



# Martin Heidegger: Anti-Semitism and Metaphysics in the *Schwärze Hefte* (1939-1941). The Attack (*Angriff*) on Husserl

**Quesada Martín J\***

Instituto de Filosofía, Universidad Veracruzana, México

**\*Corresponding author:** Julio Quesada Martín, Instituto de Filosofía. Universidad Veracruzana, Camino a rancho viejo, 12-B. 91612. Coatepec, Veracruz, México, Tel: (52) 2281 1127 19, Email: [quesadajulio@yahoo.es](mailto:quesadajulio@yahoo.es)

**Research article**

**Volume 3 Issue 2**

**Received Date:** May 19, 2020

**Published Date:** June 09, 2020

**DOI:** [10.23880/phij-16000146](https://doi.org/10.23880/phij-16000146)

Every good historian knows that no history is possible without the capability of “estrangement” and “self-exile” with respect to our own historical circumstance (...) capability that prepares us, precisely, to perceive and apprehend other economic, social and political mentalities.  
**-Jesús Turiso**

## Abstract

The aim of the present paper is to clarify the relationship, within Heidegger’s thought, between (a) his 1916 anti-Semitism of the spirit, and (b) his criticism of Husserl’s transcendental phenomenology of 1923-24. The latter took place, in turn, within the framework of the criticism of the essence of modern metaphysics as a calculated omission of the question about Being. An intentional forgetting due to the universalist machinations proper of theoretical thinking (abstract: without soil, without homeland). Hence, Heidegger’s spiritual anti-Semitism ends up transformed, through his criticism of Husserl’s phenomenology, in a metaphysical anti-Semitism. According to it, there is an analogy between (a) the judaization of the German spirit and culture; and (b) the (theoretical) essence of modern metaphysics. As an historian of philosophy, Heidegger reaches the conclusion that the reason that prevents Husserl from delving into the true experiences (originally German) is his own race. I conclude that the Shoah could only find its way in the spirit of an epoch whose racism had been grounded by Heidegger through his denial of philosophy.

**Keyword:** Heidegger’s; Anti-Semitism; Spirit

## The Text of the *Schwärze Hefte*

Methodologically, I begin by pointing out to the passage where Martin Heidegger, in an autobiographical fashion, indicated the meaning that his constant criticism of Husserl’s phenomenology really had. I intend to reconstruct in what follows this metaphysical anti-Semitism in order to return, in the last part, to the above mentioned passage.

The history (*Geschichte*) of Western humans—no matter whether they dwell in Europe or elsewhere—has slowly

advanced (*vorgeschoben*) to a situation wherein all otherwise familiar domains such as “homeland” [*«Heimat»*], “culture” [*«Kultur»*], “people” [*«Volk»*], but also “state” [*«Staat»*] and “Church” [*«Kirche»*], and also “society” [*«Gesellschaft»*] and “community” [*«Gemeinschaft»*] refuse to take shelter [*Zuflucht*]. And that is because these domains have been degraded to mere pretexts and have surrendered to an arbitrary connivance whose motive forces remain unfamiliar and divulge their operation simply in compelling humans to habituation in an ever more importunate [*aufdringlicheren*] massiveness whose “fortune” is exhausted in making do

without decisions and in becoming stupefied while intending to possess and enjoy this massiveness more and more, because what is worth possessing is becoming constantly smaller and emptier. The sole and also necessarily unguenuine anxiety such a situation still allows is the fear that this human activity could suddenly be brought to an end by new wars and everything could go astray; for where the adherence to the present-at-hand counts as the possession and mastery of beings [*das Wesen des Seienden*], there misfortune shrivels up to a state in which and through which everything present-at-hand [*Vorhandene*] must be subject to elimination [*Beseitigung*].

