

Eder Soares Santos  
Paths of Science of Man in Heidegger

Edited by  
Hans Rainer Sepp

## Editorial Board

Suzi Adams · Adelaide | Babette Babich · New York | Kimberly Baltzer-Jaray · Waterloo, Ontario | Damir Barbarić · Zagreb | Marcus Brainard · London | Martin Cajthaml · Olomouc | Mauro Carbone · Lyon | Chan Fai Cheung · Hong Kong | Cristian Ciocan · București | Ion Copoeru · Cluj-Napoca | Renato Cristin · Trieste | Eddo Evink · Groningen | Matthias Flatscher · Wien | Dimitri Ginev · Sofia | Jean-Christophe Goddard · Toulouse | Andrzej Gniazdowski · Warszawa | Ludger Hagedorn · Wien | Seongha Hong · Jeollabukdo | Edmundo Johnson · Santiago de Chile | René Kaufmann · Dresden | Vakhtang Kebuladze · Kyjiw | Dean Komel · Ljubljana | Pavlos Kontos · Patras | Kwok-ying Lau · Hong Kong | Mette Lebeck · Maynooth | Nam-In Lee · Seoul | Monika Małek · Wrocław | Balázs Mezei · Budapest | Viktor Molchanov · Moskwa | Liangkang Ni · Hangzhou | Cathrin Nielsen · Frankfurt am Main | Ashraf Noor · Jerusalem | Karel Novotný · Praha | Markus Ophälders · Verona | Luis Román Rabanaque · Buenos Aires | Rosemary Rizo-Patrón de Lerner · Lima | Kiyoshi Sakai · Tokyo | Javier San Martín · Madrid | Alexander Schnell · Paris | Marcia Schuback · Stockholm | Agustín Serrano de Haro · Madrid | Tatiana Shchytsova · Vilnius | Olga Shparaga · Minsk | Michael Staudigl · Wien | Georg Stenger · Wien | Silvia Stoller · Wien | Ananta Sukla · Cuttack | Toru Tani · Kyoto | Detlef Thiel · Wiesbaden | Lubica Ucnik · Perth | Pol Vanderveelde · Milwaukee | Chung-chi Yu · Kaohsiung | Antonio Zirion · México City – Morelia.

The *libri nigri* series is edited at the Central-European Institute of Philosophy, Prague.  
[www.sif-praha.cz](http://www.sif-praha.cz)

Eder Soares Santos

Paths of Science of Man  
in Heidegger

Verlag Traugott Bautz GmbH

*Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek*

Die deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation  
in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie.  
Detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet abrufbar über  
<http://dnb.ddb.de>



UNIVERSIDADE  
ESTADUAL DE LONDRINA



For the support, I thank the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), the National Postdoctoral Scholarship Program (PNPD), the Postgraduate Philosophy Program (PPGFIL-UEL) and the State University of Londrina (UEL).

Verlag Traugott Bautz GmbH  
D-99734 Nordhausen 2019

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier  
Alle Rechte vorbehalten  
Printed in Germany

ISBN 978-3-95948-459-6

To Benjamin, my beloved son



# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	9
Introduction	10
The <i>Black Notebooks</i> and their Relationship with the <i>Daseinsanalyse</i>	11
Heidegger's Being-historical Anti-Semitism	12
Relighting the Fire	18
Reverberation and Philosophical Narrative	22
Chapter I	
Clash with Science	28
Early reviews: science in the strict Sense	30
Philosophy as a Science of the Existential	30
Science of Being	32
Philosophy separated from Science	35
The "mathematical" Project of Science	39
The Exactness of Science	41
Science deals with the Real	44
Science in the Sphere of Technology	46
Two paths for Science	49
Chapter II	
Variations on the Concept of Man	55
From the "Man" to Dasein	55
Dasein, a Privileged Being	57
A Look at the Existential Structures of Dasein	58
Dasein in Man	61
Man: Being-with-the-other	63
Man Builder of the World	65
Paths in a Desert	66

