



BRILL

RESEARCH IN PHENOMENOLOGY 44 (2014) 315–346

Research
in
Phenomenology

brill.com/rp

Naming Φύσις and the “Inner Truth of National Socialism”: A New Archival Discovery

Julia A. Ireland

Whitman College

Abstract

This article offers an interpretive reconstruction of Heidegger’s first reference to the “inner truth of National Socialism” in the 1934/35 lecture course, *Hölderlin’s Hymns “Germania” and “The Rhine”* (*Gesamtausgabe* 39), which has remained unknown due to an editorial error. Focusing on the distinction Heidegger draws between Greek φύσις and natural science, it examines the way Heidegger conceives politics more originally through Hölderlin and the naming force of Nature. It then contextualizes Heidegger’s specific reference to National Socialism in terms of the then contemporary debate between liberalism and the racially determined “new science,” arguing that Heidegger thinks the “inner truth of National Socialism” as a φύσις-event.

Keywords

Heidegger – Hölderlin – National Socialism – “inner truth and greatness” – φύσις – natural science

Scandalous. It is the single word most often used to characterize Heidegger’s 1935 reference in *Introduction to Metaphysics*¹ to the “inner truth and greatness

1 First and foremost, I wish to thank Dr. Hermann Heidegger for permission to cite the manuscripts, and for his willingness to allow me to publish a reproduction of the manuscript page with my article. I would also like to thank Frau Heidrun Fink and Frau Hildegard Dieke at the Deutsches Literaturarchiv (DLA) in Marbach, Germany, for helping me locate Heidegger’s manuscripts, as well as the head of the Archive Department, Dr. Ulrich von Bülow, who took the time to review the manuscript page with me and to address some of my basic questions. I also wish to thank Tracy Colony, Theodore Kiesel, Richard Polt, William McNeill, John Sallis,

of N.S. [National Socialism].”² The consistency with which it is deployed by nearly everyone writing on Heidegger’s politics—from journalists to philosophically minded internet bloggers to serious Heidegger scholars—reveals it to have assumed an almost idiomatic force. “Scandalous” is the word used to capture and mark the experience of immediate moral offense built into a formulation that has the disadvantage of showing Heidegger engaged in the activity of drawing a distinction. And it is also the word used to describe the relationship between the experience of that offense and its blatancy, which connects the “scandalous” to shamelessness and to publicity.

This has placed more than one scholar into the ambivalent position of, on the one hand, praising Heidegger for the “courageousness” of his decision to include in the 1953 Niemeyer edition of *Introduction to Metaphysics* a sentence he did not deliver as part of the lecture course, while, on the other hand, taking him to task not just for *not* deleting the phrase when presented the opportunity but also for retrospectively justifying it by way of a later parenthetical.³

Greg Fried, Thomas Sheehan, and Peter Trawny for their advice and assistance. I am particularly grateful to Tom Davis, whose questions and comments have been invaluable in the progression of this article through its many drafts. Finally, I am indebted to both Whitman College and the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung for contributing funding for the three separate trips to the DLA that supported my research and the checking of my facts.

- 2 I will be referring to Heidegger’s original formulation of this sentence as it is found in the Fritz Heidegger typescript and cited by Petra Jaeger in her editor’s “Afterword” to the fourth edition of *Einführung in die Metaphysik*. Jaeger confirms that Heidegger had originally employed the abbreviation “N.S. [Nationalsozialismus],” which he subsequently revised to read as “this movement” (*diese Bewegung*) in preparing the course for publication in 1953 by the Max Niemeyer Verlag (*Einführung in die Metaphysik*, ed. Petra Jaeger, 4th ed., vol. 40 of *Gesamtausgabe* [Vittorio Klostermann: Frankfurt am Main, 1983], 243; translated by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt as *Introduction to Metaphysics* [Yale University Press: New Haven, 2001], 213; hereafter cited as *GA* 40 and *IM*, respectively). I have modified Fried and Polt’s translation throughout in order to bring forward Heidegger’s use of particular words. The sentence published in the 1953 Niemeyer edition and currently found in the 4th edition of the *Gesamtausgabe* volume of *Einführung in die Metaphysik* reads: “What is being peddled about today but has not the least thing to do with the inner truth and greatness of this movement [namely, the encounter between global technology and modern humanity] is fishing about in these troubled waters of ‘values’ and ‘totalities’” (*GA* 40: 208; *IM*, 213). Fried and Polt place Heidegger’s parenthetical reference to “global technology” in square brackets to indicate its status as a later addition.
- 3 This passage from *Introduction to Metaphysics* has a remarkably contested editorial history, which includes not only Heidegger’s replacing of the abbreviation “N.S.” with “this movement” but the question as to when, exactly, he added the parenthetical referring to “global technology.” Hartmut Buchner, who assisted Heidegger in reviewing the final changes to be

In the chapter he dedicates to this passage in *The Shadow of That Thought*, French philosopher Dominique Janicaud thus poses the question, “Why keep an acknowledgement of the ‘inner truth and greatness of [National Socialism]’? In fact this is what has caused the problem or the scandal in 1953 and what keeps it alive today.”⁴

The answer is because, for Heidegger, this expression possesses positive, which is to say decisive, philosophical content—a point he seeks to draw forward when challenged in the 1966 *Der Spiegel* interview, however much he garbles just when it was that he added the parenthetical.⁵ Despite the explanation he goes on to offer (and the most salient point concerns how we go about identifying what he there terms a “real confrontation with the technological world”), such positive content nonetheless seems to remain indecipherable within the context of Heidegger’s specific analyses in *Introduction to Metaphysics*. It does not seem possible to retrace the steps that connect the depth of creative insight that distinguishes that course with the sardonic tonality of remarks on the increased number of works on value generated by Nazi ideologues and Heidegger’s affirmation of an “inner truth and greatness.” Yet this is not the case. For when Heidegger uses this particular formulation in *Introduction to Metaphysics* he is quoting—and thereby presupposing—the entire supporting context of his *first* reference to the “inner truth of National Socialism.” Phrased in a slightly different manner and also employing an

included in the 1953 Niemeyer edition, advised him “to clarify some . . . and better develop what was actually meant by this sentence in the context of the time.” Heidegger, whom Buchner describes as becoming “very angry” at this suggestion, responded with the statement: “That I cannot do: it would be a falsification of history. I said it that way then,—and if today’s readers do not want to understand what was meant by it in the context of the whole lecture course, then I cannot help them.” See Buchner, “Fragmentarisches,” in *Erinnerung an Martin Heidegger*, ed. Günther Neske (Pfullingen: Neske, 1977), 49. Despite this statement—and it is largely based upon Heidegger’s reply here that commentators have deemed his decision to retain this line “courageous”—Heidegger was in fact willing to edit out other political references from the lecture courses. See note 6, below.

4 See Dominique Janicaud, *The Shadow of That Thought: Heidegger and the Question of Politics*, trans. Jérôme Millon (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1996), chap. 4, “The Purloined Letter,” 50–64, here 54 (Janicaud’s emphasis).

5 In the 1966 *Der Spiegel* interview, Heidegger mistakenly claims that the parenthetical was included in the original manuscript and “corresponded exactly to [his] conception of technology at that time” (*Reden und Andere Zeugnisse eines Lebensweges*, ed. Hermann Heidegger, vol 16 of *Gesamtausgabe* [Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2000], 667–68; hereafter cited as GA16, translated by Maria P. Alter and John D. Caputo as “Only a God Can Save Us,” in *The Heidegger Controversy: A Critical Reader*, ed. Richard Wolin [New York: Columbia University Press, 1991], 91–116).

abbreviation, this first reference took place exactly five months earlier within the context of a series of remarkable insertions, found in “*The Rhine*” portion of the handwritten manuscript of the 1934/35 Winter Semester lecture course *Hölderlin’s Hymns “Germania” and “The Rhine,”*⁶ but has remained unknown for contingent reasons.

The typescript of the course collated by Fritz Heidegger and corrected by Heidegger makes clear that, in contrast to *Introduction to Metaphysics*, Heidegger made an editorial decision to omit several passages containing overt political content,⁷ including parenthetical sentences found on this

6 The lecture course is divided into two parts, “Germania,” which Heidegger delivered in the closing months of 1934 prior to the Christmas holiday, and “The Rhine,” which he delivered in 1935 with the resumption of the Winter Semester (*Hölderlin’s Hymnen “Germanien” und “Der Rhein,”* ed. Susanne Ziegler, vol. 39 of *Gesamtausgabe* [Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann: 1999], translated by William McNeill and Julia Ireland as *Hölderlin’s Hymns “Germania” and “The Rhine.”* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2014]; hereafter abbreviated as *GA*39 and *GR*, respectively).

Notes by Siegfried Bröse indicate Heidegger delivered this reference in the lecture he gave on January 29, 1935 (Bröse, DLA 84.2081). The reference from *Introduction to Metaphysics* was delivered on June 27, 1935. See the article by Theodore Kisiel, “Heidegger’s Philosophical Geopolitics in the Third Reich,” in *A Companion to Heidegger’s “Introduction to Metaphysics,”* ed. Richard Polt and Gregory Fried (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 226–49.