How could there still awaken in these circumstances a trace of the anxiety which recognizes that precisely the supremacy of the present-at-hand and the unneediness for decisions [*Entscheidungen*] (the imperceptibly growing strength of the destining toward this situation) are already and only devastation and not merely destruction and that the sovereignty of this devastation through catastrophes of war and wars of catastrophe can no longer be impugned, but only attested? No essential change will be introduced into the metaphysical character of beings as a whole [*der Seienden im Ganzen*], whether or not the herd-quality of humans, abandoned to itself, through its universalization drives the human being to the consummation of his animality, or the pack of despots drives the supremely articulated and “engaged” masses to complete decisionlessness, or therefore an “order of rank” [*Rangordnung*] within the definitively identified animal (in the sense of the “superman”) can still be instituted. With the coolest audacity and while averting [*Abwehr*] all the pressure of “moral” evaluations and “pessimistic” dispositions, the thoughtful gaze must keep before and around itself the consummation of the metaphysical history of beings [*Vollendung der metaphysischen Geschichte des Seienden*], so that the atmosphere of inept decisions might blow pure and clear throughout meditative questioning.

What matters here is to know that the devastation within the domains of “refinement” [*Bildung*] and “cultural pursuit” [*Kultur betriebs*] has already progressed essentially further than it has in the field of the coarser concern for the needs of life. In correspondence, here—with the futile custodians of the spiritual heritage [*vergebliche Hüter des geistigen Erbes*—a higher cleverness has developed in the renunciation of essential meditation [*wesentliche Besinnung*]. In this correspondence, there entice and increase, on the one hand, the disempowerment of all rooted domains in favor of the empowerment of a thorough machination [*Machenschaften*] and, on the other hand, the renunciation by the human masses of all claims to decisions and standards. Through this self-expanding correspondence, there emerges an imperceptible void [*unsichtbare Leere*] whose concealed

essence cannot be grasped from the still-dominant basic metaphysical position [*metaphysische Grundstellung*], especially if this position, in the guise of its opposite, attains prestige as the unconditional incorporation of the human being into the machination of beings [*Machenschaften des Seienden*] as a whole—and this often still in reference to the historical forms of sovereignty which have already been deprived of every foundation [*Boden*]. For instance, today’s military believes it can still rely on “Prussianism,” but the military has essentially changed and is even already something other than the soldiery [*Krieger*] of the last years of the world war—besides the fact that from this domain of human activity, even if the domain places one before death in an idiosyncratic hardness, creative historical decisions can never arise, but only forms of an always average breed, and to want to expand this breed and make it “total” would demonstrate utter ignorance of the essence of being [*Wesen des Seyns*] and of its lying beyond all power and impotence.

For the same reason, however, also every “pacifism” and every “liberalism” are unable to press on into the domain of essential decisions; instead, these attitudes amount to a mere counterpart of a genuine or unguenuine militarism. But the occasional increase in the power of Judaism [*Judentum*] is grounded in the fact that Western metaphysics [*Metaphysik des Abendlandes*], especially in its modern evolution [*neuzeitlichen Entfaltung*], offered the point of attachment for the expansion of an otherwise empty rationality and calculative capacity [*leere Rationalität*], and these thereby created for themselves an abode in the “spirit” [*Geist*] without ever being able, on their own, to grasp the concealed decisive domains. The more originary and inept the future decisions and questions become, all the more inaccessible will they remain to this “race.” (Thus Husserl’s step to the phenomenological attitude, taken in explicit opposition to psychological explanation and to the historiological calculation of opinions, will be of lasting importance—and yet this attitude never reaches into the domains of the essential decisions [*wesentliche Entscheidungen*]; instead, it entirely presupposes the historiological tradition of philosophy. The necessary result shows itself at once in the turning toward a neo-Kantian transcendental philosophy, and this turn ultimately made inevitable a progression to Hegelianism in the formal sense. My “attack” on Husserl is not directed to him alone and is not at all directed inessentially [*unwesentlich*]—the attack is directed against the neglect of the question of being, i.e., against the essence of metaphysics as such [*gegen das Wesen der Metaphysikalssolcher*], the metaphysics on whose ground the machination of beings [*Machenschaften des Seienden*] is able to determine history. The attack establishes a historical moment [*geschichtlichen Augenblick*] of the supreme decision between the primacy of beings [*Vorrang des Seienden*] and the grounding of the truth of being [*Gründung der Wahrheit*].

des Seyns]]<sup>1</sup>.