Retrieve as the Revolt of Man	69
Signs of Violence	72
The Decision of Man	73
The Will to Will of Man	75
 Chapter III	
Science of Man: First Paths	79
Didactics of Thinking	81
The Role of Fundamental Ontology	83
The Failure of Sciences	84
Measuring and Calculating in Science	86
Research on Man	88
Involvement as a Method	90
Searching for a Path	91
Getting involved as a Method	92
Daseinsanalyse	93
Research according to Dasein	96
The Co-belongig of Da-sein and Man	97
Structural Presuppositions of Daseinsanalyse	99
The Contribution of Medard Boss	101
Two Paths to the Science of Man	103
 Chapter IV	
Daseinsanalyse as a Meditative Therapy for the Transformation of Man	107
Science of Experience: Applied Psychoanalysis of Winnicott	112
 Conclusion	128
 Bibliography	133
 About the Author	141



# Acknowledgments

The publication of this book became possible thanks to the commitment of my dear friend Dr. Giovanni Jan Giubilato. I am very grateful for the fellowship and for the good work we have done together.

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Hans Rainer Sepp for his kindness and willingness to establish new bridges between our research interests.

I thank Prof. Dr. Peter Trawny for the time I was under his supervision in Wuppertal and for his willingness to the openly discuss of themes worked on in this book.

I thank Lara Nogaard for reading the first draft of this book and for her precious reading advices.

I thank the friends who bring joy in my solitary days of textual production, Alessandro Iorio, Anna Luiza Coli, Ahad Parahmadian.

I greatly thank my friends Henry Burnett, Fabiana, and their children for offering me holding, when I needed.

I thank Heveliza for allowing new possibilities for me.

Special thanks to Renata and Benjamin for accepting and understanding the need for my absence.

Thanks to National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) for funding my postdoctoral research (2015-2016) that gave rise to this book.

## Introduction

“Science of Man” [*Wissenschaft vom Menschen*] is a term used by Heidegger in his *Zollikon Seminars*. However, we may at least assume that he was not referring to pure and simple anthropology. On the one hand, he had been harshly criticizing anthropology as a positive science since the publication of his famous book *Being and Time* and on the other hand, he had always been critical towards modern science, from his early writings to his last works, calling it a kind of mathematical projection of the world. In addition, the concept of “man” goes through several changes in his writings, and was understood first as “Dasein” in *Being and Time*, then as “Dasein in man” and later, “Dasein” and “man” are found in his writings, as well as the need for the transformation of the latter through the former.

“Science of Man” in the *Zollikon Seminars* was meant to serve as the foundations of the *Daseinsanalyse* to develop a new kind of psychoanalytic therapy designed by Heidegger and to be implemented by Medard Boss. The present research aims to investigate the scope of the *Daseinsanalyse* as a model for a science of man in order to show that this kind of “science” could follow the paths of serenity or experience, producing two different kinds of therapy one turn to transformation of man into Da-sein and another turn into a man suffering under ontic problems. However, to achieve that purpose, we will have to find out how Heidegger defines “science”, “man”, “anthropology” and “science of man” itself.

I do not intend to conduct a thorough investigation of any of these concepts, but to go as far as needed to be able to draw the scope and limits of a science of man as a basis for a *Daseinsanalyse*. In addition, I would like to suggest here that we could find out in an ontic therapy, like the psychoanalysis of Winnicott, a good example of how could works very well a *daseinsanalytic* approach.

However, before continue, we have a task to solve. Taking into account the publication of the *Black Notebooks* (2014), we feel that it will not be possible to work with Heidegger's philosophy without taking up a stance on the matter. In relation to the subject of this book, the discussion with the *Black Notebooks* is purely methodological. These *Notebooks* were written in a period of Heidegger's thought in which is – it is fair to say - also localized the discussion on Daseinsanalyse. It means after the *turn* [*Kehre*]. There is criticism that Heidegger's writings would be contaminated by anti-Semitic positions. Therefore, in order to advance this research we need to say how to tackle this methodological problem and what will be my reading position in this debate.

### *The Black Notebooks and their Relationship to the Daseinsanalyse*

Freudian psychoanalysis was long considered a “business of Jews”, because in the beginning, the physicians interested in psychoanalysis - such as Freud himself - were Jews<sup>1</sup>. It is not without reason that Freud were optimistic for Jung - a non-Jew in the group - who, he thought, could help change that image and continue his science. Although some studies show that his theoretical and psychoanalytical constructs are connected to his Jewish origin<sup>2</sup>, Freud himself always dealt with his findings as a scientist<sup>3</sup>.