7 A comparative review of the manuscript against the Fritz Heidegger typescript and the current German edition reveals that Heidegger made an editorial decision to leave out some of the more political references from the course, though he does so in such an inconsistent manner that Ziegler, in mistaking the abbreviation “*N.soz.*,” could not have known Heidegger intended the parentheticals included on this manuscript page to be omitted for their political content. Needless to say, the contrast this poses to the editorial process to which Heidegger submitted *Einführung in die Metaphysik* invites every type of question as to what the text of a Heidegger lecture course *is*, since Heidegger here edited out a highly charged political reference that he did not in fact deliver as part of the course and that has arguably made its way back into the text only as a result of Ziegler’s misidentification of the abbreviation “*N.soz.*”

However it was that Heidegger’s editorial process took place for this particular passage, Heidegger chose not to edit out what for the time was the racist expression “*stammverwandtes Volk*” (a people of related lineage) in referring to the metaphysical kinship between the Greeks and the Germans in their respective drives toward the origin (see *GA* 39: 205; *GR*, 187). Nor does he omit the historically specific comparison between the Führer and Christ, which Fritz Heidegger mistranscribes as “*Führersein*”—“the being of the Führer”—and which Ziegler replicates in the edited volume (see Manuscript DLA 75.7074, p. 59; Typescript DLA 75.7115, p. 142; *GA* 39: 210; *GR*, 192). Luise Krohn, who possessed a remarkably sensitive ear for Heidegger’s political references, is correct in rendering this word as “*Führertum*” (Führerdom) (Krohn, DLA 98.35.10, p. 103–25). Notably, both passages are shown to be insertions within the manuscript page. By contrast, the Fritz Heidegger typescript

particular manuscript page. When the editor for the *Gesamtausgabe* volume, Susanne Ziegler, returns to fill in these sentences, she mistakenly interprets Heidegger’s handwriting in the abbreviation “*N.soz*” for “*n.w.*,” transcribing it in the edited volume as “*Naturwissenschaft*” or “natural science.” (She has reasonable grounds for doing so.) The passage as it is found in the current third edition of the course thus reads: “Neu ist diese angeblich neue Wissenschaft nur dadurch, daß sie nicht weiß, wie veraltet sie ist. Mit der inneren Wahrheit der Naturwissenschaft [*sic*] hat sie vollends nichts zu tun. [This purportedly new science is new only by virtue of the fact that it does not know how antiquated it is. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the inner truth of natural science (*sic*)]” (*GA* 39: 195; *GR*, 178).⁸ I discovered Ziegler’s error in the context of examining what the Deutsches Literaturarchiv catalogues as “*Nachschrift*,” or lecture notes, put together by Luise Krohn, which were included as part of a review of archival documents undertaken for the English translation of the “*Germania*” and “*The Rhine*” course. Krohn’s inclusion of manuscript page numbers indicate that these “lecture notes” are, instead, an independently generated copy of “*The Rhine*” portion of the manuscript made prior to the presentation of that part of the course in January 1935;⁹ the philological and philosophical analysis of this passage shows that she correctly transcribes the

reveals that Heidegger made the decision to omit the sentence often cited in the secondary literature on Hölderlin’s status as the “poet of the Germans” in which Heidegger makes explicit reference to the unique sense of politics being enacted in the “*Germania*” and “*The Rhine*” course as a whole: “In this process [of Hölderlin’s becoming a force in the history of our people], we must keep in mind ‘politics’ in its highest and authentic sense, so much so that whoever accomplishes something here has no need to talk about the ‘political’” (*GA* 39: 214; *GR*, 195). For a further discussion of such passages, see Theodore Kisiel’s, “Political Interventions in the Lecture Courses of 1933–36,” in *Heidegger Jahrbuch 5. Heidegger und der Nationalsozialismus II, Interpretationen*, ed. Alfred Denker and Holger Zaborowski (Freiburg: Verlag Karl Alber, 2009), 110–29.

- 8 See Appendix A of the present essay for the complete citation in German of this passage, including my corrections; Appendix B is a copy of Heidegger’s actual handwritten manuscript page; Appendix C is a rendering of the layout of this same page with its content translated into English. I have included bracketed numbers in the latter, which are cued to my analysis of what I am calling ‘the logical succession of Heidegger’s insertions.’ I again want to acknowledge Dr. Hermann Heidegger’s generous permission to include a reproduction of the manuscript page, which makes graphically vivid both how Heidegger worked and the difficulties any editor of Heidegger’s works must contend with.
- 9 Krohn, DLA 98.35.10, p. 103x–103z. The Deutsches Literaturarchiv catalogues Krohn’s manuscript copy as a “*Nachschrift*,” which implies that it is a collection of lecture notes (the term can also refer to formal course *Protokolle*), and indeed Krohn’s version of the “*Germania*” portion of the course reads as lecture notes. By contrast, Krohn’s marginal notation of manuscript

abbreviation as “*Nationalsozialismus*.” Student notes confirm Heidegger did not actually read out the parenthetical referring to National Socialism as part of his actual lecture, which is consistent with the way he treated the reference from *Introduction to Metaphysics*.¹⁰

While the omission of the bracketed sentences already goes far in confirming the fact of their political content, and the further review of Heidegger’s

page numbers, beginning with Heidegger’s “Transitional Overview and Summary” (GA 39: §11; GR, §11), indicate that she was making a copy from the handwritten manuscript of “*The Rhine*” portion of the course. This is confirmed by Krohn’s correct and sometimes corrected transcription of the word “*Seyn*,” as well as her completeness and accuracy when compared against both Hallwachs’ lecture notes and the Fritz Heidegger typescript. Her inclusion of Heidegger’s “More Incisive Review” (GA 39: Zweites Kapitel; GR, chap. 2) as an independently numbered set of pages at the end of her notebook further suggests that she copied what Heidegger had already written out as the completed manuscript of “*The Rhine*” portion of the course prior to its having been delivered with the resumption of the Winter Semester in January 1935; Heidegger would have first written such a review within the context of his actually delivering the course, and there are several transpositions of blocks of text within Krohn’s copy that point to Heidegger’s later substitution of revised manuscript pages. A letter to Elisabeth Blochmann dated December 21, 1934, indicates that Heidegger had already “worked out the [‘*Germania*’ and ‘*The Rhine*’] lecture course in its entirety” and that it was available for Blochmann to read (GA 16: 336). With the exception of these transposed portions of text, Krohn’s clear disinterest in Heidegger’s brief discussions of Christianity in that “Review” in which she indicates sentences she has left out with ellipses (this is something she does not do in copying “*The Rhine*” manuscript), and her omission of sentences that she cannot read and other reasonable errors, her copy of “*The Rhine*” portion of the course corresponds exactly to both the handwritten manuscript and the Fritz Heidegger typescript.

- 10 Student lecture notes by Wilhelm Hallwachs, Alfred Bergstrasser, and Siegfried Bröse reveal Heidegger did not read the two-sentence parenthetical referring to National Socialism as part of the lecture course. However, Hallwachs’ notes show Heidegger *did* read the first parenthetical referring to “so-called liberal objectivity” that directly prompts the insertion of his reference to the “inner truth of National Socialism,” though he does so out of order in reading it at the very end of his first long insertion (Hallwachs, DLA 84.2124, p. 176). Bergstrasser’s notes, which he typed up later and are also the most fragmentary of the three, are important for recording the rhetorical tonality of the way Heidegger delivered this part of the lecture. When Bergstrasser renders this passage he both puts this section in parentheses and includes the following note: “(Here H makes a digression [*macht eine Abschweifung*], saying: Science is today the organized business of procuring and transmitting knowledge . . .)” (Bergstrasser, DLA 75.7146, “18. Vorlesung Heidegger über Hölderlin”). I wish to thank Theodore Kisiel for helping me to find Bergstrasser’s notes.

handwriting verifies the abbreviation as “*N.soz*,”¹¹ correcting this passage in the *Gesamtausgabe* does not address its deeper significance. It does not clarify what it was *philosophically* that prompted Heidegger to add the reference to National Socialism within what the manuscript page shows to be the wholesale revision of an otherwise schematic transition within Heidegger’s interpretation of Hölderlin’s “The Rhine” hymn. Nor does it help make sense of the way Heidegger then went on to add several further insertions in light of that reference, making explicit a series of latent political connections that begin with the distinction he draws between the Greek interpretation of Nature as φύσις and natural science and that extend to the lecture course on Hegel’s *Philosophy of Right*, which he was delivering contemporaneously with the “*Germania*” and “*The Rhine*” course.¹² To play off the question posed by Janicaud, the issue here is not why *keep* an acknowledgment of the “inner truth of National Socialism” but why *add* one in the first place? What about Hölderlin’s rivers prompts Heidegger to include such an acknowledgment, and then what prompts him again to repeat nearly this exact formulation five months later in *Introduction to Metaphysics*?