## The Spiritual Anti-Semitism of the Young Heidegger

On October 18, 1916, MH wrote the following to his wife Elfride:

The judaization of our culture and our universities is, without any doubt, horrendous, and I believe that the German race should gather still more inner power in order to reach the summit. Otherwise, the Capital!<sup>2</sup>.

In the middle of World War I, the anti-Semitic racism of this philosopher shows up, albeit in a private form. Seventeen years had to elapse (up to May 1<sup>st</sup>, 1933) until this anti-Semitic stance found a political expression. Since then, and up until the end of World War II, MH was affiliated to the Nazi party. It draws my attention that some Heideggerians (of daily communion), like Escudero JA, completely forget (Guild amnesia?) anti-Semitism at the time of reconstructing the philosophical itinerary of the young Heidegger<sup>3</sup>. Escudero believes that the point of departure of Heideggerian philosophy is launched by the need to elaborate a “new concept” of philosophy, of an existentialist coinage, in which, by means of the *epojé*, the *modus vivendi* of philosophy as “theory” is suspended, entirely at the margin of mathematics and logic, as a way to find the factual structures of human life<sup>4</sup>. But this explanation of the need to reach an amendment

of the entire Husserlian phenomenology is phantasmagoric and contradictory. What is the “factual” need of the new concept of philosophy? If the new existentialist philosophy has nothing to do with theory, how can one keep talking about the “concept”? On the other hand, How does Escudero want to make us believe that the young Heidegger made an *epojé* of the theoretical realm in order to reach Being?

This hermeneutic gibberish is clarified if we take seriously the rôle of anti-Semitism at the time of building a straightforward existentialist philosophy at the margin of theory. On September 8, 1920, he wrote the following to Elfride:

Manesse’s Hölderlin [?] is so grotesque that makes me laugh ---I wonder if it would possible to flee from this pollution and reach an original freshness and rooting in life-- *there are moments in which one would gladly become an anti-Semitic in spirit*<sup>5</sup>.

This autobiographical passage provides far more of information than all the hermeneutics that has been deployed in order to hide the historic and philosophic history of Heidegger’s nazism. At the time of understanding what is Heidegger referring to with the notion of “uprooting”, there is nothing better than this confession. The uprooting of the German, guardian or pastor of the metaphysical essence of the West, lies in the fact that in the German universities there is room no just for a neo-Kantian Jewish Kant, but, what is worst, an interpretation of Hölderlin’s poetry from the perspective of the Judeo-German culture. This, which is asserted against intersubjectivity or cultural miscegenation is what, actually, makes the young Heidegger to direct his thought toward a philosophy without conflicting perspectives in play. The “rooting” of being is, in opposition to what Escudero wrongly believes, what sets in motion all the meaning and structure of the criticism of Husserl’s. The dilemma «either *epojé* or rooting» is exclusive for the young Heidegger because his existentialist turn is a necessary part of his criticism and solution of the “uprooting”. The

1 Martin Heidegger, Ponderings XII-XV. Black Notebooks 1939-1941 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017), pp. 35-7. Translation of Überlegungen XII-XV (SchwärzeHefte 1939-1941) (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 2014). GA 96, pp. 44-47.

2 Martin Heidegger, *¡Alma mía! Cartas a su mujer Elfride 1915-1970* (Buenos Aires: Manantial, 2007). My translation.

3 Jesús Adrián Escudero, *El programa filosófico del joven Heidegger. Introducción, notas aclaratorias y glosario terminológico sobre el tratado El concepto de tiempo* (Barcelona: Herder, 2007).