It is used to consider Heidegger's philosophy after the turn, his permanent concern with the history of Being, the technicization of the world, and the need for transformation of today's man into Da-sein. As result, one might think that the Daseinsanalyse arises as a legitimate and clear philosophical path to reach Beyng<sup>4</sup> by means of a therapeutic process. Notwithstanding, the publication of the *Black Notebooks*, which reveal the darker side<sup>5</sup> of Heidegger's philosophy, forces us to rethink the role of the Daseinsanalyse in it. “Dark side” does not mean that his philosophy features a good side and a bad one or a correct way and a wrong one. Just as the dark side of the moon

---

1 See Fuks, 1999 and also Roudinesco, 2009. For all references, I use the form: Author, year, page number, except for Heidegger's works, which are quoted as follows: “Heidegger, GA, page number”. For *Being and Time*, I use the following edition: *Sein und Zeit*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2001.

2 See Frosh, 2004.

3 See Santos, 2010.

4 I use “Being” to translate Sein, “being” for Seiende and “Beyng” for Seyn.

5 On the suspicion of a shadow on the philosophy of Heidegger, see: Janicaud, 1990.

belongs to it, although we could not see it before the advances in space research, so do something in Heidegger's philosophy is unclear; especially his clearly anti-Semitic comments. Now it belongs to his philosophy. It was there, whether we like it or not. However, only now are we able to see that clearly, because he himself authorized them to be published in the final sequence of his complete works<sup>6</sup>. We now need to think philosophically about the resulting issues.

In addition, another fundamental issue has come up that is even more serious for those who are directly involved with his work or make use of it to discuss other issues, as in our case, philosophy of psychoanalysis. We need to find out how to read and how to use that philosophy after the publication of the *Notebooks*. Although the problem now takes on a new dimension, it has existed since the publication of *Being and Time*, since that work has also required rethinking western philosophy. The problem arises again not only because we need to rethink philosophy from its foundations, but also because we need to rethink Heidegger's own path in philosophy.

In an attempt to tackle those issues, I will first take up the two theses, as suggested by the editor of the *Black Notebooks*, Peter Trawny, one of Being-historical anti-Semitism and other of contamination of Heidegger's thought. I will then present the opinions of some commentators in favor and against those theses. Finally, I will describe my own position, arguing that it is not just about contamination – which requires to make that concept more explicit and develop it –, but also about a kind of reverberation that affects Heidegger's writings at the time he writes his *Notebooks*, such as the *Zollikon Seminars*. From my point of view, Heidegger filtered, somehow, those writings to prevent a cancerous and destructive effect on the use we might make of that material. That does not make the declarations of the *Black Notebooks* less painful or acceptable; it only shows that we still can deal with his philosophy.

### *Heidegger's Being-historical Anti-Semitism*

Peter Trawny published *Heidegger und der Mythos der jüdischen Weltverschwörung* in 2014. In his book, he discusses the most controversial

---

6 Many authors, each one in his own way, have already spoken about this side; see Levinas, 1963; Farias, 1987; Derrida, 1987; Lyotard, 1988; Faye, 2005.

passages of the *Black Notebooks*. He tries to interpret these writings and supports the thesis that 1) the anti-Semitic statements can be characterized as “being-historical anti-Semitism” and that 2) therefore; these anti-Semitic statements reveal a contamination of Heidegger’s philosophy.

The *Black Notebooks* are composed of 34 black-covered notebooks written between 1930 and 1970, in which Heidegger expresses his private thoughts, classifying them as follows: *Reflections*, *Observations*, *Four Notebooks*, *Hints and Provisionals*, in addition to *Vigils* and *Nocturne*. From that series, *Reflections-I* is missing, which was not found in his estate<sup>7</sup>. These notebooks were included into the volumes 94, 95, 96 and 97 of the complete works published by Vittorio Klostermann.

Different from many of Heidegger’s writings that resemble tractates, the *Black Notebooks* contain aphorisms that range from short to long ones and sometimes take the form of small essays. A wide range of subjects is discussed, such as language, word, truth, science, Being and being, all of which are familiar to his readers. What are new here are both his anti-Semitic comments and how these familiar subjects relate to those statements.