In this respect, Ziegler’s mistaken transcription provides the critical philosophical clue. For the interpretive reconstruction of the passage shows that the phrase the “inner truth of natural science” not only fails to make basic sense, but the meaning of these paragraphs reveals it is not a possible formulation for Heidegger; indeed, precisely his point in adding the insertion is that “natural science” is not capable of possessing an “inner truth.” This is of particular significance for understanding the larger implications of this discovery, which are not about the excavation of another reference to National Socialism within Heidegger’s philosophical corpus. Instead, the contrast between the way the “inner truth of natural science” does not make coherent sense and the way the “inner truth of National Socialism” does—and *Introduction to Metaphysics* merely confirms this—reveals that the locus of this difference lies in the distinction Heidegger draws between φύσις and natural science apropos “this purportedly new science,” which in the context of the time meant “political

11 Based on the passage from *Introduction to Metaphysics* I originally thought the abbreviation read “*n.s*”. The head of the Archive Department at the DLA, Dr. Ulrich von Bülow, first suggested it was “*N.soz*”. I was able to confirm this with Theodore Kisiel, who reviewed the manuscript page with me at the DLA in June 2011. This reading was still further substantiated by Peter Trawny, who is the editor of several *Gesamtausgabe* volumes.

12 See Hegel, “*Rechtsphilosophie*,” Winter Semester 1934/35, in *Seminare: Hegel—Schelling*, ed. Peter Trawny, vol. 86 of *Gesamtausgabe* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2011), 59–184, hereafter abbreviated as *GA* 86.

science” with its explicitly racial metaphysics. Rather than the abbreviation “N.soz” reading as though it comes from out of nowhere, the logical succession of insertions on the manuscript page makes clear that what Heidegger says about φύσις governs what the phrase the “inner truth of” can and cannot refer to. However oblique, Heidegger understands the “inner truth of National Socialism” as what I want to term a ‘φύσις-event.’

Though my concern in this article is primarily reconstructive, I conclude by sketching out directions I hope the wider engagement of this discovery might take. I adopt this narrow approach for two reasons: First, while the correct transcription of the abbreviation “N.soz” has one set of implications for Heidegger’s analysis of the Hölderlinian conception of Nature as “intimacy” (*Innigkeit*) within the “*Germania*” and “*The Rhine*” course, it has a different set of implications for Heidegger’s subsequent reference to the “inner truth and greatness of [National Socialism]” in *Introduction to Metaphysics*, beginning with the specifically political significance of his analysis of φύσις for that course¹³ and extending to the open scandal this phrase continues to generate. Second, I am deeply opposed to that style of scholarship whose tendentious use of quotations preempts genuine philosophical analysis in a manner I understand to actively mislead. It remains true that substandard scholarship continues to determine the wider debate surrounding Heidegger’s politics and that in the United States such scholarship has received the imprimatur of a university press. (Emmanuel Faye’s division of his “Bibliography” into categories such as “Works by Other National Socialist and *Völkisch* Authors,” “Apologetic and Revisionist Studies,” and “Works Critical of Heidegger,” in *Heidegger: The Introduction of Nazism into Philosophy in Light of the Unpublished Seminars of 1933–35*, is blatantly ideological; and his representation of student *Protokolle* as Heidegger’s own words is specious; both should have been challenged by reviewers as violating the most basic principles of scholarship.)¹⁴ By contrast, I intend my analysis here as an alternative for what it means to read a single, politically charged sentence when interpretation has been constrained by the necessity of a philological reconstruction and the willingness to affirm the often surprising layers of complication that have accompanied it.

13 For a detailed analysis of φύσις in *Introduction to Metaphysics*, see Susan Schoenbohm’s, “Heidegger’s Interpretation of Φύσις in *Introduction to Metaphysics*,” in *A Companion to Heidegger’s “Introduction to Metaphysics,”* ed. Richard Polt and Gregory Fried (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 143–60.

14 Emmanuel Faye, *Heidegger: The Introduction of Nazism into Philosophy in Light of the Unpublished Seminars of 1933–35*, trans. Michael B. Smith, with a forward by Tom Rockmore (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

Before turning to what prompts Heidegger to add the reference to the “inner truth of National Socialism,” I want to present a schematic overview of the layout of the manuscript page in order to contextualize where each insertion fits within the conceptual framework of what I will be referring to as ‘Heidegger’s initial long insertion.’ (“Appendix B” is a reproduction of the manuscript page; “Appendix C” is a rendering of this same page in English, with bracketed numbers corresponding to the conceptual moves outlined below.) In considering the reproduction, one must recall that the concluding manuscript pages from *Introduction to Metaphysics*—including the page referring to the “inner truth and greatness of [National Socialism]”—remain missing from the Deutsches Literaturarchiv. I suspect that the manuscript page would have looked like the one included, that is, that the sentence referring to the “inner truth and greatness of [National Socialism]” would have been an insertion within an insertion to which Heidegger later added parentheses. The dense layout of textual additions that tend to surround Heidegger’s political interventions within the manuscripts makes plausible Heidegger’s confusion as to when he added the parenthetical referring to “global technology” in *Introduction to Metaphysics*. (The outsized horizontal format of the manuscript pages, with their left-hand side reserved for writing and their right-hand side left open, makes literal the manner in which thinking for Heidegger is not simply self-revising but referenced to its unsaid.) Deciphering the relationship between the two parentheticals included on the manuscript page from the “*Germania*” and “*The Rhine*” course proved key for situating Heidegger’s reference to the “inner truth of National Socialism” within what at the time functioned as a rhetorical set-piece concerning liberalism and the “new science.” In this instance, Heidegger’s subsequent addition of a parenthesis indicates not only what he intended to omit, it signals his expanding upon—and introducing a distinction within—the implied content of what he had originally written.

Heidegger’s initial long insertion begins with the sentence, “For precisely the metaphysical meaning of Nature—*natura*—φύσις...” (Appendix C; see portion marked [1]) and extends to his call for a “more original” fundamental experience of being than what was expressed by the Greeks in the “word and concept φύσις.” The points at which Heidegger runs out of space reveals he had written out this first long insertion and then added the further insertions included within it. And, indeed, the writing of the two insertion symbols directly on top of one another [2] shows that Heidegger intervened mid-sentence to add the bracketed sentences referring to the “inner truth of N.soc” [3] and then has to make the transition back to what he had originally written, which he does with the inclusion of the sentence fragment, “If, therefore, we today set ourselves the task...” [4]. Instead of reading the two insertion

symbols' literally being written on top of one another as indicating Heidegger's later intervention within a continuous movement of thought, Ziegler includes a paragraph break at exactly this juncture in her effort to render this passage in a coherent manner. This has the effect of making Heidegger's subsequent quotation of the "three duties" outlined in the "Rectoral Address" and revised in the context of his lecture course on Hegel [5] read in a manner curiously out of place and digressive.¹⁵ In contrast to the paragraph break, I want to suggest that Heidegger's addition of the parenthetical referring to the "inner truth of National Socialism" functions as a 'caesura' within his initial long insertion. It breaks his original train of thought into two parts, each of which it comments on differently in the manner of what is both a logical progression and a discontinuous amplification whose transition—and, more importantly, whose *gap* or unsaid—is the relationship between that "inner truth" and the possibility of an "other metaphysics" governed by a more original naming of φύσις.

The conceptual moves Heidegger makes in this initial insertion may be outlined in the following manner:

1. Natural science is a metaphysically derivative understanding of the Greek interpretation of Nature as φύσις.
2. The denaturing of Nature that takes place in modern science has "recoiled back onto our conception of science in general" and has led to the science we have "today" as the organized business of knowledge.

Two further notes are required here: First, Heidegger writes the clarificatory phrase, "thus not only natural science" [6] above this particular sentence, abbreviating the word "*Naturwissenschaft*" as "*Naturwiss.*" Fritz Heidegger transcribes the abbreviation as the plural, "natural sciences," which context and philosophical sense suggest is incorrect. I believe this error, together with Heidegger's difficult to decipher handwriting, informs Ziegler's misidentification of "*N.soz*" as "*N.W.*" Second, in its contemporary context the word "today" possessed ideological connotations and had an idiomatic force Heidegger deployed in critically ironic fashion

15 At the very top of the manuscript page Heidegger adds the insertion: "This [new fundamental experience of beyng] entails: 1. transformation in the essence of truth, 2. transformation in the essence of labor." The detailed discussion of Heidegger's revision of the "three duties" outlined in the "Rectoral Address" exceeds what I am able to accomplish in a single article. However, the clue to deciphering this particular insertion is to be found in GA 86: §207, "The Metaphysical Power of the State to Come," in which Heidegger explicitly connects truth and labor while referencing content from the "*Germania*" and "*The Rhine*" lecture course.

throughout the “*Germania*” and “*The Rhine*” course. In both this passage and the passage from *Introduction to Metaphysics*, the most important word for communicating tone—and, consequently, for situating the historically specific nature of Heidegger’s references to National Socialism—is the word “today,” repeated with shifting valences and used to describe the then current situation of science with a view toward the ideological production of scholarship.

3. The various stances taken toward “so-called liberal objectivity” are inadequate for transforming “today’s science” because science can never be transformed by science but only by “an other metaphysics.” The unique but also private resonance possessed by Heidegger’s rejection of *both* the stance that affirms “so-called liberal objectivity” *and* the one that denies it prompts his insertion of the sentence referring to the “new science” (“new science” as coded language for “political science”). As I later address, the structure of this double-rejection occasions Heidegger’s positive drawing of the distinction between the racially determined “new science” and the φύσις-governed “inner truth of National Socialism.”
4. This “other metaphysics” is possible only on the basis of a “new fundamental experience of being” that must be “more original” than that named by the Greek word φύσις. It is precisely Hölderlin’s inceptive—and inaugurally *German*—naming of Nature as “intimacy” that Heidegger next takes up in his interpretation of the breaking off of the flow of the Rhine river as it turns back toward its origin in the German fatherland. The word “more original” is therefore to be taken literally as the entering into explicit relation with the origin, which Heidegger understands to be enacted in Hölderlin’s poetizing of the flow of the Rhine and in his own confrontation with φύσις in *Introduction to Metaphysics*.