4 Escudero affirms: “In short, the lessons that inaugurate Heidegger’s academic activity in the middle of the post-war period aim at the elaboration of a new concept of philosophy, one that does not constrict and subject the phenomenon of life to scientific patterns of knowledge. The existentialist tone meets the eye and characterizes a good part of Heidegger’s early work. Once and again the same question arises: How is it possible to apprehend in a genuine way the phenomenon of life without resorting to the tendentially objectifying instruments of the philosophical tradition? The answer is sharp: the primacy of the theoretic attitude must be suspended and the dominant ideal of the mathematical and physical sciences, which pervades the philosophical endeavor from Descartes to Husserl, must be placed between brackets”. *El programa filosófico del joven Heidegger. Introducción, notas aclaratorias y glosario terminológico sobre el tratado El concepto de tiempo*, pp. 12-13. This is evidence of the fact that many “experts” on Heidegger never get to know anything. One thing is Husserl’s *epojé*, to suspend judgment on the world, to put it between brackets, and quite a different one is the Heideggerian hermeneutic endeavor as “destruction” of the improper interpretations of Being (Natorp Inform). It is not a matter of “suspending”, putting between brackets the theoretical attitude before the

world, but rather of building a philosophy without theory, without *epojé*. That is why MH never pretended to “reconstruct” Husserl’s transcendental philosophy, but rather to finish it.

5 *¡Alma mía! Cartas a su mujer Elfride 1915-1970*, p. 129. Mennasse was a Jewish publisher that used to publish on cultural topics. If the researcher does not take this seriously, he will never be able to relate the Heideggerian existentialist turn that he wanted to give to philosophy with an anti-Semitism that demands to free the phenomenon “life” from its theoretical readings. That is to say: we can study Hölderlin (Aristotle, Kant, Nietzsche) from the emotion of the homeland and the native soil. We cannot study Hölderlin’s literature or philosophy from an objective position (a theory of comparative literature) but only and exclusively from those original experiences to which, obviously, the Jews can never gain access. The literary and philosophical mistake of post-Modernism is based upon that gibberish.

“becoming aware of” ---Husserlian phenomenological clue--- is going to be rendered by Heidegger as the maximum obstacle preventing the Western man from returning to his natural-instinctive orbit of Being in which man’s autonomy does not exist and cannot exist. Man cannot perform *epojé* because (*Sein und Zeit*) he “is thrown into...” (*Geworfenheit*) existence. The transformation of *Geworfenheit* into *Zuflucht* carries with it, as we know, an ontological journey based upon the logomachy that Heidegger concocts about the “temporality” and “historicity” of the *Dasein-Volk-Staat*; the community-of-the- people-in-its-State as authentic human existence. But, even though it is just logomachy, it is important as a philosophical contribution to the nationalist and anti-Semitic ideology of that epoch, before and after World War II. This shelter or haven of Being, which he begins to look for in a certain *ad hoc*, supposedly “phenomenological” interpretation of Aristotle;<sup>6</sup> this rooting in the German homeland is what always separated, both philosophically and politically, the master from the pupil, and this one from neo-Kantism, especially from Ernst Cassirer.

### Why Husserl’s Transcendental Phenomenology is “a Monstrosity”?

In §6 of the *Introduction to Phenomenological Research* ---the first course given by the young Heidegger in Marburg--- there appears, in a veiled form, in the shadow, the racist foundation of his criticism of Husserl’s transcendental phenomenology, which, as it has been said before, applies as well to neo-Kantism, because the latter is a sort of thinking that multiplies the uprooting of the West.

The question now is: *What care motivates the shaping of consciousness as the theme* and, indeed, with the specific tendency of working on a clarification in an epistemically critical sense? Let us recapitulate for ourselves the context in which “consciousness” comes to be established as the thematic core. The focus dwells on instances of knowledge, specifically scientific instances that are designated in the sense stressed as consciousness-of-something: experiences of meaning, including meanings of assertions of theoretical thinking. From this vantage point, we also understand the priority which what is entitled “consciousness” gains over all other experiences. In itself, it is, indeed, monstrous to designate love a “consciousness-of-something.” The care consists in shaping the thematic field for *theoretical knowing*, just as it factually is as *science*; for science insofar as it emerges as a possible context of achievement in the *culture*

6 Martin Heidegger, *Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles* (Anzeige de hermeneutischen Situation). GA 62. (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2005). Julio Quesada, “¿Quién es el Aristóteles de Heidegger? El revisionismo anti-democrático de la frónesis (I),” *Stoa*, vol. 8, no. 16 (2017): 79-92.

and is laid claim to as the foundation of a culture grounded on science<sup>7</sup>.