The language of the *Notebooks* is almost incomprehensible and features a range of most obscure and unintelligible passages. It including an attempt at poetic writing, dealing with known themes such as those that had already been published in the *Contributions to Philosophy* [*Beiträge zur Philosophie*], peaking in distilling bile humor against everything and everyone (the Americans, the British, the French, the Bolsheviks, the Jews)<sup>8</sup>. The few who escape from his philosophical daggers are the Germans and the Russians<sup>9</sup>.

Although those notes and statements were meant to be private, Trawny does not regard them as mere notes: “these are elaborated philosophical writings”<sup>10</sup>. As Heidegger himself had declared his aversion to publicity<sup>11</sup>, one could ask what role his “public” writings play, i.e., those intended to philosophical contribution, and what role that private philosophical elaboration

---

7 Cf. Trawny, 2015, p. 13.

8 Heidegger, GA 96, pp. 235, 243.

9 Heidegger, GA 96, pp. 257-258.

10 Trawny, 2015, p. 14.

11 “Alles in die Öffentlichkeit zerren — d. h. jedes wirkliche Dasein vernichten”. To drag everything into the public, i.e., annihilate any real Dasein. Heidegger, GA 94, p. 158.

plays on the totality of his work. Where is expressed Heidegger's philosophy, actually?

The Being-historical anti-Semitism seems to be motivated by the search for a history of Being in its truth that Heidegger begins after 1930, as he realized that *Being and Time* was still insufficient to answer the *Seinsfrage*. That history of Being extends between the beginning and the end of philosophy and the need to think once and for all a new beginning. The beginning of philosophy is Greek, its end is the machination in its technical essence, its new start the appropriative event [*Ereignis*].

The “truth” of these events is not based on any theory of truth, not even on truth as unveiling, *alétheia*. It is found in the told, i.e., in the narrative itself<sup>12</sup>. Since the narrative itself can be coherent and consistent with what is said, it arises as truth that realizes itself in the ears of the listener or in the spirit of those who read it. Neither philosophy, nor truth, exists any longer. There is a story that has a beginning, an end, and there is hope to find another beginning.

Every good story requires a powerful enemy. Machination, as the result of modern technology [*Technik*] fits that role. The enemy, machination, is revealed in its different forms: Imperialism, Christianity, Protestantism, Americanism, and Judaism<sup>13</sup>. Those able to propel the new beginning are the Germans backed by an “intellectual and spiritual National Socialism” that, unlike the “vulgar National Socialism” practiced by Hitler and his minions, could lead the German Volk<sup>15</sup> in its quest to be the fate of the West<sup>16</sup>. Thus, the basis

---

12 On “narrative” in Heidegger, see Iorio, 2017.

13 “Why are we recognizing so late that in truth, England is and can be without an Occidental stance? Because only in the future will we grasp that England began to erect the modern world, but according to its essence, modernity is directed to the unfeathering of the machination of the entire globe. Even the thought of an agreement with England, in the sense of a division of imperialist ‘jurisdictions’ does not reach the essence of the historical process that England is now playing out to its end within Americanism and Bolshevism, and this at the same time means within world Jewry. The question of the role of world Jewry is not a racial question, but the metaphysical question about the kind of humanity that, without any restraints, can take over the uprooting of all beings from being as its world-historical ‘task.’” Heidegger, GA 96, p. 243.

14 Cf. Trawny, 2015, p. 27

15 On the essence of being German and Volk, see Heidegger, GA 95, pp. 31-32.

16 Cf. Trawny, 2015, p. 28.

of Heidegger's anti-Semitism is being-historical metaphysics supported by his ambition to find a new beginning for the history of Being, which does not make it more tolerable or less disastrous.

In the context of machination, the Jews play an essential role, as they represent – according to Heidegger in the *Black Notebooks* –

the essence of modern technology. He states that the Jews have a sharp gift for calculating<sup>17</sup> and live according to the principle of the race, i.e., subjugation of life to the domain of machination. They live according to a plan that results in its total deracialisation producing an estrangement between people and a loss of history, i.e., making a decision in favor of Beyng impossible<sup>18,19</sup>.

