

Thinking Nature v. 1

/1/ - What did the early Heidegger think about nature?

Paul J. Ennis

In this article I will argue that there are two crucial points to be gleaned from the early Heidegger's scattered remarks on nature in lieu of 'thinking nature.'¹ The first is that the early Heidegger has no conception of nature as a participant in the articulation of truth.² The second point is that there is in Heidegger's conception of nature nothing that must, by necessity, be articulated. This second point is complex, but it hinges on Heidegger's thesis that truth is best understood *not* as a correspondence between mind and world, but as emerging in Dasein's transcendence that discloses a transcendent actuality. This is what differentiates his sense of transcendence from Kant's.³ It is between such disclosing and the extant that events occur. It is what occurs or happens that counts ontologically and this position leads to a particularly nuanced relation to nature throughout his thinking. Understood according to the traditional epistemological tone of the debate there is for Heidegger no contradiction between holding a modest realist stance regarding epistemological claims and a robust antirealist stance

¹I mean by the early Heidegger the Heidegger of the Marburg period. In this period Heidegger was still a transcendently inflected thinker. The two texts I will be discussing are his magnum opus *Sein und Zeit* and his 1927 lecture course *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*. See Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, 19th Edition (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2006) [hereafter SZ] and Martin Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1975) [hereafter GA24]. Translations for all the German texts used throughout this article are my own.

²Heidegger, unlike Hegel, has no need to fit nature into his schema as when Hegel, in the final speculative moments of the *Phänomenologie des Geistes* on absolute knowing [*das Absolute Wissen*], demarcates nature as the unactualized Notion [*der Begriff*]. According to Hegel the Notion was implicit all along in nature [*die Natur*] prior to our emergence. Its capacity to come to know itself had remained untapped and so remained in a state of unconscious relative proto-knowing. Hegel calls nature the 'last becoming [letzteres Werden]' of *Geist*, 'its living immediate Becoming [lebendiges unmittelbares Werden]' and 'externalized *Geist* [entäußerte Geist].' In G.W.F. Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1952), 563.

³Recall that for Kant the order that appears in nature comes from the transcendental subject. Kant never suggests that nature is consistent in its own right. It may be, but this we cannot know. It seems likely that it is since we are able to formalize it so well, but this intuition cannot constitute cognition. The 'order and regularity [Die Ordnung und Regelmäßigkeit]' of nature makes sense because we 'put it there.' In Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1956), A125. Hereafter KRV. Since one never encounters nature outside experience this is both how nature appears to us and is for-us.

regarding ontological claims. It is worth engaging Heidegger on this topic today because his position is increasingly being edged out in favour of various continental realisms. From the perspective of continental realism Heidegger belongs firmly on the transcendentalist line stretching from Kant onwards. To the continental realist the phenomenological method remains deeply implicated in the Kantian nexus and is problematic on that basis.⁴ *Accepting that there is some truth to this stance I offer only the small, but nonetheless consequential, insight that Heidegger never disbars the possibility of a realist approach to nature including the speculative kind.*

It is evident that Heidegger's conception of the phenomenological method emerges in dialogue with the transcendental nexus and that his entire project has one aim i.e. to show that one can address the question of the meaning of being without anchoring it in questions concerning entities. Despite this it is important to recognize that, contra most transcendental thinkers, he is remarkably off-hand about discussing the status of nature 'in-itself' and that his approach to the problem of nature is surprisingly nimble. Where Heidegger differentiates himself from the classic transcendental stance on nature is that he can resist formalizing or phenomenizing all content because he believes that nature, which is what is often formalized or phenomenized, does not constitute the content of phenomenological method. To him natural phenomena are actually existing entities that can be interpreted according to a wide range of criteria, but always, Heidegger insists, one approaches them with an implicit ontological orientation. This approaching is what concerns him because it is in approaching natural entities that we *question* them and so, indirectly, ask the *question* of the meaning of being. Heidegger is aware that this will draw him into the debate concerning realism and antirealism and there are times when he feels the

⁴Things have moved extremely fast in this regard. When I was writing "Toward a Heideggerean Eco-Phenomenology" in 2007 there was a general consensus that the marriage of ecological thinking and phenomenological method was almost complete. Today an entire range of speculative metaphysicians rally their considerable forces against phenomenological method in general. See Paul Ennis, "Toward a Heideggerean Eco-Phenomenology," *Intertexts: A Journal of Comparative and Theoretical Reflection* 11: 2 (2007): 123-139.

need to state his position on these matters.⁵ Where this arises Heidegger is often concerned with the specific problem of whether the human conception of natural entities is the maximal ontological consideration of that entity. Is an entity fully real independent of human considerations or only really real when it enters the maximal coherence that human engagement brings to bear upon it?

For Heidegger this question is significant only in so much as it brings light to bear on the ontological question. Hence what counts here is whether the interaction of Dasein with natural entities is a more significant ontological event in that it has a higher ontological charge than events that do not include Dasein as a participant. This can then reveal details about the import of Dasein's disclosing of entities and so supplement our grasp of the ontological question. There is little said about the status of things free from this disclosure and so Heidegger *consciously* avoids the standard realist and antirealist debates. Patricia Glazebrook neatly explains his position on the matter:

“...Heidegger is a realist who nonetheless holds antirealist assumptions, and...this position is neither garbled nor self-contradictory. Rather, it exchanges the either/or of realism/antirealism for a both/and. His realist commitment to the transcendent actuality of nature goes hand in hand with the thesis that human understanding is projective, and its corollary that the idea of a reality independent of understanding is unintelligible.”⁶

Glazebrook zeroes in on the central status of nature in Heidegger's thinking as a transcendent actuality. It consists of transcendent entities over and beyond us. This actualized region and our specific transcendence go hand in hand. The transcendence appropriate to Dasein and the transcendent actuality that is transcended toward are both definitive constituents in what happens and what occurs. From this perspective the phenomena of nature are accessed by Dasein in disclosure, but what is accessed is an

⁵This raises the issue of the relationship of phenomenology to the natural sciences and the extent to which it may or may not be beneficial to naturalize phenomenology to some extent. This arises, for the most part, outside the understanding of phenomenological method as it is developed by Heidegger, but it is important to note that many see the future success of phenomenology as hinging on this naturalization. Attempts to naturalize phenomenology are varied in themselves, but a representative sample can be found in J. Petitot et al, *Naturalising Phenomenology: Issues in Contemporary Phenomenology in Cognitive Science* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).

⁶Patricia Glazebrook, “Heidegger and Scientific Realism,” *Continental Philosophy Review* 34 (2001): 362.

actuality that in-itself remains for us unintelligible. Here Heidegger is in precise accord with the consequences of the Kantian formalist position on nature, but the disclosure Heidegger has in mind does not correspond so precisely to the Kantian ‘order and regularity’ of nature (KRV, A125). Kant is claiming that the formalization of nature is an outcome of the makeup of reason, but Heidegger sees the formalization in a much more muted sense as the disclosure that happens in the interaction between Dasein and the appearing of entities. There is no claim about what nature undergoes to appear as it does to reason.

This slight, but significant, difference in emphasis can be clarified in relation to the conceptions of truth orienting their respective positions. For Kant truth is something gained when one begins to understand the limits of cognition, but for Heidegger truth is not gained but experienced in or as disclosure. Heidegger claims that ‘Dasein is “in the truth” [Dasein ist “in der Wahrheit”]’ (SZ, 221). This means that Dasein inhabits truth in acts of disclosure because it is the event of disclosure that best corresponds to the ontological conception of truth he intends to outline.

In its ontological sense truth is common since it is disclosure as such, but this is not to suggest that truth is evident.⁷ To grasp that the disclosure itself constitutes truth requires a phenomenological seeing that recognizes that truth is generated in and emerges alongside events. To consider what happens, what occurs, or to consider events as manifesting truth marks the difference between Kant and Heidegger. The difference is further marked in the fact that disclosure makes no claims to the necessity of phenomenizing the content of this transcendent actuality.⁸ The minimal relation required is that

⁷Hence for Heidegger ‘Dasein is its disclosedness [Das Dasein ist seine Erschlossenheit]’ (SZ, 133).

⁸Depending on the context the transcendental actuality is either considered as ‘nature’ or ‘reality.’ In *Sein und Zeit* both are addressed in a similar manner. Heidegger says of nature: ‘The ‘Nature’ with which we are ‘surrounded’ is an entity within-the-world, but the kind of Being which it shows belongs neither to the ready-to-hand nor to what is present-at-hand as “Things of Nature” [Die “Nature” die uns “umfängt,” ist zwar innerweltliches Seiendes, zeigt aber weder die Seinsart des Zuhandenen noch des Vorhandenen in der Weise der “Naturdinglichkeit”]’ (SZ, 211). On reality he claims that: ‘The fact that ontological reality is grounded in the Being of Dasein cannot mean that only when Dasein exists and as long as Dasein exists can the real be as that which in itself it is [Daß Realität ontologisch im Sein des Daseins gründet, kann nicht bedeuten, daß Reales nur sein könnte als das, was es an ihm selbst ist, wenn und solange Dasein existiert]’ (SZ, 211-2).

Dasein have content to disclose. For instance, in the specific case of perceptual experience Dasein must transcend itself toward extant [Vorhandenem] things or else it would have nothing to transcend itself toward.⁹ In turn extant things are released into an encounter with Dasein, but need not be so disclosed by necessity. Heidegger remarks in *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*, again in a discussion of perception, that: ‘Perceiving is a release of extant things that lets them be encountered. Transcending is an uncovering [Das Wahrnehmen ist freigebendes Begegnenlassen von Vorhandenem. Das Transzendieren ist ein Entdecken]’ (GA24, 98). In the same manner that the amateur archaeologist waves a metal detector over a field, but might never uncover the treasure below so Dasein shines light on some treasures, but may never disclose others.

There is nothing in this to suggest that extant things need to be released into an encounter to be what they are. Heidegger is not attempting to demonstrate the necessity contained in extant things but, rather, what is required for extant things to be brought into an encounter. Extant things can be considered minimally, in the realist sense, as actually existing independent entities. They can also be considered maximally as brought into a meaningful encounter with Dasein in an event of disclosure. To consider entities minimally is to consider them in an ontic manner i.e. as beings. To consider them maximally, without assigning a value to these terms other than their ontological broadening, is to consider them according to the question of the meaning of being. The crucial point is that the meaning of being [Sein], and not the essence of entities, hinges on the maximal definition. This maximal definition includes the significant introduction of truth into the equation. In *Sein und Zeit* Heidegger claims that: ‘Being – not entities – is something which ‘there is’ only in so much as truth is. And truth

⁹Extantness and transcendent actuality refer to the same content in Heidegger’s corpus, but extantness has a specific sense of this content as it is grasped by Dasein: ‘We speak of the disclosedness given to us in the understanding of extantness [Wir sprechen von der im Verständnis von Vorhandenheit gegebenen Erschlossenheit]’ (GA24, 100). Later in *Von Wesen Der Wahrheit* Heidegger provides another useful definition using the same word to define ‘the circle of present-at-hand things [Umkreis des Vorhandenen]’ found in our environment. In Martin Heidegger, *Von Wesen Der Wahrheit: Zu Platons Höhlengleichnis und Theätet*, ed. Hermann Mörchen (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1988), 174. This is, of course, the region of the present-at-hand [Vorhandenheit] that plays such a significant role in Heidegger’s tool-analysis in *Sein und Zeit*.

is only in so much as and as long as Dasein is [Sein – nicht Seiendes – “gibt es” nur, sofern Wahrheit ist. Und sie ist nur, sofern und solange Dasein ist]’(SZ 230).

I claimed that what properly differentiates Kant and Heidegger is their conceptions of truth. Where they agree is on the point that truth is not to be considered as the correspondence of mind to a transcendent actuality as it is in-itself i.e. in nature. The Kantian perspective sees nature for-us not as a region of beings transcending us, although this might be the case since it can be *thought*, but as the formalized representation of that content as it appears to us and so as it can be *cognized*. In a muted sense the Kantian architectonic accepts the transcendent actuality as the region of empirical data that must exist in order to be formalized.

The revision of phenomenological seeing introduced in Heidegger infers the existence of a transcendent actuality in a similar muted sense. In order for Dasein to transcend toward something in perceptual experience there must be some actually existing content out there. Despite putting an end to the dream of the unification of mind and nature (in-itself) Kant remains committed to the idea, outlined in the first *Kritik*, that the task remains the uncovering of epistemological correspondence albeit on a new Critical basis that reverses that correspondence. In undermining this theoretical stance Heidegger is attempting to short-circuit these debates by insisting that the ontological perspective defuses them. This can be seen in Heidegger’s remarks on natural laws since it is here that one is supposed to find clear-cut examples of immutable truths.¹⁰ Heidegger famously claimed that before the articulation

¹⁰Frege, for his part, claimed that natural laws would continue to function as they do whether we exist to cognize them or not, but his position is also nuanced: ‘The law of gravitation is completely independent of everything which takes place in my brain and of every change or alteration in my ideas. But grasping this law is nevertheless a mental process! Yes: but a process that lies at the very boundary of the mental and can accordingly not be completely understood from a psychological standpoint. For in it something comes into account that is no longer mental in the proper sense: the thought; and perhaps this process is the most mysterious of all.’ In Gottlob Frege, “Logic,” in *Posthumous Writings*, ed. H. Hermes, et al. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1979), 145. The mental does not constitute the natural law in *this sense*, but in *another sense* it does. This latter sense is the law that is not merely functioning, but which has been cognized, that is to say grasped, in the mental processes of a cognizing subject. But also note the ambiguity that Frege accords to the cognizing process, a process that lays at the ‘very boundary of the mental,’ and that does not have its basis in psychological operations. To deepen the sense of the statement, as befitting what is ‘most mysterious of all,’ is the clarifying function that philosophy can serve in relation to the natural sciences.

of Newton's laws it is impossible to state whether they were true or false.¹¹ This does not mean that prior to their articulation Newton's laws were not operative. Rather it means that once they were articulated it then became possible to think about their epistemic validity. What became possible was the actualization of their truth and this corresponds to their maximal ontological sense. It is the truth of these laws, and not the functioning of these laws themselves, that came into being with Newton, but, to stress the point once again, it is only possible for this truth to emerge if these natural laws existed beforehand and prior to Dasein. History layers the natural world, but in terms of truth it must have some content to consider. What is transcended toward is required for transcendence.¹²

What emerges *with* Dasein is truth. This leads us neatly to time as the horizon through which one can address the meaning of being. Dasein is not just in time, but experiences time as temporality. In seeing this one can grasp the notion that there was a time when Newton's laws held but were not yet disclosed for Dasein. This is to think these laws according to the ontological difference as inscribing,

11 Heidegger makes this well known point in two places. The first remark comes in *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*: 'Newton's laws, so often used in arguments regarding the interpretation of truth, have not existed from all eternity, and they were not true prior to Newton's discovering them [Die Gesetze Newtons, mit denen man oft bei der Interpretation der Wahrheit argumentiert, sind nicht von Ewigkeit her da und sie waren nicht wahr, bevor sie durch Newton entdeckt wurden]' (GA24, 314). The second remark comes in *Sein und Zeit*: 'To say that before Newton his laws were neither true nor false, cannot signify that before him there were no such entities as have been uncovered and pointed out by those laws. Through Newton the laws become true; and with them, entities become accessible in themselves to Dasein. Once entities have been uncovered, they show themselves precisely as entities which beforehand already were. Such uncovering is the kind of Being which belongs to 'truth' [Die Gesetze Newtons waren vor ihm weder wahr noch falsch, kann nicht bedeuten das Seiende, das sie entdeckend aufzeigen, sie vordem nicht gewesen. Die Gesetze wurden durch Newton wahr, mit ihnen wurde für das Dasein Seiendes an ihm selbst zugänglich. Mit der Entdecktheit des Seienden zeigt sich dieses gerade als das Seiende, das vordem schon war. So zu entdecken, ist die Seinsart der 'Wahrheit']' (SZ, 227).