In order to interpret correctly what Heidegger is claiming, let us believe that he means what he says: Out of which historic-cultural and political *context* is he criticizing Husserl? Which was, actually, the hermeneutic situation of the young Heidegger? His own anti-Semitism, disguised, at that time, as a criticism of the “intellectualism” of theoretical thinking which, indeed, makes us more equal. Inasmuch as phenomenology wants to have a “scientific” ground, it dissolves the myth of *Kultur*, origin of the historic rights of one culture or race over others upon which the Heideggerian “temporality” and “historicity” is grounded. This modern anti-Semitism (Judaism = theory) was imposed upon the German academia since Werner Sombart, in 1911, pointed out in his *The Jews and Modern Capitalism* that the “essence” of the nomadic life of the Jew was based upon his capability of theoretical abstraction, which provides him with an extraordinary value, computational skills above other peoples<sup>8</sup>. The interest of the young Heidegger, with respect to phenomenology, was to obtain, over and against the universalism of teleological transcendental phenomenology, an authentic phenomenology: radically finitistic (*Da-sein*). Already in 1923-24, he was asking himself, in scholar fashion, what was the true reason for the preeminence of the “consciousness of “vis à vis other “experiences”. And as we saw in the former passage, and in the whole book, its reason is the proper prerogative of theoretical thinking. Or, as expressed in his private “anti-Semitism of the spirit”, the “judaization” of the spirit and culture of Germany.

Husserl’s mistake, in the final analysis, is in the *epojé*: putting the immediate world among brackets in order to gain a critical-reflexive consciousness of my own *Un-Welt* or surrounding world. But what seems to be a gnoseological mistake appears to the young Heidegger as a moral assessment. This is something that does not happen in the critique of psychologism, but only to Husserl when he proposes the “consciousness of” as point of departure of the phenomenological experience. Hence, Heidegger never

7 *Introduction to Phenomenological Research* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), p. 44.

8 Werner Sombart, *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben* (Leipzig: Verlag von Duncker & Humblot, 1911); *The Jews and Modern Capitalism* (Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001). The whole of chapter XIV is devoted to show that the proper nature of the Jewish people is its “intellectual”, “logical”, “rational”, “abstract” and “utilitarian” capacity, that Sombart labels as “teleologism”. Even though Heidegger does not quote Sombart, something customary in him because he used to hide his sources, it is easy to recognize Sombart’s footprint in Heidegger’s criticism of the Jews for their “transcendental” (utilitarian) capacity to be everywhere and nowhere. Cf. Julio Quesada, *Heidegger de camino al Holocausto* (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2008).



saw Husserl as a philosopher, but just as another agent of the “intellectuality” of the world. Javier San Martín pointed out, twenty three years ago, that this Heideggerian critique of “love” as “consciousness of” should impel us to reconsider the *existentiale* *Mitsein* of *Sein und Zeit*<sup>9</sup>. Indeed, the famous and humanitarian “being-with” can never spring from the consciousness of belonging to the human kind but, quite the contrary: it is a “being-with” of the “experiences” as finite, exclusive and exclusionary as the one that asserts: “being-towards-death”<sup>10</sup>.

This acute micro-hermeneutics of San Martín’s can be applied to the socio-political context. There is a deep phenomenological smell in the Constitution of Weimar’s Republic. A republic is based, politically, upon the human capacity to make *epojé* of our ethnic, religious, sexual, in the end linguistic differences, in order to build the *eutasia* of the State. But if the latter is not based upon the self-criticism and empathy (*Einfühlung*) toward the other which is found in the experience of the “consciousness of”, which impels us, precisely, to go beyond ourselves and identify, why not, with that nightingale that I see in the windowsill, as John Keats ---unknowing phenomenologist--- did in his poem *Ode to a Nightingale*, and if that Heideggerian “being-with” is the one of the “experiences” of a *We* completely alien to inter subjectivity with the others, then “love” (and coexistence) are linked exclusively with the homogeneous world of the “original experiences” of each human group. And so it is the “experience” of the community (*Gemeinschaft*) of the people (*Volk*) in its State (*Staat*) what must occupy and be the concern of the true “consciousness”, as *Sorge* or “care” of the “spirit” and “culture” properly Germanic<sup>11</sup>. I leave here as an open project to investigate the claim that for Heidegger “the political” is the other face of his criticism of Husserl’s phenomenology, who, precisely out of love, alone in the face of danger in a Vienna full of swastikas, wanted to put himself in the skin of the Papuans. Husserl did not have the same “experiences” of the Papuan people, but he gain conscience of their humanity<sup>12</sup>.