Among the many other anti-Semitic statements by Heidegger, this one is of special interest, since that “feature” of having a “marked gift for calculating” will be taken up and repeated several times by Heidegger in the *Zollikon Seminars* to criticize Freud's psychoanalysis, the science of “the Jew Freud”<sup>20</sup>.

---

17 “The Jews, with their marked gift for calculating, “live” already for the longest time according to the principle of race, which is why they are resisting its consistent application with utmost violence. The establishment [*Einrichtung*] of racial breeding does not stem from “life” itself, but from the overpowering of life through machination [*Machenschaft*]. What pushes forward with such a plan is the complete deracialization of all peoples by constricting of them into a uniformly constructed and tailored institution [*Einrichtung*] of all beings. At one with deracialization is the self-alienation of peoples – the loss of history – i.e., the decision-regions of being”. Translations of Roger Berkowitz. Heidegger, GA 96, p. 56.

18 “Jewry’s temporary increase in power is, however, grounded in the fact that Western metaphysics, especially in its modern development, creates the starting point for the diffusion of a generally empty rationality and calculating capacity, which in this way provides a refuge in “Geist”, without being able grasp from out of itself the hidden regions-of-decision [*Entscheidungsbezirke*]. The more original and captured-in-their beginning the prospective decisions and questions, the more they remain inaccessible to this “race””. Translations of Roger Berkowitz. Heidegger, GA 96, p. 46.

19 Cf. Trawny, 2015, p. 38.

20 “One should not get all too loudly indignant about the psychoanalysis of the Jew ‘Freud’ if, and as long as, one cannot at all ‘think’ about each and every thing other than by ‘tracing’ everything as an ‘expression’ of ‘life’ back to ‘instincts’ and ‘the atrophy of instinct.’ This way of ‘thinking,’ which in advance excludes all ‘being’ whatsoever, is pure nihilism”. Translations of Roger Berkowitz. Heidegger, GA

Calculating - and being able to calculate in advance - is the greatest symbol of machination, its gigantic [*das Riesige*]<sup>21</sup>. Calculating as an essential component of machination causes a determination of the world that would result in the lack of world [*Weltlosigkeit*] for the Jews. According to Trawny, Heidegger wants to “turn a very banal anti-Semitic statement (a “marked talent”) into historicity of Being - and it is in this figure of thought that anti-Semitism is anchored”. (ibid., p. 35)

It seems that for Heidegger, in this story, “Calculability - Rationality - Judaism” go hand in hand. To what extent can we take the considerations of the *Blacks Notebooks* seriously if we become aware of the fact that Heidegger wants to impute the discovery of calculating rationality in a being-historical context to Judaism? Alternatively, even worse, since we know that in other writings, he refers the matter to Descartes and Leibniz<sup>22</sup>. How could it all not sound absurd?

Just as hypotheses we raise the question, what are Heidegger's intentions regarding Freud's psychoanalysis? Trawny mentions in his book quoted above that although Heidegger speaks of a Jewish psychoanalysis<sup>23</sup>, he [Heidegger] felt that “Aryan modifications of the psychoanalytic doctrine” would not make any sense.<sup>24</sup> Maybe just because Heidegger considered the Intellectuals of National Socialism very ordinary? In other words, would they actually be in a position to refine and purge Freud's psychoanalysis to the point that it could serve as an instrument in the pursuit of the truth of Being? Would this

---

96, p. 218.

21 “One of the most secret forms of the gigantic, and perhaps the oldest, is the tenacious skillfulness in calculating, hustling, and intermingling through which the worldlessness of Jewry is grounded”. Translations of Roger Berkowitz. Heidegger, GA 95, p. 97.

22 See e.g. Heidegger, GA9.

23 “One finds it strange that reflection could ask beyond this, about something quite different, about being and its truth and its grounding and lack of grounds—so that reflection as self-reflection would have nothing to do with assessing the underlying grounds of lived experience; the form of this dissection remains even after one has pushed Jewish ‘psychoanalysis’ aside. This form must remain as long as one does not give oneself up as a human being with lived experiences. But until then, reflection in the thinking sense is impossible”. Translations of Roger Berkowitz. Heidegger. GA 95, p. 258.

24 Cf. Heidegger, GA 95, p. 88.



- the purification [*Reinigung*] of psychoanalysis<sup>25</sup> - be the reason why Heidegger spent ten years holding critical seminars on psychoanalysis in Zollikon? I will discuss this issue below.

