are brought about by an understanding of one’s own finitude which allow for authenticity.

It does sound strange to say that rhetoric opens one up to the possibility of one’s own death. However, it is clear that it can illuminate one’s finitude. In other words, the rhetor acknowledges that he deals in truths which are finite. They are dependent upon a temporal context. It still may not seem that rhetoric really makes one aware of one’s finitude and thus of the Nothing. However, consider that Heidegger also characterizes the Nothing as the absence of a word for Being. For Heidegger, the Nothing cannot be fully grasped in language. “What is the Nothing? Our very first approach to this question has something unusual about it…we posit the nothing in advance as something that ‘is’ such and such; we posit it as a being. But that is exactly what it is distinguished from…” For Heidegger, to conceptualize the Nothing is to miss the point. “For thinking which is always essentially thinking about something, must act in a way contrary

to its own essence when it thinks of nothing.” ¹⁷² In other words, thinking must contradict its essence in engaging the Nothing. For Heidegger, thinking attends to being and searches for “the word through which the truth of being comes to language.” ¹⁷³ However, Nothing is not a ‘being.’ Therefore, experiencing the Nothing must correspond with the absence of language. As Heidegger observes, “One of the essential sites of speechlessness is anxiety in the sense of the horror to which the abyss of the nothing attunes human beings. The nothing, as other than beings, is the veil of being.” ¹⁷⁴ In other words, because language fundamentally discloses beings and the Nothing is “other than beings,” the Nothing may only be experienced in the absence of language. In other words, as a conceptual framework, language cannot capture Being. It seems then that the Nothing can only be experienced in the absence of conceptual frameworks. But what does all of that mean in regard to rhetoric? Throughout this entire thing, it has been heavily emphasized (with a hammer) that rhetoric is the development of contingent truths. Consequently, it has been asserted that to examine something rhetorically is to say that it is contingent because it focuses upon an audience which is situated in a particular time and place. In saying that, one is also saying that the framework is lacking. It is not an ultimate method of disclosure. For example, it leads us to saying that an interpretive framework like Newtonian Mechanics cannot ultimately disclose the nature of Being. Rather, it was only persuasive at a particular time and place. It seems then that rhetoric can illuminate Nothing in the sense that it has the capacity to elaborate the contingency
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and inauthenticity of interpretive frameworks. It can break down conceptual schemes for understanding Being. Although rhetoric cannot put a name to Being, as Hyde proposes, it can illuminate what Being is not. In that sense, it approaches it as a kind of negative theology. Although rhetoric cannot name Being, it can challenge the everyday interpretations which attempt to ensnare it. In doing so, it leaves the question of Being open.
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