

Heideggerian Horizon of Dasein and Technology: A Post-phenomenological Reflection

Jitendra Sabar¹

© *Philogram Research Journal* 2025

Abstract

Heidegger understands the problem of being, in practical sense of the being of man. He calls it problem of Dasein. Dasein is the situated-ness of man in the world for him. Man being in the world is in time and space. Man has horizon i.e., world. This world demonstrates or exposes itself to man for use and his/her actualization. Man in turn needs a 'techne' to use this world as his horizon. Technology plays a mediation to it. Post phenomenology studies on this mediated experience of man in the world to explore his/her horizon. It stresses on Technological mediation of man and its relation to World. This paper analyses the horizon and Man's necessary mediated nature to explore and understand his/her horizon- World. Technological mediation exposes not merely on mediation role but it does shape human understanding of Horizon and his/her authentic living.

Keywords: Authentic, Dasein, Horizon, Mediation, Post-phenomenology, Technology, World

Introduction

Martin Heidegger being inspired by his master Edmund Husserl's Philosophy- Sciences of all sciences (Phenomenology) delves into this realm of philosophizing. His phenomenological discourses differs from his master. He studies phenomenology from the core concept of *Being*. His work *Being and time* (1927) is an exposition of problem of Being. In this work he holds that *Being* has been forgotten from the ancient time onwards and it requires a revisit. Heidegger introduced a word *Dasein* for Being. *Dasein* is being-in-the world. Man being in the world is necessarily situated in the world. His/her horizon is the world. Man actualises and realizes his authenticity in the world itself. This situated-ness of man in the world is temporal. Man being spacio-temporally situated in the world facilitates an existential meaning making process. The meaning seeking and making

¹Jitendra Sabar, Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Ravenshaw University, Odisha.

activity is in and through the horizon- world. World (horizon) is composed of multiples of events, situations, environment, history, socio-cultural dimension, linguistics etc.

The horizon of Dasein in a post-phenomenological context becomes a nuanced through a transformation. Don Ihde, Bruno Latour, and Peter Paul Verbeek like thinkers of Post-phenomenology critiqued the traditional phenomenological understanding of horizon with its transcendental subject. It (post-phenomenology) aligned with Heidegger and expands the horizon of Dasein. It re-situates Dasein's experience with the mediation, technology and embodiment. The paper exhibits this reflection that how the horizon of Dasein is constructed and understood from the post-phenomenological prism. Man and the word relation is mediated by various technologies. The experience of man in the mediated-ness becomes a dynamic and an existence to understand the horizon-world. The paper exposes the study into three sections. The first section deals with the classical conception of Horizon of Dasein, with specific discourse of Heidegger's phenomenology. The second section deals with the Post-phenomenological reflection, enquiring it as a shift or modification. The third section discusses on how post-phenomenology reframes the horizon of Dasein into a nuanced mediated experience with technological aid as concluding framework.

I

The classical conception of horizon has begun with the founder of phenomenology (Edmund Husserl). Husserl's idea of horizon plays a foundational role in his philosophy. The horizon is background to any sort of experience. It is the object of consciousness. Husserl considers that every experience or act of experience (consciousness) is situated within the larger aspects of potential experience. He called this field as *horizon of experience*. His idea of objects (also world as it is meant here) is not fully given to human experience. They are instead intended within the frame work of a broader context. Human perception of any object is always one sided (*Abschattung*). But human is able to apprehend the object as a whole object because of the background context of expectations. This background becomes larger possibility of horizon of experience. As Husserl said:

“Every experience has its horizon; a zone of indeterminacy that surrounds it, a background of familiarity and expectation against which the experienced object stands out.” (Husserl. 144.)

The horizon of experience includes what is perceived now and what is anticipated. It is what has already been perceived in the past and what will be perceived potentially in the future. This horizon facilitates our experience as coherent one. It becomes continuous unfolding of experience. In his idea of *intentionality*, the horizon becomes instrumental in constituting meaning. Objects of intentionality do not remain as just being there. They are to be understood in many ways like temporal and contextual framework.

