

HEIDEGGER, UNDERSTANDING AND FREEDOM

JOHN DICKERSON

I

One meets familiar concepts in Being and Time--"mood," "discourse," "world," "freedom," "understanding," and all sorts of others. But they're like people one knew once who've changed completely: The familiar features that once marked them have been wiped away or rearranged so radically that all they've kept is a name. Reading Heidegger's book one has to learn what these concepts mean all over again; one has to approach them fresh, without preconceptions, if one wants to understand them.

The way Heidegger writes makes that difficult. All too often he just gives us a word whose meaning he has changed without telling us how he has changed it; we have the new meaning--Heidegger's--but not the old one. This makes it hard for us even to comprehend the new concept, and harder still to take its measure. If one has no inkling of the continuity between conceptual meanings and if one can't sense what old problems Heidegger wants the new meanings to solve then one can hardly understand Being and Time, much less criticize it.

If Heidegger doesn't give us a way into the book himself we have to approach it on our own; and this essay tries to do that, not for the whole book but for one concept--the concept of understanding--and really not for the whole of that concept but for a part of it--the sense in which understanding is free. What follows surveys a problem which Heidegger's sense of understanding addresses (if not in intention at least in effect) and tries to solve. I contrast the old concept of understanding which led to the problem with

the new concept; by doing this I want to convey more clearly just what Heidegger means by understanding (verstehen). And I want to engage it critically. For once we see this new meaning clearly, we will also see that it has faults of its own that its novelty doesn't erase.

II.

Heidegger's notion that understanding is free addresses a problem that one finds in its most acute form in Kant. The problem is familiar. How does one recognize both the necessity one finds in experienced nature--and in human action as part of nature--while at the same time recognizing that man as a moral being acts freely and responsibly? Kant thought that he recognized truth in both these claims. But even those most sympathetic to Kant would agree that he brought the two contentions into harmony only by taking the force out of the second of them. When Kant finishes it's difficult to see how freedom could be a real possibility for human beings at all.

Kant thinks of freedom as a "kind of causality that belongs to living beings insofar as they are rational" or "the power that a rational being has of acting in accordance with his conception of laws"--in accordance, that is, with principles (particularly moral principles) that a rational being can use to guide his actions. Kant contrasts this ability with what he calls "natural necessity," the causal determinism that moves the world as we understand it. Any event that we can understand scientifically, Kant says, we must understand as determined completely by antecedent causes that precede the event in time.²

Kant thinks of "human action" in both ways. If one thinks of such action as an event in the world experienced in space and time, one must think of it as completely determined. According to the first Critique this is because any event in the experienced world must be experienced as causally determined if it can be experienced at all. Kant gives us a tortuously complicated argument in the first Critique to prove this proposition. I won't discuss that argument here; its central point is evident: Causal determinism must be a feature of the experienced world if experience of a world as one in space and time is to be possible. And as far as we can experience human actions as events in the spatio-temporal world we have to understand and explain those actions as completely determined.

Free action then has to occur outside of or beyond space and time and so beyond what we can experience; Kant is quite serious when he says in the Groundwork that no example from experience can be given of free moral action, because such an example would destroy the coherence of experience as the first Critique details it. If autonomous action is outside space and time, it is consistent with determined events, which do take place in space and time. Kant expresses this by saying that what holds of the "phenomenal" world (determinism) does not necessarily hold of the "noumenal" world. While any action that appears to us must be understood as determined, it is at least theoretically possible that such an action is free "in itself"--apart from our experience. And (Kant thinks) freedom is not only theoretically possible but also practically necessary.

We don't need to look at Kant's arguments for freedom's necessity either. Because even if those arguments hold they leave us with a sense of freedom that very few would accept; Kant's freedom is a power to which one can't apply spatial or (more importantly) temporal categories. Strictly speaking this self-caused autonomous action doesn't "happen" at all. Space and time, modes of apprehension that belong to our experience, don't apply to free action. And neither does the scientific category of cause. Kant's free will doesn't operate in any world where it would make a difference; it slips through the only categories that we can use to understand it.