9 Javier San Martín, “La crítica heideggeriana a la fenomenología de Husserl,” in *Eduardo Ranch Sales and Fernando Miguel Pérez Herranz (eds.), Seminario de filosofía, centenario de René Descartes (1596-1996)* (Alicante: Universidad de Alicante, 1997), pp. 88 ff.

10 The “ontological denial” of the Holocaust, pointed out by Emmanuel Faye in the lecture delivered by Heidegger in 1949 in Bremen (The Danger), finds its prologue there. Emmanuel Faye, Heidegger, l’introduction du nazisme dans la philosophie. Autour des séminaires inédits de 1933-1935 (Paris: Albin Michel, 2005), p. 395 ff.

11 Heidegger’s tremendous mistake does not consist of appealing to the world of experiences of our daily life, or *Lebenswelt*, which already was in Husserl, but of making of these experiences a metaphysical apriori with which to differentiate ontologically and historically the “true” Germans from the German Jews.

12 “Philosophy and the Crisis of European Man”, lecture delivered in

## “MI Attack on Husserl”: Anti-Semitism and Metaphysics

Since his inaugural rectoral speech of 1933 (*The Self-Assertion of the German University*) Heidegger unified the “anti-Semitism of the spirit” and his criticism of Husserl’s transcendental phenomenology with the cultural and political project of National Socialism. The first legislation of the new German regime will be concerned with the struggle for the purity of Honor. I want to stress the deep analogy that is taking place between (a) that the *epojé* is in itself a “monstrosity” and (b) that the Jewish officials should be deposed from their positions in the government. There is in both cases a self-assertion (*Selbstbestätigung*) of what is properly German against the Jews. The “monstrosity” of the “consciousness of” reveals, since 1933, as the (normal) monstrosity of the nazism of Heidegger the philosopher.

My claim is proven in that ominous passage of the *SchwärzeHefte* with which the present paper began. The fact that those seven fundamental terms ---homeland, culture, people, State, church, society and community--- give no longer “refuge” to Western man means that what Heidegger understands by “history” determines, by itself, the impossibility, the absolute negation, of transformations and changes in history. The Time of Being cannot bring about any change. This is the vault password of his ontology conservative of the self-assertion of the German culture and spirit. The “uprooting” merely means, simply put, for example, that this constitutional “homeland” of the Weimar’s Republic no longer gives shelter to the German honor of the blood (*Blut*), because the false guardians of *Kultur*, through neo-Kantian and transcendental phenomenological “cosmopolitanism” and “universalism” want to transform the *Reich* into a modern republic. Hence, the “rooting” cannot be but the project of purification of those terms ---people, State, community--- that no longer provide shelter to what is authentically German<sup>13</sup>.

When the homeland, the culture, the people and the State are not rooted, the uprooting of the West takes place. But, note, these terms, “rooting” / “uprooting”, are useful only to simulate racism as *Sorge* or care of Being. One has to be a cow-reader, as Nietzsche demanded in the Prologue to the *Genealogy of Morals*, able to ruminate and regurgitate Heidegger’s tramp in order to grind it again. The mass man,

Vienna, on May 10, 1935. Cf. Edmund Husserl, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970), pp. 1-20.