Trawny raises a methodological question, how to deal with Heidegger's being-historical anti-Semitism? Moreover, the issue gets more serious, since the *Black Notebooks* show that Heidegger's private reflections feature an anti-Semitism supported by his philosophical thoughts. Trawny therefore asks to what extent Heidegger's works have been subject to a general contamination.<sup>26</sup>

Seen from this angle, the anti-Semitism would have infiltrated various dimensions of Heidegger's philosophy implying the necessity of reviewing its reception.

To date, Heidegger's involvement with National Socialism is an issue that resulted in partially exaggerated condemnations, but also in justified reservations. Today, given the publication of the *Black Notebooks*, the existence of a specific anti-Semitism that appears at a time when the thinker takes up a very critically position against the actual National Socialism cannot be ignored.<sup>27</sup>

The *Black Notebooks* require reflection at several levels: regarding the actual content of the *Notebooks*, we need to investigate the meaning of Heidegger's anti-Semitic statements, just as we need to investigate the other passages to see to what extent they are interrelated with these statements<sup>28</sup>. We have to reflect on how these private reflections relate to the rest of his work. On another level, we need to examine the philosophical style of the presentation of these notebooks. Is the way of presentation and reflection enough to be able to state that there is something philosophical happening, here? That question, in turn, leads to another: what has philosophy eventually become? What did Heidegger wanted show us by demanding that these *Notebooks* be published only at the end of the collection of his complete works? Finally, we need to find out how we are supposed to work with his texts and treat his philosophical thought.<sup>29</sup>

---

25 Here, in the same way, he speaks of "Reinigung des Seins". Heidegger, GA 96, p. 113

26 Cf. Trawny, 2015, p. 123.

27 Trawny, 2015, p. 131

28 This kind of work has been done by the Heidegger-Institut in Wuppertal, directed by Peter Trawny.

29 I refrain from raising the question of whether we should read Heidegger or forget

The attempts to address these issues that lie at the heart of the *Black Notebooks* and the reactions to Tawny's reading differ widely, as we will see briefly below.

### *Relighting the Fire*

There has been an open philosophical debate about Heidegger's relation to Nazism and its implications regarding the Jews and the Shoah since 1960. The discussion gained new momentum with the publication of Victor Farias' book, *Heidegger et le nazisme* (1987), which was followed by an intense debate involving various philosophers<sup>30</sup>. The fire is relit with the recent publication of the *Black Notebooks*.<sup>31</sup>

Two very different camps exist to date: the accusers and the defenders. However, the latter are currently more concerned with dismantling and attacking the theses of the being-historical anti-Semitism and of contamination. *La Règle du jeu* (Lévy, 2015) exemplifies that parade of positions well. I will highlight some of them. In one hand, as we can see below, Milner, Bensussan, Pascal David and von Herrmann, Guest, and Fédir placed clearly against the position assumed by Trawny. By other hand, O'Brien, Babich in certain way, Di Cesare, and Cohen reaffirm the theses of contamination. In the end, we see the moderate positions of Lévy and Loparic to contribute on this exciting debate.

According to Milner, Heidegger's *rectorial address* is a response to Max Weber's text *Science as a Vocation* [*Die Wissenschaft als Beruf*] of 1917, i.e., an attempt to exclude anything "Jewish" from the university, giving the floor to the professor-prophet and to the monopoly of the purified German language for philosophy. Having failed to accomplish his purpose, Heidegger focused on language to achieve that project.<sup>32</sup>

---

it in a dusty corner of the library, for it is simply absurd. Any philosopher that deserves to be called as such should not refrain from reading whatever may serve his/her investigative interest and no one should be denied the right to access knowledge, even if some readings might be difficult to bear.

30 Such as Lyotard, 1988; Derrida, 1987; Levinas, 1963; Zarader, 1990; Loparic, 1990.

31 Cf. Steinbock, 2015, p. 309.

32 Cf. Milner, 2015, p. 33-34.

Bensussan thinks that, unlike Faye (2005), who talks about the introduction of Nazism into philosophy, what takes place is the introduction of philosophy into Nazism, suggesting that one cannot continue to read Heidegger's texts as if nothing had happened.<sup>33</sup>

Pascal David joins von Herrmann against Trawny's reading stating that the "target" of the *Black Notebooks* is not Judaism but Christianity understood as an instrument of power.<sup>34</sup> Von Herrmann, quotes David, says that the absence of anchorage, the absence of history, the pure and simple calculation about the being, the gigantic, the absence of world are themes that Heidegger devoted to the history of the destiny of Being. There is no anti-Semitism at all and those passages do not refer to the Jewish spirit, but reveal above all the spirit that governs the present time. (Von Herrmann<sup>35</sup>, unpublished text, p. 4, quoted in David 2015, p. 125-6) As one can see, in his defense of Heidegger against Trawny's statements, David disregards or does not take Heidegger's statements about the Jews as very relevant. He concentrates on the meta-narrative effect of Heidegger's narrative in the *Blacks Notebooks* and disregards the proper style found in them.

As for the theory of contamination, Guest calls into question whether it is not too exaggerated to condemn Heidegger's entire thought on Being.<sup>36</sup> He states that "to be Heideggerian" is first accepting reading Heidegger, accepting and recognizing the - unavoidable - necessity to seriously study an immense work.<sup>37</sup> He aims to show that the fourteen passages of Heidegger's criticism of Judaism and his anti-Semitic statements are erratic and almost meaningless when compared to the other 1250 pages of the *Notebooks*. Heidegger, he states, merely repeats anti-Semitic prejudices and clichés that were typical of that time in those few passages.<sup>38</sup> In addition, he states that the current condemnation is a mere media effect and purely dogmatic; Trawny's interpretation is totally biased by suggesting a "logic of contamination" as a

---

33 Cf. Bensussan, 2015, p. 101-102.

34 Cf. David, 2015, p. 125.

35 For a wider discussion of von Herrmann's criticism, see von Herrmann; Alfieri, 2016.

36 Cf. Guest, 2015, p. 36.

37 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 137.

38 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 139.

reading method.<sup>39</sup> He questions if the mere suspicion of contamination is sufficient to condemn Heidegger's entire work<sup>40</sup> and accuses Trawny to oppose the pure and the impure, to propose historic Manichaeism, a sanitary and prophylactic cleavage of Heidegger's thought.<sup>41</sup>

Fédier follows in the same critical direction when he highlights that thinking against blocks the possibility to do anything else than making a reply against that which is fought against. The question is to think in favor, because thinking against merely repeats and perpetuates what we oppose.<sup>42</sup> According to Fédier, one cannot incriminate that Heidegger want not publicly express; there is no ground for incrimination.<sup>43</sup> He thus claims that Trawny manipulated the texts so that Heidegger's thoughts could be denounced as “dangerous thinking” and that the book by the editor of the *Black Notebooks* reveals a biased text that concludes nothing, and that the designation of anti-Semitism inscribed in the history of Being is empty.<sup>44</sup>

Others, such as Nicolas de Warren, prefer to limit Heidegger's Judaism and anti-Semitism to the historical context of the post-First World War period that lasts from 1918 to 1939.<sup>45</sup> According to that author, Heidegger's thought repeats the confrontation between Judaism [*Judentum*] and Germanness [*Deutschtum*] present since the First World War.<sup>46</sup> Dahlstrom believes that the relationship between Heidegger's philosophy and Judaism is rooted in Meister Eckhart's indirect influences on the philosopher.<sup>47</sup>

From the point of view of O'Brien, Heidegger had been concerned with the issue of history since 1917, date on which he mentioned the “historical man”.<sup>48</sup> This would justify the idea of the being-historical contamination of Heidegger's work, as claimed by Trawny and reaffirmed by Babette Babich<sup>49</sup>. However, Babich asserts that it is not enough to claim that Heidegger had a programmatic interest in fighting world Jewry from the beginning and that

---

39 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 141.

40 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 150-1.

41 Cf. *ibid.* p. 159.

42 Cf. Fédier, 2015, p. 205-6.

43 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 209.

44 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 209; p. 221; p. 227; p. 230.

45 Cf. Warren, 2015, p. 243.

46 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 44.