Kant has harmonized necessity with human freedom but he does it at too high a price. Freedom becomes a power that we can't comprehend, something almost magical--a power that causes, though we can't say what kind of cause it is; a power that works, although it works at no time. And although one might think this is simply a problem in the way Kant conceives freedom one can just as easily see a problem with the way Kant conceives human understanding. If he's given freedom too little power--it can't work anywhere or any time--he's given understanding too much: It works everywhere and at all times. If the categories (like cause) are necessary for the possibility of experience itself, and if they are the categories of a mechanistic and deterministic world, then one can't understand free action as a possibility that can become real in space and time. Kant's understanding pushes autonomy into the shadows, out of any place where it could possibly operate. Kant doesn't save ethics from science because his conception of scientific understanding leaves no coherent freedom to save.

III.

Heidegger is certainly not trying in Being and Time to "save" ethics from science. He is trying to do "fundamental ontology"--what we might describe as an attempt to investigate the essence of human beings, to uncover and describe what human beings are in their most fundamental or ontologically basic condition. He thus hopes to describe Human Being as Human Being is "in itself," apart from any secondary perspective--for example, a scientific perspective--that other descriptions of human being might take. And though Heidegger's fundamental ontology does not explicitly address itself to the Kantian question, the effect of that ontology--if it is correct--is to revolve the problem of harmonizing science and freedom around a new axis. We can grasp the essence of human understanding and of the world first understood by human beings, Heidegger thinks, by grasping how they function existentially. By seeing understanding existentially--which means simply seeing understanding as it is in its ontologically primary sense--we can see how both a scientific understanding of man and an ethical understanding of man derive from and depend on a prior existential understanding. And because existential understanding is itself free, we can also see how derivative modes of understanding (like science) must also finally be grounded in freedom. If Heidegger is right even scientific views of the world are based on an existential understanding of an existential world, and it is absurd to suppose that science can contradict its existential basis by denying, in any way, the possibility of human freedom.

Taken in its existential sense, understanding can also be characterized as "disclosedness."⁴ As disclosedness understanding acts, it projects, it allows us to grasp or get hold of an existential world--the world that is our possibilities--and thus enables us to grasp things within this world as meaningful or significant things. For Heidegger, then, "man" and "world" are not ontologically separate, even when "world" is taken to mean something like "the collection or totality of things that exist", because although those things or objects can exist apart from man, they can't meaningfully exist apart from him. Heidegger devotes much of his existential analysis to explaining how man and world are in this way inseparable. He wants to explain, that is, how human existence ontologically conditions the possibility of the significance of any object,⁵ event, etc., in the traditionally-conceived "world." Two aspects of

existence, mood and understanding, are particularly important here.

State-of-mind, or mood is to Heidegger's vision a kind of "attunement."⁶ But Dasein does not "attune" itself toward any particular object or event; Heidegger's sense of mood is not, for example, the sense in which one might be in a "good" or a "bad" mood because of something one could point to--that one has failed a test, or lost one's job, for instance. Mood taken ontologically attunes us to our Being-in-the-World; and by that Heidegger means that mood attunes us to our possibilities of our existential world. Mood is thus existentially necessary for any particular object or event in the traditional world to matter to us. If we were not attuned to our existential possibilities, it would be impossible for any particular thing to be significant or insignificant to us.

Understanding projects those possibilities to which mood attunes us. "To project" means "to cast forward, or beyond," and this is precisely the sense in which Heidegger thinks we project ourselves when we project our possibilities: We cast ourselves forward into the future, beyond what we are in the present or what we were in the past.

Heidegger describes mood and understanding as "equiprimordial." The word sounds dark and muddy but Heidegger means something simple by it. Being-in-the-World always includes both mood and understanding: mood always has its understanding and understanding has its mood, neither is prior or "more primordial" than the other. One doesn't first attune oneself to what surrounds one and then project possibilities for oneself; one can be in a mood or state of mind only if one already understands. The opposite also holds. One doesn't understand without a mood. Both structure our "thrown" Being-in-the-World and our ordinary meaningful experience of the things around us.

Existential understanding makes possible our ordinary, everyday kind of familiarity with the "world" of objects and events in which we live. When we ordinarily understand something, one might suppose, we grasp what that something is. For Heidegger, things in their ontologically primary sense are zuhanden--things ready-to-hand, objects or things of use: We've grasped what a pen is when we've grasped it as a writing instrument or a hammer when we've grasped it as a tool for pounding. This is not by any means an intellectual grasp. Heidegger does not see it as an

ability to give a definition of a pen, or to detail scientifically a hammer's physical characteristics. We understand the pen, or the hammer in Heidegger's sense when we use them.¹¹

This kind of everyday understanding depends on a prior ontological understanding. Heidegger distinguishes the two by designating the former "interpretation": All objects of use are involved with other objects; in as much as they refer to other objects that form a complex within which any particular object is used. When one uses a particular object, one "interprets" it by assigning it a place within such an equipmental complex; As Heidegger describes it,¹² one "lets it be in such a way that it is itself." I interpret the pen when I write with it, which means that I involve it, in the writing, with other items of equipment that form the writing-complex--the paper, a place to sit, a lamp, a desk and so on.