Keeping in mind this logical succession, I want to now turn to a commentary on Heidegger’s initial long insertion, focusing on the metaphysically derivative status of natural science with respect to what Heidegger characterizes as the “primordially inceptive naming force” of φύσις.

“Naming Force”: Nature, Poetry, and Natural Science

The manuscript page shows that Heidegger had fully written out what is included on the left-hand side of the page before crossing it out and adding the series of insertions on the right-hand side of the page. Wilhelm Hallwachs’ transcript indicates Heidegger had just concluded his analysis of Hölderlin’s

line “Demigods now I think” (*GA* 39: §13; *GR*, §13), and begins in this lecture to transition to his interpretation of the course of the Rhine as it diverges in its easterly flow to turn back toward its origin in Germany. Heidegger’s intervention within what began as an otherwise schematic review thus takes place at a particularly vulnerable moment within the lecture course as a whole, anticipating his later topology of the origin in which he equates the “breaking off” (*Aufbruch*) of the course of the Rhine with the necessity of the Germans’ rupture from the Greeks through the new naming of Nature he believes to have been most fully accomplished in “The Rhine” hymn itself (*GA* 39: 255; *GR*, 231). There, Heidegger’s use of the German word “*Aufbruch*” is ambiguously used to capture both the divergence of the Rhine as well as the Germans’ metaphysical-political ‘awakening,’ which establishes them as a “people of related lineage” to the Greeks in their “primordial drive toward the origin” (*GA* 39: 205; *GR*, 187).

Though Heidegger had briefly touched on Hölderlin’s rivers in the “*Germania*” portion of the course, the difficulty he encounters at this juncture relates to the problem of gaining interpretive access to the counter-turning of the Rhine as “historical” (*geschichtlich*). As the unrevised portion of the manuscript page shows, this difficulty is situated by the tendency to approach Nature in the poem in objective terms, which preempts carrying through on what it means for Hölderlin’s rivers to be “taken for themselves” (*selbst gemeint*). While these objective terms include the apparatus of literary science that occasions Heidegger’s final and tellingly parallel reference to φύσις later in the course, the succession of insertions on the manuscript page makes clear that what most concerns him here is not the interpretation of the rivers as “‘images’” but their treatment as one domain in the “field of objects for the natural sciences.” It is this reference to the “natural sciences” that prompts Heidegger to introduce the distinction between φύσις and natural science that governs the entire insertion, including his later addition of the parenthetical referring to the “inner truth of National Socialism.”

In crossing out what he had originally written to make a point about how natural science “denatures Nature,” Heidegger returns to two interrelated claims he made early in the course concerning the way natural science “leaves us in the lurch” in approaching the poetic conception of Nature. As Heidegger there writes—and in anticipation of Derrida—his reference to “our questioning” concerns why animals do not talk:

We shall first approach our questioning here if we ponder fundamentally how poetizing as the fundamental event of the historical Dasein of human beings relates—if we may put things in this way at all—to *Nature*, prior

to all natural science [*vor aller Naturwissenschaft*]. The whole of natural science—indispensable though it is within certain present day limits, for instance for the manufacture of rubber and the alternating current—for all its exactness leaves us fundamentally in the lurch here regarding what is essential because it de-‘natures’ Nature. (*GA* 39: 76; *GR*, 68–69)

Heidegger’s first and most important claim is that historical Dasein’s relationship to Nature is “prior” (*vor*) to natural science. Yet as his carefully qualified wording signals, this priority is not one of objective relation. Rather, poetizing as the opening up of beings in their totality (and this totality is in fact what Heidegger means by “Nature”) implicates the disclosure of Nature within the disclosure of Dasein’s *Da* at the same time that it constitutes Nature as historical through language. What Heidegger can only misleadingly articulate as “relation to”—it is instead the event of relation *per se* or what Heidegger takes up through Hölderlin as “intimacy”—is the paradoxical, because temporally inceptive, simultaneity of the poetic revelation of Nature and the inauguration of Dasein as historical. This priority in turn informs Heidegger’s second claim, namely, that Nature remains inaccessible to the “whole of natural science” not because of its failure to be exact but because its very exactness “de-‘natures’ Nature” by picturing it solely in terms of change of location to which numerical values might be assigned. It is thus no accident that Heidegger’s examples here treat a war industry as equivalent with the electrical current (and this same logic extends to “world commerce,” “industrialization,” and “machine technology” on the manuscript page); each derives from mathematical physics as the basis for Heidegger’s confrontation with technology during this period.

When, however, Heidegger felt himself compelled to intervene within what he had already written on the manuscript page, something deeper was at stake than the language of being “left in the lurch” suggests. For at issue is not just the constitution of the exact but the fact that the objective orientation of natural science is metaphysically derivative, and metaphysically derivative in a manner itself constitutive of natural science. As is evident in his truncated genealogy, Heidegger interprets the denaturing of Nature by the alien powers of Christendom and modern science to have literally “recoiled” back onto the conception of “science in general.” This recoil not only implicates the notion of truth operative in natural science—as such, it is an important dimension of Heidegger’s remark about “so-called liberal objectivity”—it also impacts the science operative “today” as what Heidegger terms the “organized business of procuring and transmitting knowledge” (*GA* 39: 195; *GR*, 178). (As a further addendum to the manuscript page, it is worth remarking that Heidegger had originally written “*Wissensförderung*” before crossing it out and replacing it

with the word “*Wissensbeschaffung*” [procuring knowledge], suggesting that the distinguishing feature of this recoil is the “challenging forth” of knowledge primarily for the sake of its organization through which it is secured in being delivered *as knowledge*. Whence Heidegger’s preoccupation in both the “*Germania*” and “*The Rhine*” course and *Introduction to Metaphysics* with the National Socialist infatuation with collected anthologies and bibliographies, and the instituting of new journals and periodicals.) In preempting interpretive access to Hölderlin’s rivers as historical, the objective stance adopted by natural science preempts access to that naming of Nature whose inceptive priority places it disjunctively *before*—and therefore interruptively *alongside*—natural science as the locus of “an other metaphysics.” To interpret Hölderlin’s rivers either ecologically or metaphorically (and this amounts to the same thing) is to fall subject not to just any kind of metaphysical error, it is to be cut off from the Hölderlinian naming of Nature as the only possible basis for what might be termed a “new science.”

Such interruptive priority is best approached in connection to what Heidegger characterizes on the manuscript page as the “primordially inceptive naming force” of φύσις. Though Heidegger does not offer an analysis of φύσις anywhere in the “*Germania*” and “*The Rhine*” course (he uses the Greek word only five times, but each use suggests the extent to which his interpretation of “*The Rhine*” is in dialogue with the *Introduction to Metaphysics*), the distinctiveness of the formulation “Nature—*natura*—φύσις” recalls the second lecture of his 1933/34 Winter Semester *Übung*, “On the Essence and Concept of Nature, History, and State.”¹⁶ After rejecting its Latin rendering with “*natura*” (getting born) together with its conventional translation as “growth” (*wachsen*), Heidegger offers a series of translations each of which aims to bring forward the meaning of φύσις as that which “comes forth” or is “moved by itself”

16 *Heidegger Jahrbuch 4. Heidegger und der Nationalsozialismus 1: Dokumente*, ed. Alfred Denker and Holger Zaborowski. (Freiburg: Verlag Karl Alber, 2009), 53–88, translated and edited, with an introduction, by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt as *Nature, History, State: 1933–1934* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), with essays by Robert Bernasconi, Peter Eli Gordon, Marion Heinz, Theodore Kisiel, and Slavoj Žižek; the German text is hereafter abbreviated as *NGS*. It is important to note that this course is comprised of often variable student transcripts. The analysis I am putting forward here is substantiated by *Introduction to Metaphysics*; in *Being and Truth* Heidegger also uses the specific formulation the “miracle of language” in characterizing the failure of human beings to “keep silent” as itself the origin of language. See *Sein und Wahrheit*, ed. Hartmut Tietjen, vol. 36/37 of *Gesamtausgabe* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2001), 108, translated by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt as *Being and Truth* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010), 85; hereafter cited as *GA* 36/37 and *BTr*, respectively.

(*das Von-Sich-Selbst-Herkommen, das von-Selbst-Bewegtsein*) (NGS, 60–61). In attempting to reorient interpretation from a narrow conception of “process” (*Vorgang*) or “development” to the essence of growth as the “by-itself” of creative origination, Heidegger seeks to shift the predominant understanding of φύσις as referring solely to natural phenomena to “something *that created itself*,” which he states presented itself at the inception of Greek philosophy as the “whole of being as *by-itself*” (*das Ganze des Seins als Von-selbst*).