13 This is another way of understanding why, for Heidegger, the endeavor of his hermeneutic has to be destructive and not inclusive.

the *das Man*, is associated to the “quantity” and the “opinion” of the newspaper. Not few Heideggerians have believed (Naively?) that, due to this anti-mass stance, Heidegger is the leader of the liberation of man as individual. But these interpretations, like that of the translator Escudero JA, are non-sensical. Heidegger promises to free us from the gregarious conditions both of capitalism and communism only to let us fall into the gregariousness of race. It is obvious that Heidegger does not believe that being thrown into a race may end up forming the strongest possible gregarious tribe. On the contrary, this belonging to the German race is what distinguishes Being from Non-Being or Nothingness.

The attack on Husserl has two angles: (1) a general, and (2) a particular one. (1) In a generalized way Heidegger establishes in 1941 that the momentary power of Judaism is due to its alliance with modern philosophy. This relationship, that Heidegger does not develop here, because he has spoken about it in other places, like the Introduction to Metaphysics, the *Beiträge* or the lecture *The Age of the World Picture*, in the decade of the 1930s, is based in turn in the aforementioned thesis of Werner Sombart's: the form of existence of the Jews is the “theoretic”, the “abstract”. He sees an analogy between the nomadic abstractive capability of the Jew, on one hand, and the *Discourse on Method*, the *Critique of Pure Reason*, and the *Logical Investigations*, on the other, which is in itself a “monstrosity”: the experience of the Jewish race, as race, has nothing essential (*arché*) to say to science or philosophy. It is against this (anti-racist) alliance that Heidegger asserts that the Jews have managed to “contaminate” the *Kultur*, in order to make believe that they also have *Geist*. It is clear that, for Heidegger, this spirit is empty because it contains only computational skills, pure “universalist” abstractions that drag toward “uprooting”. And this is the main reason why the nazi philosopher (an oxymoron) sent his teacher and mentor Edmund Husserl to live, as Ernst Cassirer, out of the philosophy of existence. And this has to be repeated as many times as necessary: the Jewish exile with respect to the philosophy of *Da-sein* is the major premise for the disappearance of the Jews from existence.

(2) Just in case this general criticism is not clear enough, Heidegger adds the parenthesis that you may ruminate calmly. ¿What does he add there? For Heidegger, the criticism of transcendental phenomenology is only the tip of the iceberg, something really “petty”. From this moment on, the history of Being blends with the narrative plot which is in Heidegger's head. No matter how hard he tried to enter into the essential domains of philosophical reflection, that is to say in the essential domains of the non-theoretical experiences proper to the German people, Husserl was always, and will always be, outside of “the” German. There are no arguments in this criticism of Husserl, only experiences and a history incompatible with “teleologism”

and “universality”. It is Husserl's own “race” what a priori makes impossible for transcendental philosophy to take care of the inheritance of the German people. Even though he left behind “psychologism”, Husserl could never have gone to the things themselves because the nature of his philosophy is “transcendental”.

There lies for Heidegger the problem of evil. The evil of nazism, as Levinas saw it early back in 1934, is “elementary” because it has to do with the “secret nostalgia of the German soul”<sup>14</sup>. There is nothing more; it as raw as that: anti-Semitism consists of eliminating the Jews, an action that in turn affirms the German identity. Nevertheless, this criticism of the essence of Judaism, which coincides with the criticism of the essence of Western metaphysics as “omission” of the question about Being, was inscribed in what, in his phantasmagorical fantasy, is defined in the *SchwärzeHefte* as a decisive historic moment or happening. Against the “omission”, the “Truth about Seyns” is philosophically and politically imposed. This hermeneutic archaicism ---proper to a radically finite logic of the “origin” (Ursprung)--- is telling us that Being or existence do not depend of theory, concept, or arguments, but of the exclusionary form of the *Dasein = Volk = Gemeinschaft = taat* as German “experience”. That is to say, the birthplace: “being-there”. One has to be blind, or even cynical, in order to be unwilling to see that the “metaphysical” criticism of Husserl for belonging to that “race” was only the tip of the iceberg, of what the nazi regime was preparing in order to solve the “Jewish problem”.

Philosophy, or what is called by that name, had fallen so low. Out of philosophy, out of the polis, what followed for the Jews was exile. But it was Heidegger, not Luther or Hitler, who went farther in his evil: they could not even die in the concentration camps. This attack, and the posterior (1949) “ontological denial” of the Holocaust, make of Heidegger “the deepest thinker of the twentieth century”, a good laboratory where philosophy and literature (but also psychiatry) should delve into the heart of darkness. The banality of evil? The “final solution” (*Endlösung der Judenfrage*) began, institutionally, on February 26, 1942, at the Wansee Conference. But, culturally and spiritually, the solution to the “Jewish problem” had started long before.

On June 20, 1932, also from Friburg, Heidegger writes to Elfride what follows:

I am reading Bismarck's memories and thoughts ---and also about Greek history--- and I do not stop asking myself where we have come to land. It is not just that nothing great

14 Emmanuel Lévinas, “Quelques réflexions sur la philosophie de l'hitlérisme”, *Esprit*, no. 26 (1934): 199-208. Translated in “Reflections on the Philosophy of Hitlerism,” *Critical Inquiry*, no. 17, (1990): 62-71.

or essential exists but, as it is natural that it be, given the way things are, the *instinct* for norms and hierarchies is missing. But, as I have written, even though the effort demanded by the nazis is huge, it will always be better than this pernicious poisoning to which we have been exposed during the past decades under the motto of “culture” and “spirit”<sup>15</sup>.

Almost one year before affiliating to the nazi party, Heidegger was justifying the national socialist movement from his hermeneutic position: the destruction of those decades of poisoning in which the “useless guardians of the inheritance” (*SchwärzeHefte*) had allowed the transformation of the political “instinct” into a political theory. The *Seyns* of the political, therefore, is neither an argument nor an idea, but “instinct” without mediation, in its purest state. And it was this purity and its spirit of cultural cleansing ---metaphysically grounded by Heidegger--- what makes feasible to understand historically the coming to be of the Holocaust as a possibility opened by Heidegger’s thought. It is not that the philosopher allowed himself to be dragged by the anti-Semitic trend of the epoch ---as Jean Luc Nancy wrongly believes in his commentaries to the

15 *¡Alma mía! Cartas a su mujer* Elfride 1915-1970, p. 190. The emphasis is mine.

*SchwärzeHefte*--- but rather his thought was instrumental in the formation of the Holocaust’s *Zeitgeist*<sup>16</sup>.

16 Jean-Luc Nancy: *Banalité de Heidegger* (Paris: Éditions Galiléé, 2015). I have carried out an analysis in depth of the first volume of the *SchwärzeHefte* in my book *Martin Heidegger. Metapolítica. Cuadernos negros (1931-1938)* (Bogotá: Editorial Aula, 2019). In that book I show not only the relationship that holds in Heidegger’s thought between “metaphysics” and “politics”, which we already knew, but ---and this is more important--- that anti-Semitism is not a “biological” issue, but rather a “metaphysical” one. This makes evident: (1) The tremendous mistake of J-L. Nancy: How could Heidegger’s anti-Semitism be the product of the German historical circumstance if it is “metaphysical”? And (2) That by means of the *SchwärzeHefte* one understands, even better than in his planned course on Nietzsche’s metaphysics of 1941-42, which he could not deliver due to the war, his assertion that the “notion” of “race” was actually possible, that is to say “metaphysically necessary”; both the “training of men” as well as the “principle of an institution for the selection of a new race” (GA 43, 193). Enough of banalities! The main thesis of Emmanuel Faye’s study (*Heidegger, l’introduction du nazisme dans la philosophie. Autour des séminaires inédits de 1933-1935*) is that nazism introduces into metaphysics and this, in effect, is only possible if in Heidegger’s metaphysics there is room for nazism, anti-Semitism and the Holocaust. As far as I am concerned, we can conclude, therefore, that this “principle” that has to be institutionalized for the racial selection of man, and that “historical circumstance” which consists, as we saw, in the final “attack” of Heidegger on Husserl, in the “creation of the truth of Seyns”, are one and the same metapolitical issue.