We interpret these smaller complexes by referring them to even wider complexes. The contexts in which we use each piece of equipment refer to others, and eventually all these complexes refer to something for the sake of which they are, which is always Dasein. Dasein is the "ultimate for-the-sake-of-which," the being that exists for the sake of itself, as opposed to equipmental complexes which exist (meaningfully) only "for-the-sake-of" Dasein.¹³

Since the meaning of equipmental complexes depends on Dasein's possibilities, all interpretation--even seeing--presupposes a prior existential understanding.¹⁴ For if Dasein projected no possibilities, equipmental complexes would serve no purposes; and since equipmental complexes have significance only in their relation to Dasein's possibilities and purposes these complexes would be existentially insignificant, and meaningless, without Dasein.¹⁵ By projecting ourselves or our possibilities--by existing--we have also projected a structure within which things can then be interpreted. And what we project (and structure) in understanding is the world, taken ontologically and existentially.

Heidegger thinks, then, that a particular thing is significant when it is involved in an equipmental complex. And equipmental complexes are significant only through their relation to Dasein's possibilities or its world. Meaning or significance, in the sense of interpretation, is primarily a relation things have to Dasein's possibilities.¹⁶ In its ontological sense,

though, meaning is that structure in which things, when related, have meaning. That sense of "meaning" or "significance" is "world" in the sense of "Dasein's possibilities." Thus Dasein's possibilities, projected in understanding, are the existential conditions of the possibility of the meaningfulness of anything at all.

"World" is Dasein's project or Dasein's possibilities.¹⁷ And since each Dasein's project is itself, world is Dasein (in the sense that each Dasein is its possibilities, as that for the sake of which it exists.) The world, then, is not an object like the objects to which it lends significance. We might see it on the model of Husserl's distinction between noema and noesis: for Husserl the noema (or meaning) "accompanies" every noesis (or act of meaning-giving) not as an object towards which the act is directed but as the meaning of the act itself. In the same way, world is not some object towards which projection or understanding directs itself but is the meaning of that projection as its possibilities.

In what sense, though, is this projection or possibilities of of a world free? Dasein's essence, Heidegger says, is its existence. Existence is our projection of our selves into the future, in the sense that we¹⁸ project possibilities to which we are attuned in mood. And existence, Heidegger never tires of repeating, is an issue. In what sense is it an issue? If an "issue" is an "unsettled matter that calls for a decision," then existence is an issue in the sense that Dasein must decide his own essence in existence; that is, he must decide himself.

But exactly what this means is not clear and clarifying it is vital; for if we can see in what sense existence is an issue, we can see in what sense understanding is free. It's easier first to see what Heidegger does not mean. He does not mean that Dasein can decide whether to project possibilities or not, for this would be equivalent to saying that Dasein can decide to be Dasein. Heidegger denies this emphatically. We are thrown into existence, he says, and by that he means at least that we cannot abrogate the necessity to decide ourselves. Nor can Heidegger mean that in existence we choose to take up possibilities already determined for us. For this would mean that in the case of any particular Dasein significance, or world, would be ontologically prior to existence, or projection. If in any particular case possibilities (and so Dasein itself) were given, then existence would not be a projection of possibilities

but simply an acceptance of them. It would also mean that ordinary everyday significance or interpretation would precede understanding--which Heidegger, again, explicitly denies.¹⁹

Heidegger means that existence confronts us with the issue of what possibilities to project and thus of what self to make of ourselves. Projection of possibilities is thus a decision; when we project possibilities, or understand, we decide what we are to be. The issue is then "what self are we to make of ourselves?" and to decide on that issue is to project possibilities, or ourselves, or a world.²⁰ And (Heidegger seems to think) if nothing can be given beforehand that determines what possibilities any particular person projects, that projection or understanding must be free.