47 Cf. Dahlstrom, 2015, p. 283.

48 Cf. O'Brien, 2015, p. 383-4.

49 Cf. Babich, 2015, p. 423.

his entire philosophical work is a mere anti-Semitic work, as Faye asserts (2005).<sup>50</sup>

Di Cesare holds that Heidegger was not a Nazi “by chance”, given the fact that anti-Semitism is one of the pillars of National Socialism. According to that author, Heidegger's concern in defining the Jew is more than clear. If the Jew appears in the history of Being, it is precisely to be excluded.<sup>51</sup> Sloterdijk further intensifies the discussion as he asserts that the very meaning of “History” comes into question and that the discussion cannot keep siding with neither Heidegger's adorers, nor his detractors.<sup>52</sup>

According to Cohen, we cannot read or reread Heidegger's work today without taking into account what the significant “Jew” meant to Heidegger and in relation to his thought. The *Black Notebooks* are not only a proof of his pronounced aversion against the “Jews” and “Judaism”, but also an attempt to relegate them to unprecedented anonymity in the history of Western thought.<sup>53</sup>

To sum up this debate, Lévy asserts that on the one side, there are the friends of Heidegger's thought, who are now somewhat embarrassed by the *Blacks Notebooks*, but still keep arguing that the word “Jew” had never appeared in Heidegger's work before that recent publication. What is actually taking place here is a relationship between the Jewish prophetic thought and Heidegger's oracular thought. On the other side are Heidegger's opponents who insist that the Jewish name, the Jew significant, is constantly present in Heidegger's work, even if he does not mention it, since the linguistic and ideological context of that time implies the presence of the word Jew, even if it is not explicitly mentioned.<sup>54</sup>

The attacks and defenses take place in a quite passionate manner. Contaminated or not, the question lingers how to judge Heidegger's philosophy?<sup>55</sup> The man Heidegger has condemned himself by phrasing the statements contained in the *Blacks Notebooks*, even if he has never assumed that guilt publicly. But, what about his philosophy? As Loparic asks, are we entitled to judge him by making use of a different philosophy? Which one would that be? Are

---

50 Cf. *ibid.*, p. 424.

51 Cf. Di Cesare, 2015, p. 637-8.

52 Cf. Sloterdijk, 2015, p. 720.

53 Cf. Cohen, 2015, p. 746- 747.

54 Cf. Lévy, 2015, p. 776-777.

55 See Loparic, 1990.

not both the “other” philosophies and Heidegger's not the result – and do not they result – from one and the same origin? How may we judge his philosophy without performing a complete investigation of philosophy itself?<sup>56</sup>

In my view, we are facing the introduction of a negative philosophy in Heidegger. We are not prepared for and which is not merely the negation of philosophy in its metaphysical history, but negation as opposed to the positive place that philosophy has always occupied, aiming to think right as opposed to wrong, good facing evil, the beautiful in itself. Heidegger takes conceptualization and thinking down a path where certain subjects do not have the right to exist in philosophy, since they discredit the very exercise of philosophical thinking, such as thinking, e.g., a form of anti-Semitism that has justified and based on the metaphysics of Being. Heidegger is not interested in fighting that theme, as the approaches to ethics and politics usually do, but to take it as a basis for the development of his narrative on the history of Being.

Heidegger has introduced the philosophical unthinkable, the unthought<sup>57</sup>, thus taking philosophy from a positive plane to a negative one. Reason, which is able to think the good and the progress of humanity, is now also capable of thinking its baseness philosophically. Philosophy held at a different level, a negative level, i.e. a different way of achieving the end of metaphysics.

As far I can see the thesis of the being-historical contamination of the *Black Notebooks* goes hand in hand with their *reverberation* in texts published after the 1930s. Taking into account that no explicit attacks on Jews are found in these texts, one may presume that Heidegger was wary of exposing his private thoughts. To what extent can contamination and reverberation be used together to read Heidegger's work?

### *Reverberation and philosophical narrative*

As already mentioned above, we have here to face a methodological question. We intend to address a subject in Heidegger's philosophy - the science of man -, which is part of his writings that are engaged in a heated debate about the fate of his work. I would like to present my reading position that, although

---

56 Cf. *idem*.

57 About Judaism and Jews as the unthought in the philosophy of Heidegger, see Cohen, 2015, p. 745-762. For a deeper discussion, see Zarader, 1990.