The world is as understood by the objectivists is pre-given and primary existent. Husserl considers transcendental subjectivity primary. The 'I' subject is the centre and creator of

his own horizon. Subjective ego is horizon. Husserl's conception of horizon is internal and subjective horizon. It is Subjective idealism. As he states in Crisis:

"it is not the being of the world (*Sein der Welt*) as unquestioned, taken for granted, which is primary in itself; ... rather what is primary in itself is subjectivity, understood as that which naïvely pre-gives the being of the world and then rationalizes or (what is the same thing) objectifies it." (Husserl 69)

Heidegger on the other hand derives his master's philosophy but differs in his approach on horizon. His phenomenological approach is existential and hermeneutical. His conception of Horizon is blended with Dasein. For Heidegger horizon is the background for beings. Through this horizon-world Dasein makes meaning for him/herself. For Heidegger Dasein means 'man-in-the world. Dasein of man therefore is being-in-the world. In his work *Being and Time* he exposes What is meant by 'Being-in'? It is the proximal reaction to round out the expression 'Being-in' 'in-the-world'. This 'Being-in' is meant as "being-in something. He instantiates water to understand this, as the water is 'in' the glass. By this 'in' he meant the relationship of Being. The relationship is between two entities extended 'in' space. Here the *Dasein* of man is clear that he and the world is also extended in space. The world poses itself as *Being-present-at-hand*.

It is here he finds itself situated. In this horizon he lives, sustains, creates his own life. Dasein cannot understand beyond or away from this horizon. It is from within this world he understands, dreams, becomes and creates its possibility. The world as horizon of Dasein is not mere spatial location but its temporality, linguist, social and cultural field for meaning making. Heidegger points this as *Dasein's facticity*. This facticity is *Being-in-the-world*. It has always dispersed into definite ways of Being-in. The dasein's facticity is expressed in multiplicity or multiple ways. For instance, producing something, attending something, and looking after it, making use of something, giving something up, and letting it go, understanding, accomplishing, evincing, interrogating, considering, discussing, determining. All these kind are ways of 'Being- In'. It is *in the world*, in which Dasein is able to showcase all these. The world for man is possibility for his facticity.

The discourse of Horizon is explicit in his work of *Being and Time*. In this work Heidegger refers the word horizon as the background or field of understanding. Within this background Man (Dasein) interprets its existence. World is the horizon where Dasein is situated. And this is not a boundary. It is neither fixed one and a limit for human. It is a dynamically open spot. The world facilitates the Dasein to relate other beings. And it consistently interprets its meaning in being-in-the-world. Here only the Dasein understands its temporality. It shapes itself. It choses from choices available and moves towards the future (death). As he says Dasein-being-in-the-world is always a reminder of death. Birth of man is an anticipation of death. The horizon is known from the Dasein's understanding of being-in-the-world (being situated in the world). This is its world hood. The world in which it is, is not constructed by it but is disclosed. As Heidegger (1927) states again- "*The essence of Dasein lies in its existence.*" (Heidegger 67)

*The essence of Dasein is known and seen from its being in the world. The essence of Dasein is constituted of man-being-in-the world. Being-in-the world necessitates Dasein a meaningful whole. It has to exist in order to actualize or realize its essence. The world as horizon of Dasein, exhibits itself to man as his/her space for realization or actualization. In this horizon it encounters multiplicities of settings. The world becomes a spatial condition for essence creation. In the multiplicities of settings of world-horizon, one of the most dynamic settings of the current world (modern world) scenario is technological advancement and use. In this modern era of technological and scientific development humans have elevated themselves to seek the real/ truth by these. Technology in particular has helped human instrumentally to discover the world. In essence making and seeking of Dasein, in the world encounters with a technology that is instrumental for its wholesome. Technology becomes an extension or medium for human. Technology and human therefore should have a meaningful and cordial relationship. As he systematically exposes in his work *The Question Concerning Technology*:*

“We shall be questioning concerning *Technology*, and in so doing we should like to prepare a free relationship to it (Heidegger 3).