Projection, or understanding, then, is free like a decision is free; nothing prior to the decision--prior to projection--can limit that decision and so determine it.²¹ Nothing can limit that decision because prior to it nothing significant exists; projection itself decides what significance will be given to things. Heidegger seems to think that if things did have significant characteristics prior to projection those characteristics might impose some restrictions on what possibilities Dasein could project. But since through projection things or situations "within the world" first gain meaning originally, then (it seems) projection must be free.

To summarize: Dasein's essence is its existence. Its existence is to transcend, or to project possibilities to which it is attuned. That transcendence is a free action: Dasein's Being is such, Heidegger maintains, that its Being is an issue which Dasein must decide. Possibilities are what Dasein is, and the meaning or significance of those possibilities is the world, the ultimate backdrop against which objects ready-to-hand in the world are interpreted. The existential world must be understood--that is, significant possibilities must be projected--in order for any particular thing or object to have meaning. What possibilities Dasein will project is, again, an issue for Dasein to decide; and so the significance of objects, since it depends on this prior projection of understanding, is also in a sense an issue for Dasein--because projection of possibilities is itself an issue.

IV.

A Heideggerian analysis of the Kantian problem raised earlier would then read this way: had Kant penetrated to the ontological stratum which Heidegger investigates, he would have seen that the confusion generated by the competing claims of scientific understanding and moral categories could be untangled.

Opposing Kant's dualisms of theory and practice, of understanding and practical reason, Heidegger concentrates on a different type of understanding altogether--an existential understanding. And he claims that the lived understanding found in existence, and the life-world thus understood, are ontologically prior roots of both the "scientific" and "moral" worlds and of our understanding of those "worlds."

Human Being's primary mode of understanding occurs through projection of possibilities, whose own significance gives meaning to objects within the ordinary world. This understanding is primary in the sense that in order to understand (let's say) scientific propositions about objects in the world including those about human beings, those propositions must somehow relate to the world of Dasein's possibilities. Indeed those propositions are significant only to the extent that they can be so related.

Since existential understanding is free, and since all other modes of understanding derive from this basic mode, then scientific understanding must also grow out of human freedom. But if that is correct, then scientific understanding cannot contradict the freedom that is its ultimate ontological basis. Kant thought that scientific understanding was necessary and universal because it based itself on unchangeable categories. However, existential understanding grounds the very structure of science, so scientific categories cannot lie beyond our power to change them. The imperatives of morality are in the same position; they too have significance or meaning only in relation to Dasein's possibilities, which Dasein projects freely. Moral categories, like those of science, rest finally on existential decision.

When one adopts this position, the Kantian dilemma vanishes. When Kant tried to reconcile free moral action with scientific experience, he did so with the understanding that although science described experienced man accurately, morality and freedom

applied to man as he is in himself. But man as he is in himself cannot be experienced, and man's freedom cannot be theoretically understood.²² In uncovering existential understanding Heidegger shows how the most basic or significant experience is impossible apart from understanding's free projection of possibilities. It is not that the freedom of human action needs to be beyond experience because experience is ordered causally. Meaningful experience itself is possible only because understanding is free. From an ontological standpoint, then, Heidegger shows how Kant described both contexts incorrectly. Both are dependent, neither can claim to get at man as he is in himself; and thus the problem is not one of accommodating morality to science or vice versa, but of seeing how both science and morality find their roots in existence.

V.

This "Heideggerian account," though, presumes that the fundamental ontology on which it rests is itself sound. But there are complications in Heidegger's ontology. I will now consider two objections to his analysis of "understanding." Though Heidegger can answer the first objection, that answer itself leads naturally to the second objection--and this second objection is one that Heidegger cannot answer. The relationships between the two will become clear, I think, as the discussion advances.

The first objection says this:²³ Understanding and state of mind constitute our Being-in-the-World, our existence, which is an issue for us. Projection of possibilities--that is, understanding--is the ontological condition that makes possible the significance of things within the world. Without understanding, things have no significant characteristics, since only by relating them to the whole of significance which is the existential world can things be interpreted at all. But if things or objects (and the world taken as the collection or totality of objects) have no significant characteristics apart from or without projection of the world of possibilities or understanding, what can limit our projection of possibilities, our understanding itself? What prevents me from projecting any possibility I wish? If things have no significant characteristics apart from projection which could limit projection, and if understanding's content cannot be given, then nothing can limit the projection of

possibilities. And if nothing can limit the projection then that projection must simply be arbitrary.

What prevents me, for example, from projecting as a possibility listening to a concert by the Chicago Symphony in my living room?²⁴ If nothing has meaning before I project such possibilities who could say that this possibility isn't genuine? Heidegger can't answer this by saying that we all project the same possibilities so that such an example is contrary to fact; for this would imply that human essence preceded human existence, that our projection of possibilities is fixed and substantial, given for us all. That way is closed to a philosopher for whom one's existence is an issue.

Heidegger could, however, answer though that objecting this way simply misconstrues projection by characterizing it as "arbitrary." Before projection of possibilities in understanding, things have no significant characteristics because projection is necessary for things to acquire significance originally. And if the objectionable sense of "arbitrary" is the sense in which "arbitrary" means "without consideration of relevant facts" due, let's suppose, to willful disregard to the facts or to caprice, then understanding cannot be arbitrary--because, before projection or understanding, consideration of relevant facts is impossible. If in other words one had to consider relevant facts or fail to consider them before projection of possibilities, then projection could be arbitrary if it proceeded without due consideration of those facts, or if it proceeded in willful disregard for them. But if before projection there are no relevant facts then consideration of them isn't even possible. And before projection there are no relevant facts, because there are no facts. Nothing has any significant characteristics at all, and so no facts can be expressed.

The category of "arbitrary" or its contrasts ("fair" or "considered") doesn't apply to projection at all. It's not that the absence of established rules or significant characteristics of objects makes understanding arbitrary, for in the absence of understanding--that is, before significance--nothing can be relevant or irrelevant, significant or insignificant. Thus the conditions under which understanding could be arbitrary or nonarbitrary don't obtain.

This answer to the objection, though, cuts two ways. For although it answers a serious charge, it raises other questions about understanding that are just as serious. The most immediate question is this: if we can't think of projection as even possibly arbitrary, can we really think of it as free?

To this we have to answer "no." Arbitrariness cannot characterize projection, nor can its opposites, because before projection no things in the world have significant characteristics that projection could ignore. And if calling projection "arbitrary" depends on projection taking place in willful disregard of the facts or in willful ignorance of them, then projection cannot be arbitrary.

But if projection can't be arbitrary it can't be a decision. A decision must decide something--in this case the issue of existence. Here, though, what projection supposedly "decides" can't in principle be formulated. Before the decision, before understanding, nothing is significant. If that is true then the "issue" that projection decides can't be formulated, because in order for the issue to be formulated it would have to have some meaning or some significance. And if projection is the condition for meaningfulness, then in order for existence to be an issue projection or understanding must already have taken place.

In deciding it must at least be possible to formulate what the matter that presents itself for decision is, and it must be possible in making one's decision to take into account factors that speak for and against various alternatives. This is true even though in some cases--like the cases where one decides arbitrarily--one doesn't take significant factors into account at all. In the case spoken of here, however, nothing is significant before the decision--projection--occurs; and so it is not possible either to formulate what one is deciding, or to take into account factors that might be relevant to making the decision. In other words projection doesn't decide, because before projection or understanding nothing has meaning.

And if one can't decide to project one set of possibilities rather than another, in what sense can one call projection or understanding free? One might be able to call projection free if it were possible to decide what possibilities to project even though one didn't actually decide. But if a person can't decide at all it makes no sense to call the decision free. The reason that Heidegger's projection cannot be a free

decision underlies why it cannot be an arbitrary decision: It is not a decision at all.

Certainly one needs to ask here: 1) What sense of "free" one has in mind when one says "decisions are free" and 2) whether there isn't some equally valid sense of "free" that would apply to Heidegger's notion of understanding. As to (1), a very simple sense of "free" will do: the sense in which one can choose or decide from among alternatives unhindered by forces beyond one's control. It is obvious that if alternatives cannot be formulated it makes no sense to say that one chooses among them; it makes no sense even to say that there are alternatives. How, then, if projection is not a choice, is it a free choice?

As to (2): Perhaps there is some other sense in which projection is free. Could one for example maintain that projection is free simply because nothing limits it, because (in other words) nothing demands that any particular Dasein project one set of possibilities rather than any other? Could it be that Heidegger means only that understanding's content is not determined by anything prior to its projection and is therefore free?

This might seem an enticing answer. But if this is the sense in which understanding is free, it would not include the sense of freedom marked by saying existence is an issue. In saying that existence is an issue Heidegger means to say that to exist is to decide what possibilities to project for ourselves. And in order for existence to be an issue there must exist something meaningful that projection of possibilities can decide, something that can meaningfully present itself as an issue. Heidegger seems, it is true, to think that existence confronts us with the question of what we are to make of ourselves. But if meaning arises only from projection, and not before, how could the issue of existence--even when phrased as a question--meaningfully confront us? The sense of "free" one has to ascribe to understanding is the sense in which decisions are free. And unless projection can decide what possibilities to project, one can't call projection "free"--at least not in the sense that Heidegger has in mind.

VI.

After setting out Heidegger's concepts like this--as if they spoke to Kant--we can notice not only where

those concepts go wrong but also where they lead us. Compare Heidegger and Kant for a moment: Kant thought that the categories of human understanding were necessary. Heidegger thinks that at its most basic level human understanding is completely free. Both views are faulted. Kant failed to make a coherent place for responsibility and freedom not only because he thought that the causal determinism that Newtonian mechanics enshrined was the only kind of causality that could make experience possible, but also because he thought of experience as essentially limited to the kind of experience out of which one could make science. So naturally Kant thought that the categories of understanding stood beyond our power to change them.

Rather than seeing understanding as unchangeably structuring any and every experience Heidegger sees understanding as having a deeper basis in human existence, as having a function which on the existential level it freely performs. But the kind of freedom Heidegger gives existential understanding has no more coherence than does Kant's freedom of the will. Kant's freedom lacks a world in which to work. But so does Heidegger's; while his freedom of understanding allows understanding to make, in effect, the meaningful world within which moral freedom can then operate, understanding has no context itself for its own acts.

Having seen this we can see beyond it. Can't we see, for example, that we can understand in different ways, and that there are different experiences--moral, aesthetic, religious perhaps--for which different categories are appropriate? And is there any good reason to insist that any one kind of experience or structure is ontologically prior simpliciter? Both scientific and existential experience exist--with that much we can agree with both Heidegger and Kant. But do we have to put either up as fundamental? Even further: If we agree that there is such a thing as an existential understanding, do we then have to agree that such an understanding is either free or determined? Why does it have to be one or the other? I put this last paragraph as questions because I can't claim--not on the strength of what has been said here--to be looking clearly at the territory that Kant and Heidegger open up. I don't question, though, if the analyses I've given of Kant and Heidegger are correct, that we ought at least look harder in the directions towards which these thinkers point us.

University of Colorado, Boulder

NOTES

¹Immanuel Kant, Groundwork Of The Metaphysic Of Morals, trans. H. J. Paton (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), pp. 36, 63, 98. References are to the second German edition of this work.

²Kant, p. 98.

³Cf. on this point Robert Paul Wolff, The Autonomy of Reason (New York, Harper and Row: 1974), p. 99.

⁴Martin Heidegger, Being and Time, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 171. All references are to the English pagination of the book.

⁵Cf. here Richard Schmitt, Martin Heidegger On Being Human (New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 105-06.

⁶Heidegger, p. 172.

⁷Schmitt, pp. 154-56.

⁸SZ, p. 185; also Schmitt pp. 187-91.

⁹Heidegger, p. 183.

¹⁰Heidegger, p. 95 ff. For Heidegger even natural objects are ready-to-hand.

¹¹Schmitt, 169.

¹²Heidegger, p. 187.

¹³Heidegger, p. 160.

¹⁴Heidegger, p. 194.

¹⁵Heidegger, p. 193.

¹⁶Heidegger, p. 152.

¹⁷Heidegger, p. 402.

¹⁸It must be emphasized that for Heidegger projection of possibilities and mood go together. If Dasein did not project possibilities there would be nothing to which Dasein could be attuned in mood for there would be no situation, no being-there: A situation is possible only if possibilities are projected, or if there is understanding. Cf. on this point in a paper by Professor Wesley Morriston, "Heidegger on the World" Man and World, Vol. V no. 4 (November, 1972), pp. 461-62.

¹⁹Heidegger, p. 194.

²⁰We have yet to investigate whether this assertion makes sense. I will conclude, finally, that it does not.

²¹By "limit" I mean that nothing can force our decision of ourselves to take any content whatever.

²²Cf. Kant, p. 28.

²³This objection is made (though with very different results) in the article by Professor Morriston cited earlier.