At this point, the specific disclosivity of the word φύσις becomes important within the overall arc of Heidegger’s interpretation. Returning to the distinction he introduced at the end of the first lecture and that can be seen to structure the entire progression of the *Übung*, Heidegger claims that φύσις “grasps as one” (*in eins faßt*) both the formal and the material concept of Nature—though he importantly clarifies that the material concept of Nature “presupposes” the formal concept of Nature and is “encompassed” by it in the same way that growth as process presupposes and is encompassed by the essence of growth as what is moved by itself. Thus where the formal concept of Nature refers to something’s “kind of being,” the material concept of Nature designates the “what-being of a being” that within the larger context of the *Übung* allows it to be assigned to the domains of “Nature,” “history,” or “state” as they are successively demarcated from one another by a temporality Heidegger in each case seeks to distinguish from natural processes.

Within the context of describing the peculiar unity of this doubling-into-one of the formal and the material, Heidegger twice uses the formulation “φύσις—*natura*—Nature” writing: “In the same way [that growth presupposes that something is], Nature tells of what its things are and how they are. The simultaneous unity inherent in such doubling harbors the miracle of language [*Solche in eins fallende Doppelung birgt das Wunder der Sprache*]” (NGS, 61). The wondrousness of the actual word φύσις is to be found in the disclosive structure of its “double-interpretive possibility,” which makes manifest the being of beings in their totality while at the same time giving expression to the how of beings’ emergence as what they are (τὸ τὶ ἐστὶ). Φύσις, which Heidegger decisively emphasizes is a “domain” of Dasein, may therefore be understood to name the irruption of the ontological difference as it is articulated in terms of the creative origination of beings and thought in accordance with a temporality that derives from the structure of Dasein’s own disclosivity.

Introduction to Metaphysics recapitulates a version of these same points in seeking to recuperate what Heidegger, in a direct echo of the manuscript page, characterizes as the “authentically philosophical naming force” of φύσις and as its “undestroyed naming force” (GA 40: 15–6; IM, 14–15). (Yet despite his repetition of this key word, Heidegger’s analysis intimates that he understands this

naming power to have been if not destroyed, then, with the Latin translation of *natura*, at least cut off from its root. If the recoil of knowledge into organized industry takes place through the translation of φύσις, so too does its recovery, beginning with its rendering as the “emerging and abiding of what prevails” [*das aufgehende-verweilende Walten*], whose interpretive violence Heidegger intends as a corrective to an ambiguity in the Greek that enables Nature to become physicalism on its way to mathematical physics.) In refining his own translation, Heidegger again asserts that the coming forth by itself of φύσις is not equivalent to the “processes” that “we today” count as part of “nature.” He then uses this strong distinction between emergence and process as the means to transition to the inceptive priority of the poetic conception of Nature—he here calls it “a poetizing-thinking fundamental experience of being”—which, in first making beings visible in their coming into appearance, in turn makes beings “observable” (*beobachtbar*) in the objective sense presupposed by modern science. I quote at length because in its reference to “the gods as themselves standing under destiny,” this passage serves as the further commentary on the line from Hölderlin’s hymn “As when on a feast day . . .,” “For she [Nature], she herself, more ancient than the times / And beyond the gods of Occident and Orient,” that prompts Heidegger’s final reference to φύσις in the “*Germania*” and “*The Rhine*” course:

Not in natural processes did the Greeks first experience what φύσις is, but the other way around: on the basis of a poetizing-thinking fundamental experience of being, what they had to name φύσις disclosed itself to them [*aufgrund einer dichtende-denkende Grunderfahrung des Seins erschloß sich ihnen das, was sie φύσις nennen mußten*]. Only on the basis of this disclosure could they then take a look at nature in the narrower sense. Thus φύσις originally means both heaven and Earth, both the stone and the plant, both the animal and the human, and human history as the work of humans and gods; and finally and first of all, it means the gods who themselves stand under destiny. Φύσις means what prevails in its emerging and the perduring of that through which it prevails. This emerging, abiding sway includes both “becoming” as well as “being” in the narrower sense of fixed continuity. (*GA* 40: 17; *IM*, 15–16)

In disclosing beings as a whole, the having to name φύσις that takes place in the Greeks’ poetizing-thinking first allows Nature to appear in the more narrowly circumscribed sense of the ‘natural world.’ Heidegger’s listing of what is encompassed by φύσις in terms of a “both-and”—this importantly includes human history as well as the delimitation of “being” and “becoming”—stands

in contrast to a “field of objects” in bringing forward the differential ordering of beings according to their emerging and temporal perduring as this can become manifest only through the revelation of beings in their totality. And, indeed, Heidegger’s striking equation of Nature with destiny, of the prevailing of “*walten*” later interpreted in his analysis of Sophocles as “*das Überwältigende*” (the overwhelming), is essential for following out the relationship between φύσις and δίκη (*Fug*, ordering enjoining) through which Heidegger rejects the National Socialist interpretation of Nature as biological law in favor of a Nietzschean/Heraclitean conception of rank.

Where *Introduction to Metaphysics* makes clear that the Greek naming of φύσις sustained its double-interpretive possibility up through Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, Heidegger understands the Latin translation of φύσις as *natura* to have coincided with its demotion in Christianity to “something created,” which means to something rationally thought out in advance by God (*GA* 40: 202; *IM*, 207). The denaturing of Nature by the alien powers of Christendom and modern science thus form a continuous historical narrative—the conceptual transformation that takes place in the former prepares for the latter—at the same time Heidegger interprets mathematical physics to mark an *essential* departure from Christianity in securing the sovereignty of thinking over being as “calculability” (*Rechnung*). In the coincidence of its Latin translation and Christian reinterpretation as “something created,” the “narrow” meaning of φύσις finally eclipses its “original” meaning, thereby covering over the eventful connection between the miracle contained in the disclosive structure of the actual word φύσις and the insight into creative origination it captures as a fundamental experience of being. Though this point is largely implicit in Heidegger’s reference to “‘becoming’” in the above quotation, the covering over of the itself sufficient formal meaning of φύσις by its material meaning results in a modification in the interpretation of φύσις as “growth.” Thus where Heidegger’s analysis in “On the Essence and Concept of Nature, History, and State” indicates that the essence of growth as “getting bigger” (*größer werden*, literally “to become more”) retains its connection to φύσις as creative self-origination, with its wholly material interpretation Nature *qua* “growth” comes to be understood as “development” or “process,” whose assigning of time as a constant allows it to be modeled mathematically as change of location.

In addition to clarifying in what sense natural science is metaphysically derivative, Heidegger’s insistence on the priority of the original meaning of φύσις connects the opening up of a fundamental experience of being to what is best characterized as the ‘compulsion to name.’ This compulsion, which Heidegger already interpreted in the “*Germania*” and “*The Rhine*” course as the articulation of being’s “need,” is to be understood as the violent rupture

into language that internally connects the creative revelation of Nature with poetry's very power to disclose beings in their totality. As the unusualness of the middle-voiced construction "*erschloß sich ihnen*" (disclosed itself to them) signals, a fundamental experience of being does not take place outside of language; it is not 'pre-linguistic' in any conventional philosophical sense. Rather, Nature opens itself up to a poetizing-thinking whose transitivity or being 'set into motion' is itself a manifestation of the way language is co-responsive with that opening up, which is evidenced precisely in the reflexivity of the Greeks' "having to name" Nature. Yet it is precisely in this compulsion's *not* originating from Dasein that language derives its naming force through Dasein's being opened up to what is *first* disclosed through it and inaugurates it as historical. *Introduction to Metaphysics* takes this up as the disclosively reciprocal, but inceptively asymmetrical, relationship between φύσις and λόγος, which Heidegger expresses toward the conclusion of *Introduction to Metaphysics* in the formulation: "φύσις = λόγος ἀνθρωπογενῆς ἔχον: being, the overwhelming appearing, necessitates [*ernötigt*] the gathering that pervades and grounds being-human (accusative)" (GA 40: 184; IM, 187).

Heidegger's statement about the Greeks' "hav[ing] to name φύσις" was already informed by his interpretation of Hölderlin's fragmentary hymn "As when on a feast day..." in the "*Germania*" and "*The Rhine*" course, which Heidegger addressed in answering the question why poetry "*has to unveil*" (*enthüllen müssen*) Nature (GA 39: §19c; GR, §19c). Heidegger's analysis of this hymn, which is also the most important for understanding the poet's vocation, prompts his final reference to φύσις in the course in a manner whose schematic moves exactly parallel to the manuscript page, beginning with his "warding off" interpreting the hymn's opening as the "poetic depiction of a process of nature" and thus a "poetic comparison" (*dichterischer Vergleich*). (In direct homage to Pindar, the opening of the hymn's first two strophes reads, "As when on a feast day, to see the field a countryman goes . . . / So they [the poets] stand under favorable weather. . ."). In contrast to the manuscript page's logic of insertions, Heidegger's analysis here is governed by an immense rhetorical compression that tends to bury rather than bring forward his operative conceptual distinctions: His targeting of "poetic comparison" occasions a critique of the misguidedness of "traditional poetics," whose predominantly Christian interpretive categories—he specifies both "image" and "metaphor"—indicate an inability to come to terms with the "essence of poetizing" (GA 39: 254; GR, 230). This critique next segues into a series of remarks on the derivative status of "today's literary science" (*heutige Literaturwissenschaft*), which, after taking a shot at psychoanalysis, conclude with the observation that "now everything

is dripping with [talk of] national tradition and blood and soil [*Volkstum und Blut und Boden*], but everything remains wedded to the old.” Further registering his dismay, Heidegger then seamlessly progresses to the effort being expended on various scholarly productions, which culminate in his dismissive reference to Alfred Bäumler’s program of “heroic science,”¹⁷ without Bäumler being named or the possibility of a genuine “heroic science” being disavowed. To reproduce this passage:

“Poetic comparison”—what an unpoetic concept that is in the end! Yet one is so occupied with the scribbling of books, with the founding of new journals, with the organization of collected editions of literature, with not missing the boat, that one has no time for such questions [whether the concept of a “poetic comparison” is a misinterpretation of poetic telling]. An entire life could be spent on such things, even the effort of an entire generation. Indeed! So long as we fail to devote ourselves to such questions, talk of the “heroic science” now purportedly coming is idle talk. (*GA* 39: 254–55; *GR*, 231)

Parallel to the manuscript page, Heidegger here links the contemporary but antiquated categories of literary science to the business of scholarship, which he ties to an ideologically-driven National Socialist program of knowledge. In both passages, the effect of the German word “*angeblich*” (purportedly) is to assert an ironic distance before scientific initiatives that, in failing to know the history of their own metaphysics, adopt the activity of sheer production as their standard of rigor. It is this that is then construed as “heroic.” Heidegger also connects the production of knowledge to its organization (his reference to the “inner truth and greatness of [National Socialism]” in *Introduction to Metaphysics* is prompted by what he presumes is a sharp increase in works on the concept of value), with the added insight that such productions literally *consume* time, “even the effort of an entire generation.” This subtle point is not to be overlooked in a lecture course in which the possible arrival of the new gods is undergone in the experience of the “*essentially long*” time as

17 While Alfred Rosenberg made brief mention of “heroic science” in *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* (1930, 1935), I understand Heidegger to be specifically referencing Alfred Bäumler’s *Männerbund und Wissenschaft* (Berlin: Junker und Dunnhaupt, 1934). See in particular the talk delivered in May and June of 1933, “Hochschule und Staat,” in which Bäumler puts forward a Nietzschean-inspired vision of “heroic science” (*ibid.*, 139–48).

temporalizing the “world-time of peoples,” which also requires generations (*GA* 39: 56; *GR*, 53).

At this particular point, Heidegger returns to his concern that the hymn’s opening will be treated as a “poetic comparison” at the same time he makes what appears a rhetorical leap in his critique of National Socialist ideology in posing the question, “Poetic comparison for . . . What is being compared to what? A process in nature to a lived experience in the spirit” (*GA* 39: 255; *GR*, 231). Though his answer initially picks up with the division between the sensuous and supersensuous as the basis for traditional poetics, his emphasis shifts from poetic comparison as a literary figure to the disclosivity of Nature with the question, “[O]f what use is comparison, if the poet says that Nature herself teaches the poet?” Anticipating his central interpretive claim, Heidegger understands what *Introduction to Metaphysics* called the “disclosing itself [of φύσις]” to be of the “same origin” and “same essence” as poetizing; Nature “teaches” the poet as the itself inaugurating event of poetic telling, whose founding of being takes place as the compulsion to name Nature, through which poetry simultaneously unveils the origin of its own activity in the disclosure of beings in their totality. Hence the connection in “As when on a feast day . . .” between Nature and the self-reflexivity with which Hölderlin calls attention to his vocation as poet. Commenting on how Nature is to be properly understood, Heidegger distinguishes between the Hölderlinian conception of Nature as the embracing of “intimacy” and what he derisively identifies as the “biological-organic worldview” before going on to draw the positive contrast between Greek φύσις and Hölderlin as the “future of the Germans”:

The Nature of which Hölderlin tells here and in his poetic work as a whole is not the nature of landscape; Nature is also not the opposing domain to spirit or to history. Nature is here, as we might say quite vaguely and vacuously, the ‘universal,’ and yet not the primal soup or primal swamp and the bubbling over with which the biological-organic worldview ends and begins. Nature is the all-embracing. (ibid., *GA* 39: 255; *GR*, 231)

There are several points I want to emphasize about this passage in relationship to the manuscript page. First, Heidegger’s resistance to treating Nature in “As when on a feast day . . .” as a “process in nature” or “the nature of landscape” derives from his distinction between the formal and the material concept of Nature. Poetic comparison, in order to function as a comparison, has to privilege nature in its material sense as the observable in order to then import a spiritual meaning into it. Though Heidegger’s remarks appear to be merely a re-articulation of his earlier point about the denaturing of Nature by modern

science, the figures employed by traditional poetics do not just preempt access to the Hölderlinian conception of Nature, they preempt access to Hölderlin's poetizing of the essence of poetry through which one gains such access as the realization of a transformed metaphysics. (And Heidegger understands the disclosive event implicit in that essence to be constitutive of the people not *through* Hölderlin's language as something objectively present but *as* the itself inaugural event of the German language and, consequently, of German national identity.) Relatedly, “*Literaturwissenschaft*” and “*Naturwissenschaft*” can function as rhetorically interchangeable because, in their objective orientation as “sciences,” each is a manifestation of the denaturing of Nature and is therefore metaphysically derivative. What makes Heidegger's culminating connection between Nature and φύσις in this passage particularly significant is the convergence of the two in the ideological interpretation of poetry as the biological expression of the people. Such convergence not only reverses the order of priority between poetry and people—for Heidegger there is no people without the event of language realized through poetry—the ideologically-driven natural science lends its veneer of rigor to literary science not through the imposition of its objective methods but by transforming the literary object into something political through the notion of race.

This leads to my final point: Hölderlin's new naming of Nature transforms not only the very possibility of the poetic but also the very possibility of the political. Heidegger's disavowal of “talk[ing] about the ‘political’” in the “*Germania*” and “*The Rhine*” course is not some coy hedge but is a critical response to the fact, first, that “talk[ing] about ‘the political’” was code for talking racial ideology and, second, that precisely such talk distracted attention from the genuine *Aufbruch* inaugurated by the naming force of φύσις. Heidegger's refusal to engage in politics while presenting the lecture course as its authentic enactment is indicative of his own fraught position, which, on the one hand, is already situated within Hölderlin's “other metaphysics” and, on the other, subordinates itself to an interpretive stance whose transformation he enacts as the alternative to both literary science and to racial biologism. Instead of operating out of the metaphysical divide between the sensuous and supersensuous, material and spiritual that determines traditional poetics, the “*Germania*” and “*The Rhine*” course attempts a ‘poetics of φύσις.’ And, indeed, the redundancy implicit in this phrase points up the decisive philosophical innovation that underlies the distinction between φύσις and natural science that begins Heidegger's initial long insertion on the manuscript page: Heidegger thinks ποίησις more originally from φύσις as the naming force inaugural of not only an “other metaphysics” but an “other” politics.

New Science and the “Inner Truth of National Socialism”

In my schematic overview I pointed toward the significance of interpreting the parentheses that ambiguously bracket Heidegger’s reference to the “inner truth of National Socialism.” I now want to revisit the layout of the manuscript page as supplying the hermeneutical clue for deciphering the expression the “inner truth of National Socialism.” For if Heidegger’s reference to the “field of objects for the natural sciences” first prompted him to draw the distinction between φύσις and natural science, the question that next suggests itself is, What, within the logic of that initial insertion, prompts him to add a still further insertion, one in which he this time distinguishes between “this purportedly new science” and the “inner truth of National Socialism”? Still further, in what sense is this second distinction governed by Heidegger’s initial distinction between φύσις and natural science?

The omission of the two sets of parenthetical sentences from the Fritz Heidegger typescript provides the key for answering the first question. While it is obvious why Heidegger would have bracketed the insertion referring to the “inner truth of National Socialism,” thereby indicating his intention not to read these lines, it is by no means clear why he would have later added brackets to the sentence in his initial long insertion that reads: “Whether this business is kept in operation in the stance taken by so-called liberal objectivity, or in one that merely rejects that stance, alters nothing with regard to the shape of today’s science as such” (*GA* 39: 195; *GR*, 178). In other words, Heidegger’s bracketing and omission of *both* sets of sentences signals the relationship between them as specifically political, albeit in a manner whose historical context is gestured to so opaquely as to be non-existent for the contemporary reader. As such, the insertion of the parenthetical referring to the “inner truth of National Socialism” does not mark the addition of new content but Heidegger’s filling in and making explicit what he understands to have already been implied in his next point about a “transformation in science as a whole.” Read in terms of the graphic layout of the manuscript page, the parenthetical is a literal ‘putting beside’ whose prompt and specific point of reference is the “stance” that “merely rejects [so-called liberal objectivity],” which Heidegger is at pains to distinguish from his own rejection of liberalism.