12The point is reinforced throughout the *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie*: 'What perception is directed toward in conformity with its sense is the perceived as such. This is what is intended. What is expressed in this exposition that is not deluded by any theories? Nothing else than that the question as to how subjective intentional experiences can relate to something objectively present is asked in the wrong way. I cannot and should not ask: how does inner intentional experience get out into the world? [Das, worauf die Wahrnehmung ihrem Sinne nach gerichtet ist, ist das Wahrgenommene selbst. Dieses ist gemeint. Was liegt in dieser durch Theorien nicht verblendeten Aufweisung? Nichts Geringeres, als daß die Fragestellung, wie die subjektiven intentionalen Erlebnisse ihrerseits sich auf ein objektiv Vorhandenes beziehen können, von Grund aus verkehrt ist. Ich kann und darf nicht so fragen: Wie kommt das innere intentionale Erlebnis zu einem Draußen?]' (GA24, 89). Again, and this time in direct relation to intentionality: 'The window does not get its existence from my perceiving it, but just the reverse. I can perceive it only if it exists and because it exists [Das Fenster bekommt doch nicht dadurch Existenz, daß ich es wahrnehme sondern umgekehrt, ich kann es nur wahrnehmen, wenn es existiert und weil es existiert]' (GA24, 49).

and impressing in the most direct manner possible, the difference between the time of entities and the time of Dasein i.e. temporality. From this horizon truth becomes something that can emerge in this temporal frame, specific to Dasein alone, so long as one recognizes that the difference can also maintain truth in terms of natural phenomena, i.e. ontic minimal truth, and truth in terms of disclosure i.e. ontological maximal truth.¹³ In sustaining this difference Dasein is never forced to rein in the extant and the transcendent actuality, or the noumenal realm, can remain as the arena of things ‘unknown’ to ‘intellectual intuition [intellektuelle Anschauung]’ (KRV, B312, KRV, 308).¹⁴ One can always maximise one’s position on, or in relation to, the extant by stepping from the epistemological stance to the ontological stance.¹⁵ Here the extant can maintain its function as a boundary concept in terms of theoretical knowing and this is to hold that it can still have its epistemological application. For Heidegger this will only ever be a limited stance. Truth, as he sees it, has to be seen from the temporal horizon. It is not enough to say that Newton’s laws hold for all time. One must also note that Newton’s laws were discovered in the time of Dasein and so have a ‘temporalized’ truth significance. It is an event in Dasein’s history, Heidegger’s infamous historical procession of being, and is an event that takes place for Dasein. In turn Dasein, as the Da-, is where the taking-place of this event can unfold in ‘maximal’ time and in temporal history.¹⁶

13Later Heidegger will say that Dasein’s disclosure deconceals the extant: ‘The essence of truth qua ἀλήθεια (unhiddenness) is deconcealment.’ In Martin Heidegger, *Von Wesen Der Wahrheit: Zu Platons Höhlengleichnis und Theätet*, ed. Hermann Mörchen (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1988), 73-4.

14This follows from the basic thesis that Dasein exists among extant things or amidst a transcendent actuality. Heidegger expresses this point as follows: ‘The statement that the compartments of Dasein are intentional means that the mode of being of our own self, the Dasein, is essentially such that this being, in so much as it is, is always already amongst the extant [Die Verhaltungen des Daseins sind intentional besagt, die Seinsart unser selbst, des Daseins, ist seinem Wesen nach so, daß dieses Seiende, sofern es ist, je schon bei einem Vorhandenen sich aufhält]’ (GA24, 90).

15Heidegger considers this the stepping into a fuller, less deflated world than the world of the theoretical. This is possible because the world [die Welt], as Heidegger sees it, is always the world of worldhood [Weltlichkeit] and the meaning of this world is bound up with disclosure. Disclosure only occurs when Dasein is on the scene (SZ, 63). See Cristina Lafont, *Heidegger, Language, and World-Disclosure*, trans. Graham Harman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

16On the topological dimension in Heidegger’s thinking see Jeffrey Malpas, *Heidegger’s Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2006).

This temporal angle seems to unite Heidegger more with Hegel than Kant. Hegel had posited in the final recollective moments of the *Phänomenologie* that through the process of ‘inwardizing [Er-Innerung]’ there is an outpouring of *Geist* into history [die Geschichte] (PDG, 564). There is a definite passage here within which all content is unified or, at least, unified in preparation for the next step in the Hegelian schematic. Heidegger does not introduce the temporal in order to ease the passage of the unactualized Notion and so account for the outstanding issue of the transcendent actuality in Kant. Rather Heidegger maintains that there always remains an intractable difference.¹⁷ This means that in as much as an outside exists, populated by entities *unlike* Dasein, there exists a difference *unlike any other* difference. This one difference has the consequence of introducing the significant dimension appropriate to Dasein alone. Included in this difference are entire cultures, entire temporal structures, entire ethics, entire histories, or, which is to say the same thing, entire *worlds*. The difference between being and beings is, for this reason, the abiding origin of Heidegger’s thought and it is returned to persistently.¹⁸ Nature can continue to exist whether Dasein does or not. This much we have established so far. World, however, cannot. There is no world *sans* Dasein.¹⁹ Heidegger, in so much as he thinks