Technology does play a role of instrument for human activity and essence making. But technology has its own essence too. Technology has to be understood from its instrumentality. To understand this Heidegger questions the technology as, how does it relate to human? How it is related to comprehending world-horizon? How should be the user (Dasein-man) and used (instrument- technology) relation? It can be strenuous relation or free relation. What is necessary condition for free relationship? Heidegger says, ‘The relationship will be free, if it opens our human existence to the essence of technology’ (Heidegger 3). Heidegger points that the technology and human relation can be known from two aspects. As every person would conceive it off, as a means and an activity. It is a means for a purpose or end. And activity as it has been used as means in human activities. He puts it as:

“When we ask what it is, everyone knows the two statements that answer our question. One says: Technology is a means to an end. The other says: Technology is a human activity (Heidegger 4). “For to posit ends and procure and utilize the means to them is a human activity (Heidegger 4).

Further we see that technology becomes not only mere means and human activity. It demonstrates its own essence. What is its essence? Its essence is not on the entire being of its instrumentation. In human activity technology presence itself. This *presencing*, was not at the initial stage. It is from *poiesis* (stability) to the bringing forth. Heidegger says, ‘Every occasion for whatever passes over and goes forward into presencing from that which is not presencing is *poiesis*, is bringing forth’ (Heidegger 10).

This bringing forth of technology happens from the occasioning (due process of four causes- causality). This occasioning assists to presencing. Pressencing makes possible the bringing-forth. Bringing forth is what, when something *concealed* is *unconcealed*. This unconcealment of technology is what Heidegger calls *Revealing*. In his line:

“Occasioning has to do with the presencing of that which at any given time

comes to appearance in bringing –forth. Bringing –forth brings hither out of concealment forth into unconcealment. Bringing-forth comes to pass only so far as something concealed comes into unconcealment. This coming, rests and moves freely within what we call revealing” (Heidegger 11).

The revealing aspect of modern technology possesses a character of challenging forth. It is seen from the unlocking of energy concealed in nature. In his example of Rhine river hydroelectric plant, he exposes this sort of frame work. This challenging forth becomes challenging revealing when it is regulated and secured everywhere. The revealing rules modern technology by setting-upon a challenging forth. The challenging happens from the un-concealment of concealed. Un-concealment is transformed to storing up, in turn it is distributed, and again it is switched to anew. Heidegger says, ‘revealing never simply comes to an end...even becomes the chief characteristics of the challenging revealing’ (Heidegger 16).

The challenging revealing is *ordering, standingreserve, monotonous* and therefore oppressive. This way modern technology reveals real. This real is revealed as standing-reserve. It is again accomplished by someone or something. This is man. Man by his different way of being makes technology for his use. But technology by its nature of unconcealment shows itself and withdraws. As Heidegger puts it:

“Who accomplishes the challenging setting upon through which what we call the real is revealed as standing-reserve? Obviously man. To what extend is man capable of such revealing? Man can indeed conceive, fashion, and carry through this or that in one way or another. But man does not have control over unconcealment itself, in which at any given time the real shows itself or withdraws” (Heidegger 18).

Man participates in this technological revealing and he also seems of becoming a standing-reserve by becoming part of the nature or natural resources ready to be exploited and used. But man is not challenged and transformed to standing-reserve. Instead he takes part in ordering to reveal truth. He takes forward the technology. However the unconcealment is beyond man’s work or activity. Man participates in this process of unconcealment of technology. But he never becomes part or transformed of standing reserve. Man takes part in revealing aspect of technology. Man to actualize himself instruments technology and through this he participates in revealing aspect of technology. But, Heidegger contends that the unconcealment itself, within which ordering unfolds, is never a human handiwork. Here in this realm man passes every time as a subject relating to an object (Heidegger 18).

How does man participate with technology in revealing its nature? Is it a mere subject-object encounter? Is it pure instrumentation of technology for human goal? It is not in certain. Man finds him in the process of unconcealment and him fits whenever technology calls forth in to the modes of revealing.

“When man, in his way, from within unconcealment reveals that which

presences, he merely responds to the call of unconcealment even when he contradicts it. Thus when man, investigates, observing, ensnares nature as an area of his own conceiving, he has already been claimed by a way of revealing that challenges him to approach nature as an object of research, until even the object disappears into the objectlessness of standing-reserve" (Heidegger 19).

The role of man in standing-reserve is to act as a revealer of that truth. He orders the self-revealing as standing-reserve. This is called *enframing* (*Ge-stell*). Heidegger means it as the gathering together of that setting-upon which sets upon man, challenges him forth, to reveal the real, in the mode of ordering, as standing-reserve. In this sort of *enframing* technology becomes or reveals something unknown. Technology transforms into the essence of modern technology. And in this *enframing* of technology is itself nothing technological. (Heidegger 20)

The enframing contains the essence of technology. It opens up the possibility. Through unconcealment and revealing it lights up the real. The real that is revealed is a destined one. So modern technology is progressively becoming with its enframing nature. Technology now at this juncture is not mere instrumentation or ready at hand of man. But it destined to reveal a new. In the world of horizon therefore an open space for technology to reveal a new. It may bring new challenges ahead for social, economic and political conditions alone with cultural and linguistic realm of man. This enframing is concealed in some way that it is not understood in clear form. Enframing becomes a danger. It turns into concealed. What is the response or role of man then? How does it be in the world- horizon?

"It stills Being into the coming to presence of world. May world in its worlding be the nearest of all nearing that nears, as it brings the truth of Being near man's essence and so gives man to belong to the disclosing bringing-to-pass that is bringing into its own" (Heidegger 49).

The world is where man is in. He creates his history. He creates it, in and through the availability of different set ups. Technology plays a mediated role from the anthropological perspective in this process. But, again it is not limited to a state of revealing and enframing. By this condition man is instrumenting technology for actualization. And being in the world to explore for meaning making is challenging revealing with enframing. This discloses the undisclosed but still remains concealed. The essence of man and the essence of technology somewhat go hand in hand. The world plays a role of horizon of *Dasein*. World as a horizon of *Dasein* expands itself to its limitlessness. As man searches his/her essence to actualization and authenticity it encounters an unlimited horizon. Through this realization he/she encounter her/himself as an entity of finitude and contingency. *Dasein's* contingency is that situated-ness in the world (horizon) at the particular time and space. Its expansion is limited by this space and time conditions. Spatial-temporality of man makes to understand the *thrown-ness* to the world. It is here he/she needs to make use of it. In the modern era where technology

in particular with scientific temperament explores its essence and meaning making. Today technology is a boon that instruments man in the being-in-the-world. It creates his/her possibility of becoming. At same time it (techne) challenges man in the being-in-the-world. Therefore technology gives more power to act. It is affecting the human life (as seen from the sociological frame work).

This sort of encounter between man and technology in the word (horizon) becomes a critical and new way of being. Whereby they can co-constitute. Moreover it becomes under the purview of human instrumentality for being-in-the-world. It requires a rigorous process of enquiry and questioning. As Heidegger questions and discovers the enframing and challenging revealing nature of technology. And how Dasein (man) can respond in response to technology and his/her situated-ness to world to discover essence. The most importantly how does man relate to world? How does man understand world? What is the role of Technology in understanding the world?

These aspects of necessary enquiry need a fundamental understanding concerning man-technology relation to know the world (experience of the world which is a horizon of Dasein). This sort of questions and phenomenological enquiry pertinently dealt in the post-phenomenology.

II

Post-phenomenology has its foundation from the phenomenology itself. And it is a phenomenological enquiry of reality from the subjectivity just as Husserl the founder has initiated. But Post-phenomenology has a shift in many aspects of perception. What does post-phenomenology state as anew or shift from the traditional phenomenology? Is it different from the phenomenology (traditional)? What and which way does it make a shift of its philosophizing? How does it address the discourse of *Dasein's horizon*? Before all of these, what post-phenomenology as such is?

Post-phenomenology is a phenomenological style of doing philosophy. It studies the phenomenon from the questions of the purity of experience as in traditional phenomenology. By its nature and characteristics of philosophizing it can be said that it is a branch of phenomenology. But its shift and orientation lies from the methodical shift and from the phenomenon of its interest and enquiry. Post-phenomenology studies on the experiences of the world not as a given. It studies as it is mediated by technologies. It blends phenomenology with pragmatism. Therefore post-phenomenology is concerned with the existential and hermeneutical dispositions of man in the world.

“What I am after with the formula “pragmatism+phenomenology= post phenomenology” comes from recent observation made by Carl Mitcham”
(Ihde 117)

Post-phenomenology studies the horizon of Dasein from the mediated sphere. How man actualizes or discovers the horizon with the mediation of technology? How it helps man to understand the reality where he/she is situated to in and through the

technologies? Man in-the-world is multifaceted. World opens itself to be known or exposes or reveals. How man encounters and discovers is the important question for post-phenomenology. Through the technology man explores the multidimensionality of world-horizon. The shift occurs here with the technological mediation. Mediation in response brings forth many ways of relational aspect between man and technology. What ultimately depicts is, man is related to the world from pure subjectivity. But it is exposed with the multiplicity of subjectivity. Man in the world is an embodied being. It is not in isolation of body and mind as separate. This embodied experience of man in the world (horizon) becomes a complex multiplicity. In this complex realm of multiplicity man has to make a choice to understand and search for meaning. Don Ihde understands the shift from subjective idealism to multistability and embodied relations of man to the world, with the perception of mediation or mediated perception. Here perception and being are entangled with *techne*, i.e., tools, artefacts and other cultural aspects of man. Postphenomenology expresses *man-technology-world* as a right combination of its main objective of study. Man and his life world can be properly understood from the mediation of technology. This sort of study shifted the main interests of phenomenology (traditional) to technological meditation theory of Dasein's horizon. It shifted to the ideation of relational ontology, i.e., the constitution of the self is through technological relations. And it has also shifted to decentralized subjectivity- distributive agency (no central Dasein but hybrid subjectivity connected with networks).

Don Ihde in his work, *Technics and Praxis: A Philosophy of Technology*, talks about two distinct ideas of philosophy, idealist and materialist who deal on technology. The idealists would theoretically look at the technology and the materialist see it as applied science. He describes his phenomenology with mediated understanding, i.e., human-technology-world relations. He based his phenomenology with various experiments of technology such as computers, other electrical gadgets. This experimental implication of technology is applied to phenomenological approaches initiated by Heidegger. From rigorous phenomenological reference, he differentiates the technologies. The technologies that extend and embody human experiences and those that need a hermeneutical understanding (Mitcham 29).

In the book *Technology and Lifeworld: from Gardern to Earth*(1990) Ihde explores, how phenomenology of technology can be framed? What is lifeworld? How does technology and lifeworld relate? Unlike the Heidegger's philosophy (*Being and Time*) shows human existence is (Dasein) spatial-temporally within the world. Within this world various forms of human-world relations occur. Ihde suggests a relativistic approach to this relation between man and world (expressed as man-world). He speaks of five relations. He symbolizes the relation as: I Relation.....world (I - world). This relation embodied with technology,becomes a different set up. As it can expressed, I- embodied tech - the world. For example 'glasses', the relation would become a mediated one. The mediation furthers different relations, among them are, *man and world*, *man and technology*, and *man*

through technology and world. The symbolic expression follows like this, for the first relation *I – world*, *I – technology--world*, and *(I-glasses) – World*. The first relation is direct relation i.e., *Man-world*. And it has been discussed in traditional phenomenology from subjective perspective. The second relation is mediated relation. Man and world relation is mediated by technology. The third relation depicts the Man-technology and world relation is embodied relation. The embodied relation shows that the glasses become part of the man as he experiences the world. Ihde says:

“My glasses become part of the way I ordinarily experience my surroundings; they “withdraw” and barely noticed, if at all. I have then actively embodied the technics of vision. Technics is the symbiosis of artefact and user within a human action (Ihde 73).

This sort of relation is not limited to few technologies. It can be any technology that facilitates the meditational and conjoining role of man in his activities of perceiving the world. As Ihde puts, ‘Embodiment relations, however, are not at all restricted to visual relations. They may occur for any sensory or micro perceptual dimension’ (73).

Another sort of relation is proposed by Ihde known as hermeneutic relation. At this relation technology plays a role of an object which is used as an instrument. This relation is depicted as *I - (technology world)*. In this relation technology plays a role of interpretation. It becomes the part of world process and depicts its meaning in a certain way in a context.

“Hermeneutic relations maintain the general mediation position of technologies within the context of human praxis towards the world, but they also change the variables within the human-technology-world relations” (98)

Alterity relation is another sort of relation that Ihde speaks of. This relation is of subject-subject relation. Here he proposes a different set up for man and technology relation. He speaks of a possibility, that technology can become a subject. The object role of technology disappears at this juncture of relations. He derives the word from Emmanuel Levinas. Levinas means by alterity, a radical difference of the human (subject) with another human (subject). Ihde reflects it in line with the Levinian alterity but restricts it in the frame work of human-technology analysis. Technologies can become the other. If they become the other then how do they be? Do they act as humans do? If not then, how could technology be called the other like human? Even if they act is it a necessary condition to attribute them as others? However, Ihde demonstrates systematically this sort of relations. In his own words:

“At the heart of this question lies a whole series of well recognized but problematic interpretations of technologies. On the one side lies the familiar problem of anthropomorphism, the personalisation of artifacts. This range of anthropomorphism can reach from serious artefact-human analogues to trivial and harmless affections for artifacts” (Ihde 98).

He gives AI as an instance of the *alterity* relation. AI functions as human-like intelligence and it can be contemporary anthropomorphism. Another example he gives of this

understanding is about the religious object. This object does not simply refer to some spiritual entity away from the spatial temporality of the world. It is endowed with sacredness within the spatio-temporality and with an efficacy. In this relation technology plays a role of another subject or quasi other and world as background. This is symbolized as: I- technology-(-world).

The last relation he speaks of is background relations. Technology plays a role of background. The technology turns to a near-technological environment itself. It becomes a world of itself or for human. In the context of home for example he gives are lighting, heating and cooling system. This sort of technology hardly plays a frontier line rather it remains at the background. He points two things in this relation. The first is the absence of transparency and opacity in the relation. It acts as an absence.

“The machine activity in the role of background presence is not displaying either what I have termed a transparency and opacity. The “withdrawal” of this technological function is phenomenological distinct as a kind of absence” (Ihde 109).

The second aspect he speaks of his the external environment that facilitates the relation but they are un-recognized. This sort of technologies does play a role of background. “Another form of background relation is associated with various modalities of the technologies that serve to insulate humans from and external environment. Clothing is a borderline case” (Ihde 110).

After these discourses on different relations of man-technology-world, Ihde explores on to the *Horizon*. *Horizon* is a phenomenon that in which we discuss the various relations. As Heidegger considers this is the horizon in which man seeks his/he authenticity, essence and makes meaning of his life. This is the boundary of phenomenology. Ihde considers the traditional understanding of the horizon as limited concept. He contends that horizon can be indicated by many ways. As the technological advancement is in continuity the human and technology relation also continues. It brings fort different set up of being with, being in and being at. This sort of being of man in the world as Heidegger says may expand its horizon. But the technological relations of man and world definitely frame certain outlook of horizon. Ihde articulates as:

Horizons belong to the boundaries of the experienced environmental field. And whether we refer to a kind of inner horizon (the fringes of embodiment) or the external horizon (ultimate form of texturing that a specific technological culture may take), the result is the atmosphere (Ihde 114).

III

The post phenomenological approach of technological mediation and relation has sparked various philosophical conception. Especially in the study of post-phenomenology and philosophy of technology. From the five relations of man-technology and world relation, Don Ihde gives a sense of technological inclination. And it

unravels the un-alienation for modern man to experience the horizon. Dasein's horizon from this lense opens a drastically different conception of the world-horizon. Here the technology, man, and technological being will be in their utmost actualization. The mutual and an ordered stance of being are in urgent need. With this framework of Post-phenomenology Peter- Paul Verbeek tries to expose a moral dimension of being. In his book *Moralizing Technology: Understanding and Designing the Morality of Things* (2011), explores on the possibility of ethical discourse on technology or possibility of ethics of technology. He show cases the different relations established by Ihde to a perspective of enquiry to find out the ethical and moral consideration. Verbeek points it:

"The postphenomenological approach makes it possible to move beyond the modernist subject-object dichotomy in two distinct ways. First of all, Ihde shows the necessity of thinking in terms of human technology associations rather than approaching human subjects and technological objects as separate entities. If the fundamental intertwining of humans and technologies is not taken into account of, the relations between human beings and reality cannot be understood. Second human-world relationships should not be seen as realities between pre-existing subjects who perceive and act upon a pre-existing world of objects, but rather as sites where both the objectivity of the world and the subjectivity of those who are experiencing it and existing in it are constituted" (Verbeek 2011).

The modern technologies challenge the human in the horizon and environment. By demonstrating different set of enframing and revealing. But in turn Dasein adapts and channels the technologies accordingly. The horizon of it tends to actualization and realization of essence. It frames ethical consideration on technologies. In this way the technology is not a danger to man, rather a scope for self-actualization in most optimistic way. For instance AI technology today, it has raised multiple opportunities and challenges. It has opened a greater horizon for man in his thinking, action, and futuristic endeavour. AI facilitates a greater ease for human tasks like, in the academic research, in data analysis, and in computing. It has brought ease with a time saver opportunity. The possibility of human horizon becomes more progressive in this sense. It also gives a sort of human extension. AI as an instrument for human actualization becomes meaningful. But it has concerns in privacy, dependency and autonomy. At the outset of all, the meditational understanding of technology becomes always a co-constitutive and Dasein (situated man) plays vitally central role with greater autonomy with control and ethical framework.

The current study has its limitation. The study limits to ideation of technology from specific personalities like Martin Heidegger, Don Ihde and Peter Paul Verbeek. For the nuanced and lucid understanding, the other contemporary thinkers are not considered to strengthen or weaken the ideation of the concern.

Works Cited

- Hakhamanesh, Z. "Heideggerian Phenomenology." *Horizons of Phenomenology: Essays on the State of the Fields and Its Application*, edited by J. Yoshimi, P. Walsh, and P. Lond, Springer, 2023, pp. 107-121.
- Heidegger, Martin. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Translated by William Lovitt, Harper & Row, 1977.
- Husserl, Edmund. *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. 1970.No. 45, pp. 144.
- Ihde, Don. *Technology and the Lifeworld: From Garden to Earth*. Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Ihde, Don. *Experimental Phenomenology: Multistabilities*. 2nd ed., State University of New York Press, 2012.
- Ihde, Don. *Technics and Praxis: A Philosophy of Technology*. Reidel, 1979.
- Mitcham, Carl. "From Phenomenology to Pragmatism." *Postphenomenology: A Critical Companion to Ihde*, edited by Evan Selinger, State University of New York Press, 2006, pp. 21-33.
- Schussler, Arne E. "From Dasein to the Posthuman, Or toward a Rhizomatic-Coexistence-in-an-Open-World." *Journal of Posthuman Studies*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2022, pp. 151-167.
- Verbeek, Peter P. *Moralizing Technology: Understanding and Designing the Morality of Things*. University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Philogram or its licensor (e.g., a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.