While Heidegger’s disparaging attitude toward liberalism has been amply commented upon (it is a central component of Faye’s argument and a dimension of his curious *apologia* for Descartes), Heidegger’s use of the expression “so-called liberal objectivity” (emphasis mine) is not the endorsement of his own general position but instead functions as a type of quotation in referring to what at the time served as a rhetorical set-piece within an academic com-

munity competing to provide the ideological framework that would bring the German university into line with Hitler’s “new order.” As the German philosopher and historian of logic Volker Peckhaus writes in his investigation of the “‘new concept’ of science” as applied to mathematics:

The demand for a “new shaping of science within the German spirit” was, however, being mouthed by everyone, whether this demand was now directed against “liberalism” in science, which sought “to maintain its position under the guise of the objective and absolute science,” or whether it aspired to a “*renewal of science* and thereby the *university*” against “intellectualism” and the “mania for objectivity.” A distinguishing feature of “new science” was the adoption of its opposing position to all previous conceptions [of science].¹⁸

As Peckhaus elaborates, the rejection of the universal values of liberalism was employed to stage the affirmation of the “new science” without the ideological tenants of that science having been articulated beyond the constitutive dimension of its own rhetorical evocation and default recourse to racial biologism. (The latter notably led to the privileging of natural science as one of the “leading sciences” within the National Socialist university.) Indeed, Peckhaus’ guiding insight is to use the conceptual incoherence that resulted when the “new science” was applied to the formally objective domain of mathematics as a lens for examining the disciplinary implications of an emergent ideology where the very status of mathematics as a “science” came to be predicated not on its objectivity but on its “scientific”—and this meant “political”—consolidation of a racial ideology that it had already assumed and that was applied to it as the measure of its standard of rigor.

The extent to which Heidegger’s analyses in the early 1930s are situated in response to the “new science’s” rejection of objective truth emerges at several junctures in the lecture courses included in the *Gesamtausgabe* volume *Being and Truth* (GA 36/37). In what he himself identifies as a startling move, Heidegger states the following about the validity of the principle of contradiction:

18 Volker Peckhaus, *Der nationalsozialistische “neue Begriff” von Wissenschaft am Beispiel der “Deutschen Mathematik”—Programm, Konzeption und politische Realisierung* (M.A. thesis, Rheinisch-Westfälischen Technischen Hochschule, Aachen, 1984), (Erlangen/Paderborn, 2001), 30–32: <http://darwin.bth.rwth-aachen.de/opus3/volltexte/2009/2696/pdf/2696.pdf>. Peckhaus’ analysis—which is his *Magisterarbeit*—is enormously useful for its comprehensive research and citation of primary sources.

Showing that the law of being expressed by the principle of contradiction is unprovable and indisputable leads us back to the *quite unexpected ground*—unexpected for the entire conception, interpretation, and treatment of the axiom up to now. This ground in which its validity is grounded is *human Dasein*; and not that of man in general, but of *historical* man in the language- and people-bound, spiritually determined being-with-one-another of those who belong and are obligated to each other. The dominant *fundamental reality* of this *being-with-one-another* is *language*. (GA 36/37: 57–58; BTr, 46)

As this quotation indicates, Heidegger's placing into question the axiomatic status of the principle of contradiction aligns with the "new science's" rejection of objective truth, and does so in a way Heidegger directly links to a spiritual and "people-bound" (*volkhaften*) community. Yet what Heidegger signals as "unexpected" is not just the fact that the principle of contradiction is historically determinate but that it is historically determinate as grounded in "*the existential structure of our Dasein in general*" (GA 36/37: 58; BTr, 47). As the articulation of Dasein's *Da*, the principle of contradiction derives its validity through the way language "obligates" Dasein to others as a dimension of Dasein's disclosivity at the same time that the structure of that "obligation" or "belonging" takes the form of its validity. Similar to his analysis of "poetic legislation" in the "*Germania*" and "*The Rhine*" lecture course, what concerns Heidegger here is the structural connection between the disclosivity of language and what might broadly be termed 'bindingness,' which, as the expression of Dasein's finitude, internally relates the notion of a people to the conception of truth as historical. (This also explains in what sense Heidegger's 1934 *Logic and the Question of the Essence of Language* [GA 38] is a political lecture course concerned with the "we" as a people.) Exactly this type of interpretation distinguishes Heidegger from the default recourse to the racial ideology of the "new science"; blood or ancestry is not a mode of being-with-one-another sufficient to constitute the binding Heidegger understands to comprise a people—it is not a mode of being-with-one-another at all.

Heidegger makes backhanded reference to the "new science" in a manner that directly anticipates the manuscript page in the 1933/34 lecture course, "On the Essence of Truth," though the precise way this passage operates is unfol- lowable in the absence of familiarity with the historical context. After asserting that the "*essence of truth is essentially one with the essence of being*" (and this immediately follows Heidegger's commentary on Fragment 53 by Heraclitus in which he claims that πόλεμος possesses not only an "edeictic" function but

an “epoetic” one in bringing beings into “visibility” and thus into the openness of truth), Heidegger writes that the “greatest obstacle” to following out this insight is the entire history of Western Dasein itself, “whose power becomes all the more obstinate as the *great transformation of human Dasein* arises in a more originary and irresistible manner.” He continues:

At this point, it is getting embarrassing that there are more and more people who believe they have discovered that liberalism must be refuted. Certainly it should be overcome, but only when we comprehend that liberalism is just a marginal epiphenomenon, and a very weak and late one at that, rooted in still great and unshaken realities. And there is the danger that the overzealous killers of liberalism will quickly turn out to be the “agents” of a liberal National Socialism, which just drips with the naive and upright innocence of the youth movement. (*GA 36/37: 119; BTr, 93–94*)

Heidegger’s disdain makes vivid that the opposition of the “new science” to liberalism is not only embarrassing—Peckhaus makes clear that the “new science” is distinguished precisely by its oppositional attitude—it is beside the point given the continued efficaciousness of the Western tradition. Indeed, in referring to its “obstinacy,” Heidegger goes so far as to suggest that the “new science” is the final instantiation of that tradition—a point he underscores in referring to the “overzealous killers of liberalism” as “‘agents’ of a liberal National Socialism” willing to call into question the objectivity of truth while simultaneously treating race as a transcendent category.

However, what needs to be emphasized is that the “new science’s” rejection of truth as universal and objective to something to be founded in the “political,” neither implies nor necessitates a confrontation with Dasein as the “ground of truth,” much less the alethic eventfulness that connects the naming force of Nature to the historical configuring of truth through language. (And this connection would in fact designate what Heidegger understands by the word “*Volk*.”) Yet as the manuscript page suggests, the denaturing of Nature that occurs in modern science enables the “new science” to evacuate the notion of objective truth while simultaneously installing in its place the interpretation of nature as process that had to be presupposed in order to first arrive at an objective conception of truth. This is key: As articulations of a denatured Nature, liberalism and the ascendancy of natural science as race are coincident with one another and are metaphysically equivalent. Heidegger makes this point explicit when he writes in *Contributions to Philosophy (Of the Event)* that “[o]nly a thoroughly modern (i.e. ‘liberal’) science can be a ‘people’s [*völkisch*]

science.’”¹⁹ In constructing a “so-called liberal objectivity” solely for the sake of affirming itself as “new” in opposition to it, National Socialist ideology simply substitutes biological determinism and naturalistic explanation for objective truth without understanding that its conception of nature as race is itself the most resistant expression of modern subjectivity. (Building off the recent work of Robert Bernasconi, certainly one of the more startling implications of the interpretation I am forwarding is the implicit connection Heidegger makes between race and technicity.)²⁰ Thus rather than directly condemning racial biologism within the context of an academic intellectual milieu in which an opposing stance implied a historical elision that was part of how the “new science” produced itself as “new,” Heidegger’s posthumously published, “The Rectorate 1933/34: Facts and Thoughts,” indicates that he understood his critique of National Socialism to take place by way of his interpretation of the essence of truth. In a passage that assumes a different resonance when read in conjunction with the manuscript page, Heidegger comments: “The ‘new’ [the word ‘new’ should be read as a metonym for the “new science”] meanwhile had appeared in the form of ‘political science,’ the very idea of which rests on a falsification of the essence of truth.”²¹ However, the “falsification” here lies not in the “new science’s” rejection of liberalism but in the inadequacy of its philosophical resources for carrying through on its own insight into truth as historically (rather than biologically) grounded in the people through language.

This background helps contextualize Heidegger’s statement about the antiquatedness of the “new science” at the same time that it points out the ambiguous radicality that underlies the very expression the “*inner truth* of National Socialism [emphasis added]” in a passage that includes a still further insertion calling for a “transformation in truth.” When Heidegger writes on the manuscript page that the stance that rejects “so-called liberal objectivity” “alters

19 *Beiträge zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)*, ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, vol. 65 of *Gesamtausgabe* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1989), 148, translated by Richard Rojcewicz and Daniela Vallega-Neu as *Contributions to Philosophy (Of the Event)* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012), 116.

20 See Robert Bernasconi, “Race and Earth in Heidegger’s Thinking during the Late 1930s,” *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 48, no. 1 (March 2010): 49–66.

21 *Reden und andere Zeugnisse eines Lebensweges (1910–1976)*, ed. Hermann Heidegger, vol. 16 of *Gesamtausgabe* (Frankfurt am Main: V. Klostermann, 2000), 372–94, translated by Karsten Harries together with Heidegger’s Rectoral Address as “The Self-Assertion of the German University,” in *The Review of Metaphysics* 38, no. 3 (March 1985): 481–502.

nothing in regard to today’s science,” he is rejecting *both* liberal objectivity *and* the rhetorical-ideological gesture through which the “new science” rejects liberal objectivity as the means to affirm the “political” concept of the people as race. It is the structure of this double-rejection that occasions Heidegger’s positive drawing of the distinction between the “new science” and the “inner truth of National Socialism.” In answer to my second question, what governs this further distinction is the naming force of φύσις and its internal connection to truth as ἀλήθεια from out of which the notion of an “inner truth” must itself be thought.