¹⁷There is much that can be said on the relationship between Hegel and Heidegger since they are both thinkers, in their respective manners, of time, history, and temporality, but there are significant differences especially when one opposes the progressive slant found in the Hegelian picture to the decline of being Heidegger offers us. In Hegel reason has a specific function in that it drives the consideration of history because it allows one to recognize the rational core in the development of history. Recall the well known quote from the *Philosophie der Geschichte* lectures: ‘The only *Thought* that *Philosophy* brings with it to the contemplation of History, is the simple conception of *Reason*; that *Reason* is the sovereign of the world; that is the history of the world, therefore, presents us with a rational process [Der einzige Gedanke, den die Philosophie mitbringt, ist aber der einfache Gedanke der Vernunft, daß die Vernunft die Welt beherrsche, daß es also auch in der Weltgeschichte vernünftig zugegangen].’ In G.W.F. Hegel, *Philosophie der Geschichte* (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, 1961), 48-9.

¹⁸It is important to note that the distinction is made possible in relation to the entities that Dasein contrasts itself with and this is especially noticeable in intending ourselves toward them. In *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie* Heidegger neatly summarizes the general idea under consideration: ‘But we know from our earlier reflections over the course of the discussion of the first thesis that the Dasein’s compartments have an intentional character and that on the basis of this intentionality already the subject stands in relation to things that it itself is not [Allein, wir wissen aus früheren Überlegungen gelegentlich der Diskussion der ersten These daß die Verhaltungen des Daseins intentionalen Charakter haben, daß das Subjekt aufgrund der Intentionalität schon im Bezug steht zu solchem, was es selbst nicht ist]’ (GA24, 221).

¹⁹It follows from this that there is no truth, no events, and no transcendence without Dasein: ‘World is only, if, and so long as a Dasein exists [Welt is nur, wenn und solange ein Dasein existiert]’ but we also have to remember that: ‘Nature can also be when no Dasein exists [Natur kann auch sein, wenn kein Dasein existiert]’ (GA24, 241).

necessity, thinks it in terms of Dasein as the condition for the emergence of worldhood. This is what I meant earlier when I stated that Heidegger is only really concerned about whether it is possible to discuss the question of the meaning of being without anchoring it in questions concerning entities.

I claim that Heidegger's case is instructive for thinking nature for the following reasons. It becomes possible to dispense with necessitarian inferences, such as the Hegelian Notion, without losing the idea that certain content is definitively actualized by Dasein. It is also possible to avoid the need, perhaps even the desire, to bridge the mind-nature distinction. The problem with the Hegelian position on nature is that in presenting us with retroactive justifications for the passing of the Notion into consciousness he needlessly implicates us in metaphysics. There is a trace of strong necessity that belies Hegel's commitment to the principle of sufficient reason. The Notion *must* emerge into consciousness. In Heidegger the emergence of world, truth, and history is not something that must have happened as a metaphysical rule.²⁰ Rather, in order for certain specific content to have emerged it is necessary that Dasein exists. If Dasein ceased to exist there is no corresponding Notion that would go unfulfilled. This is a weak necessity since there is no strong reason that Dasein should have emerged at all only the requirement that if world, truth, and history are to emerge the existence of Dasein is their necessary condition. Hence it is important as we emerge into a time of increasingly speculative and realist approaches to the thought of nature that we not do a disservice to the past. There is nothing in Heidegger that suggests that nature must be reigned in under the human capacity for truth-creation, and he was the first transcendentalist thinker to untie the subtle metaphysical necessity that has been hitching a ride on transcendentalism since its inception. Whatever else Heidegger might be accused of he cannot be accused of corraling nature into the region of thought.

²⁰See Martin Heidegger, *The Principle of Reason*, trans. Reginald Lilly (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1996).