I want to conclude by raising a few points about the larger implications of this archival discovery and the direction I hope its wider scholarly engagement might take. First, the very fact of the discovery necessitates a reinterpretation of Heidegger’s reference to the “inner truth and greatness of [National Socialism]” in *Introduction to Metaphysics* together with an examination of how that reference has been put to use in the secondary literature, where it has functioned as a ‘floating signifier’ in authorizing every kind of philological and philosophical claim. I believe that many of these claims—including the interpretation of this expression as a ‘personal confession of faith’ or the addition of the parenthetical referring to “global technology” as a retrospective interpolation—simply do not hold. It is a peculiarity of this discovery that its singular resonance derives from the fact that it is *not* unique and thereby both implies and supplies interpretive context. As I have shown, the logical succession of insertions on the manuscript page, beginning with the distinction Heidegger draws between φύσις and natural science and culminating with the demand for an “other metaphysics” he believes to have been accomplished through Hölderlin, provides the key to the interpretation of both references as sustainedly *philosophical*—and sustainedly *philosophical* in a manner that connects Heidegger’s inaugural interpretation of poetic dwelling to a presuppositional critique of technology and racial ideology through the naming force of Nature.

Second, Heidegger’s reference to “so-called liberal objectivity” in conjunction with the “new science” is historically specific and located within what at the time was an ideologically determined debate about the status of science and objective truth. A more historically informed examination of key volumes from the *Gesamtausgabe* will show that the majority of Heidegger’s most controversial political references to National Socialism were themselves provoked by ideological initiatives or contemporary discourses specifically concerned with *Wissenschaft*.

In this article I have shown how Heidegger's references to the "new science" and to Bäumler's "heroic science" in each case prompts Heidegger's drawing of a distinction that situates his rejection of Nazi ideology while simultaneously (and this means protectively) gesturing toward the possibility of an "other" National Socialism determined by the new naming of Nature. Similarly, Heidegger's assertion of the "historical singularity of National Socialism" in the 1942 Hölderlin's Hymn "The Ister" (GA 53) is prompted by a reference to Himmler's program of "scientific occupation" (*Wissenschaftseinsatz*), which was concerned with the discovery and establishment of a German-Aryan ancestral heritage. (Heidegger's interpretation of the πόλις in that lecture course is offered as an alternative to the retroactive National Socialist colonization of the Greeks, which transforms them into the original Germans precisely by way of the racial-ancestral connotations operative in the word "political.") In each of these instances a clearly identifiable schema is operative, one whose implicit and repeated set of connections points toward the unsaid locus of what Heidegger understands by the word "*Nationalsozialismus*." While the most thoughtful work on Heidegger's politics has begun to fill in these connections, what remains missing from the current scholarship is the subtle yet historically specific ways Heidegger indicates in the lecture courses how closely he is in dialogue with his times, especially when what is at issue is science, the production of scholarship, and the university.

Third, and most important, is the way Heidegger's two references to the "inner truth of National Socialism" are each framed by φύσις and the necessity of a new naming of Nature. As I have suggested, Heidegger's conceptual innovation is to think the creatively emergent power of Nature as originally poetic rather than biological. And, indeed, Heidegger is not alone in his effort to radically rethink Nature as the basis of politics. It is Arendt who, in seeking to provide a metaphysical alternative to totalitarianism as "motion," takes recourse to the Latin interpretation of Nature as *natura*—as the miracle and spontaneity of birth (natality)—in theorizing the political. This prompts what remains for me the deeper philosophical question posed by this discovery: If the political must be thought by way of Nature, as seems to be the case in the Western philosophical tradition, then a transformation in the essence of Nature will transform the political. How is the essence of Nature transformed through the naming force of φύσις? And how, thereby, is the political itself transformed? Not just in itself but precisely for us. How does the naming force of φύσις transform the political as the site of the existential structure of our Dasein?

Appendix A: Hölderlins Hymnen “Germanien” und “Der Rhein,”
GA 39: 195–96; GR: 178–79

I have noted in footnotes corrections I have made to what is published in the *Gesamtausgabe* volume.

Wir wissen die Ströme sind nicht einfach ›Bilder‹ für etwas, sondern sind selbst gemeint und mit ihnen die heimatliche Erde. Aber diese ist nicht ein irgendwie abgezirkelter Bereich von Land, Wasser, Pflanzen, Tieren und Luft unseres Planeten im Sinne des Gegenstandfeldes der Naturwissenschaften von der Geologie bis zur Astrophysik, überhaupt nicht ›Natur‹ im neuzeitlichen Sinne. Denn gerade der metaphysische Sinn von Natur, *natura*, φύσις in der uranfänglichen Nennkraft des Wortes ist schon eine wesentliche Auslegung des Seins, die mit Naturwissenschaft nicht das Geringste zu tun hat. Die ursprüngliche, von den Griechen erschlossene und ins Wort gebrachte Natur wurde später durch zwei fremde Mächte *denaturiert*. Einmal durch das Christentum, wodurch die Natur erstlich zum ›Geschaffenen‹ herabgesetzt und zugleich in ein Verhältnis zu einer Über-Natur (Reich der Gnade) gebracht wurde. Sodann durch die neuzeitliche Wissenschaft, die die Natur auflöste in die Machtbereiche der mathematischen Ordnung des Weltverkehrs, der Industrialisierung und der im besonderen Sinne maschinenhaften Technik. Geschehnisse, die ihrerseits wieder zurückschlugen in die Auffassung der Wissenschaft überhaupt, also nicht nur der Naturwissenschaft,²² und zu dem führten, was wir heute haben: Wissenschaft als organisierten Betrieb der Wissensbeschaffung und -vermittlung. (Ob dieser Betrieb in Gang gehalten wird in der Haltung der sogenannten liberalen Objektivität oder einer solchen, die diese Haltung nur verneint, ändert an der Gestalt der heutigen Wissenschaft als solcher nichts.) (Neu ist diese angeblich neue Wissenschaft nur dadurch, daß sie nicht weiß, wie veraltet sie ist. Mit der inneren Wahrheit des Nationalsozialismus²³ hat sie vollends nichts zu tun.)²⁴ Wenn wir uns daher heute die Aufgabe stellen, einen Wandel ›der Wissenschaft‹ im Ganzen zu erwirken, dann gilt es zuvor, eines zu wissen: Wissenschaft als Ganze kann nie durch Wissenschaft und noch weniger durch Maßnahmen, die nur eine Änderung ihres Lehrbetriebs betreffen, gewandelt werden, sondern nur

22 “*Naturwissenschaft*,” singular, for “*Naturwissenschaften*.”

23 “*Nationalsozialismus* [N.soiz]” for “*Naturwissenschaft*.”

24 Addition of two sets of parenthetical markers; elimination of paragraph break.

durch eine andere Metaphysik, d.h. eine neue Grunderfahrung des Seyns. Diese schließt in sich: erstens Wandel des Wesens der Wahrheit, zweitens Wandel des Wesens der Arbeit. Diese Grunderfahrung wird ursprünglicher sein müssen als die der Griechen, die sich in Wort und Begriff der φύσις ausspricht.

Appendix C: Hölderlin's Hymns "Germania" and "The Rhine," DLA 75.7074: 55; GA 39: 195–96; GR, 178–79

We know that the rivers are not simply "images" of something, but are meant to be taken for themselves, and that together with them the Earth of the homeland is intended. Yet the Earth is not a domain of land, water, plants, animals, and air belonging to our planet, a domain that is somehow circumscribed in the manner of the field of objects for the natural sciences extending from geology to astrophysics, [] [section crossed out on left-hand side of manuscript page; beginning of insertion [1] on right-hand side of page. The bracketed numbers are mine, and correspond to the logical succession of Heidegger's insertions on the manuscript page discussed in the introduction of this article.

[3] This purportedly new science is new only by virtue of the fact that it does not know how antiquated it is. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the inner truth of N.soc.)

[5] This entails: 1. transformation in the essence of truth. 2. transformation in the essence of labor. Whether this business is kept in operation in the stance taken by so-called liberal objectivity, or in one that merely rejects that stance, alters nothing with regard to the form of today's science as such, [2] science ^ as a whole^ can never be transformed through science, but only through another metaphysics, that is, a new fundamental experience of being. This fundamental experience will have to be more original than that of the Greeks, which expresses itself in the word and concept φύσις . and still less through measures that are concerned merely with altering the business of its teachings

[1] ^it is not at all 'Nature' in the modern sense.^

For precisely the metaphysical meaning of Nature—*natura*—φύσις in the primordially inceptive naming force of the word is already an essential interpretation of being that does not have the slightest thing to do with natural science. Primordial Nature, disclosed and brought to word by the Greeks, later came to be denatured by way of two alien powers. On the one hand, by Christendom, through which Nature was first demoted to something 'created' and at the same time brought into a relationship with a supra-Nature (the realm of grace). And then by modern science, which dissolved Nature into domains of power belonging to the mathematical ordering of world commerce, industrialization, and technology, which in a special sense is machine technology. Events that for their part in turn recoiled back onto our conception of science in general [6] ^thus not only nat. science^ and that led to what we have today: science as the organized business of procuring and transmitting knowledge.

[4] If, therefore, we today set for ourselves the task of bringing about a transformation 'of science' as a whole, then we must first come to know one thing: