CHAPTER VI

DREAD, IN INDIVIDUAL'S PSYCHOLOGY

In this chapter, the concept of dread, as having a bearing on the psychology of the individual is discussed at some length. Although it finds a mention elsewhere in the thesis, its importance is not sufficiently highlighted in the history of the western philosophy. Unfortunately, Kierkegaard himself, after writing his short work, *The Concept of Dread*, did not follow up these seminal ideas in his later works. Its impact however has been colossal in western psychology. The chapter clearly proceeds in two parts. The first part will give an exposition of Kierkegaard’s concept of dread. In the second part I will show how the concept of dread, as associated with the individual, has grown in various ways in the psychologies of Freud, Adler, Fromm, Binswanger, Erikson, and Rollo May. This is done simply to establish the unconscious nature of the concept of dread in Kierkegaard’s writings. If the chapter succeeds in showing how the concept of dread, experienced by the individual, is a unique philosophical entity, that laid an altogether different foundation for psychologies, distinct from behaviourism, long after Kierkegaard’s death, I should feel amply rewarded.

A. Dread and Consciousness.

Psychological insights of Kierkegaard are throughout his writings. But some of them are crystallized in the *Concept of Dread*. A comprehensive understanding of the concept of the dread is extremely important for the concept of the individual, the focus of my thesis. In Kierkegaard, psychology and ontology are inextricably woven together to
illuminate the wholistic nature of the individual. The psychological make-up of man is the first step to the understanding of the individual’s ontology. Kierkegaard rightly saw dread as the culminating point of divergent factors, determining the personality of the individual. The Concept of Dread, along with yet another psychological work, The Sickness Unto Death, largely expresses the individual’s emotional struggle to bring about a healthy unity in the quest for true existence. Dread paves the way for understanding the individual, as he strikes a balance within himself. An individual in dread is best explained as the synthesis of the temporal and the eternal, the inner and the outer, and the sacred and the secular. The dualities must co-exist without adverse inflection on each other. Psychology paves the way for our understanding the journey undertaken by the individual as he strives for existence, thus making way for human ontology.

(i) Guilt-consciousness

Dread, in common parlance, signifies a feeling of unease, but it must be understood rather as the suffering that an individual undergoes on his long journey to self-realization. It is in the service of the realization of human existence. Dread is like an emotional roller-coaster for the individual finding himself faced with possibilities and the consequent need for a decision. It is more a state of being, as man is faced with both eternal and temporal obligations, apparently claiming their fulfillments. Man realizes the difficulties involved in relating himself to these opposing, but compelling, elements. Dread thereby suggests that there is something amiss with one’s personality, more importantly, that one’s existence is yet to be perhaps achieved. As a result the individual is engaged in existential thought, with a view to penetrating this existential suffering: This naturally gives rise to “guilt-consciousness”.

The existing individual undertakes a regressive “walk-back”, as it were, into himself by way of reflecting upon the existential state of suffering, and brings to his consciousness the possibility of a deeper and more meaningful existence. The reflection makes the individual conscious of a contradiction between himself and his telos. The
Telos can be replaced one after the other as they are found relative. The relative however is a pointer to the absolute telos. He now becomes aware of the difficulty involved in absolutely relating himself to his absolute telos. His suffering gets accentuated in his inability to relate absolutely to the absolute telos. Guilt-consciousness becomes deeper, as the consciousness of the near impossibility of the relation of the individual to this contradiction within himself grows more acute. The individual now reflects on the contradiction itself. In suffering, the existing individual does not even understand that he is the contradiction, that there is nothing wrong with the absolute telos. However, in guilt consciousness, he comes to understand that one’s self is the contradiction. The guilty individual understands that there is not merely a difficulty involved in relating oneself to the absolute telos, but that he is divided within himself; moreover, that the breach must not be understood as a difficulty, but as a contradiction which expresses his very self.

The individual experiences guilt consciousness, not because of some magical power, but because of his own being and activities. The individual is not external to himself, he understands himself as related to himself as an absolute telos. Kierkegaard writes,

So the essential consciousness of guilt is the first deep plunge into existence, and at the same time it is the expression for the fact that an exister is related to an eternal happiness.¹

The consciousness of guilt is an expression for the self’s relation to an absolutized telos. Suffering is an outcome of intense self-examination, and not an “innocent guilt”. The individual experiences guilt, because he failed to see beyond the aesthetical compulsions and the ethical obligations. He did not distinguish the temporal and the eternal, between man and God. The telos he had known so far was within the temporal, be it aesthetic or ethical. If he did encounter a divine imperative, he did not distinguish it from the ethical order. In other words, the individual, if he imagined to be in the religious stage, was still in the “religiousness A”, or “religion of immanence”. In the religion of immanence there is little difference between ethics and religion. Here, guilt is the expression for the
division within the structure of the self itself. It is resultant upon the individual’s failure to relate absolutely to his absolute telos, on account of the inherent contradiction within himself. The individual realizes the true structure of his self through reflection, and yet has not succeeded in relating himself to the paradox in “religiousness B”, or “religion of transcendence”. This requires a qualitative leap, but the individual still cannot take this step, as it implies freedom, and he is not aware of the possibility lying in the future.

To acknowledge the contradiction and, then, to deny that the individual is responsible for it would be self-contradictory. For the contradiction cannot be existentially appropriated without being chosen, and only in choosing himself as a contradiction can the individual understand that that is what the self is. By choosing to understand himself, he chooses to be guilty. To choose oneself is a free act. The individual is responsible for what he becomes, because he freely chooses himself in becoming. The individual now truly exists, because “only when I choose myself as guilty do I choose myself absolutely.” In other words, it can be said that the imperfection of the individual is at bottom guilt. Man is born imperfect and to realize this is guilt-consciousness. Man, being born imperfect, is further predisposed to act in a manner which will involve difficulties in relating to an absolute telos. Being in the religiousness A only aggravates this imperfection, because he does not see God as the absolute, that He is above everything else on this earth. Much less does he freely choose to accept in faith the paradox, say, the incarnate Christ. The individual has to undertake a conscious self-examination to realize his state of existence. To realize that one is a synthesis of temporal and eternal obligations needs a conscious and deliberate act on the part of the individual. Only he alone can appropriate the contradiction as his own, that he is this contradiction.

(ii) Sin-consciousness

In guilt-consciousness the individual is nevertheless contented to maintain his identity, which is characterized by a connection of an eternal self and a temporal self. Guilt-consciousness is a product of the past, it is an inherent endowment of the
individual, and it calls for the present and a future. To fulfill this requirement the individual now has to move forward, which is exhibited in the transformation of guilt-consciousness into “sin-consciousness”. This marks a qualitative movement of the individual from religiousness A to religiousness B. He has to move out from the centre of his own self to a transcendent spirit, now. For the first time, faith of the individual comes into the picture at this juncture. The individual’s leap of faith, or the unconditional acceptance of the paradox, is what is demanded. By believing in the paradox with absolute passion, the individual is arrested in the present situation of self-division, and this further paves the way for the future. It is extremely difficult to be set on the path of faith and make the transition to the paradoxical religiousness. Indeed, it is much easier to be complacent, without any impetus to move forward, unless the individual is intensely and completely gripped by his present situation of guilt consciousness. By being gripped by the guilt, he experiences the dread, the individual is left, as it were, with no other option but to believe in the paradox. Nevertheless, paradox is consciously chosen. It is a qualitative decision. Faith could not be less voluntaristic.

The individual has now come out of the slavery of the past. Dwelling in the present, and believing in the paradox, the individual becomes sin-conscious. Sin-consciousness is not, according to Kierkegaard, necessarily implicit in guilt. It is not a result of reflective level of consciousness. It cannot be derived by man alone. It rather depends upon the historical revelation of the deity in time. Kierkegaard’s radical Christian bias is explicit here.

To allow one’s self-consciousness to be informed by such a revelation requires an act of faith. In such an act, a break with the immanent self-reflection is firmly established: “Sin-consciousness is the breach with immanence.” The foundations of the givenness of the individual are shaken. In sin-consciousness the individual’s identity is threatened. He is no more confident that his past can sustain him, the way he was in his guilt consciousness, or the religion of immanence. By the paradox is dawned on him the realization that
Between God and a human being there is an absolute difference. In man's absolute relationship to God, this absolute difference must therefore come to expression, and any attempt to express an immediate likeness becomes impertinence, frivolity, effrontery, and the like.

As a result the urgent and natural step for a man in faith is to accept God as his personal Master. The surrender of faith is begun in the life of the individual. The failure to differentiate adequately between God and the world is closely associated with what Kierkegaard regards as the principle shortcoming of the individual. In sin-consciousness however this shortcoming is overcome, and the individual comes to acknowledge the total dependence of the self upon God. With the coming of the paradox into play, the individual is now made aware of his freedom, or the deepest subjectivity. When the individual is faced with possibilities, it dawns on him that he has the ability to make the right choice, if only he so wishes. Thus he is made aware that all along he had failed to make the right choice, and so he was in sin. He is born imperfect, but God has given him that important tool through which he can strive for perfection, which is his divinely ordained destiny. Sin is individual's own handiwork. However, God requires of him, demands of him, to become perfect in his eyes.

In sin-consciousness, the individual recognizes that the division in himself, which is disclosed in guilt and accentuated as sin, in faith, is his existential reality, a state which characterizes the very being of the individual. Sin-consciousness is a breach with the immanence of the guilt-consciousness. Psychology has now given way to human ontology. According to Kierkegaard, this constitutes, not an alteration within the self, but an alteration of the self, so that the self's identity with itself is destroyed. This only means that the individual abandons self-reflection as the means of becoming himself. Kierkegaard's opposition to the prevalent Hegelian idealism is once again explicit. But it is also the beginning of a radicalism of the Christian faith in the Protestantism of the Danish Reformed Church. Explicitly, the existing individual negates the possibility of
realizing temporal obligations through the power of his own freedom. Prior to sin-consciousness, the individual was conscious of himself as being in possession of the power to realize the temporal obligations. The temporal obligations would cover even the entire realm of social and ethical duties. But, in the consciousness of sin, the possibility becomes an impossibility. With confrontation with the deity in time, the individual gets a more radical perspective on the division within himself, and the separation of his own self from God. This is precisely what is meant by becoming “another”, “the alien”.

With the dawn of consciousness of sin, and the free act of faith thereafter, the individual is presented with trust and hope for the future. The radical change of the individual does not refer to any physical change, but a change in self-consciousness. In this sense, the existing individual becomes something other than what he was before. Having willingly surrendered to God, a new attitude or outlook to life emerges; the individual is now dependent on God. With the acceptance of God as his absolute Master, an intrinsic change takes place within him. A change in his attitude gives him a new personality.

B. Ethical and Religious Obligations

We can say that the future of the individual, if the need arises, may even be characterized by the teleological suspension of the ethical by the individual. In a situation of the suspension of the ethical, the temporal and eternal obligations are weighed with a consideration of priority. In the past both obligations were viewed as possibilities before the individual. However, at this point of time, the eternal obligations take precedence over all other obligations, however greatly valued they may be aesthetically, socially and ethically. To an individual, who is blessed with the grace of God, the eternal obligations will emerge as unquestionably prior to everything else. The suspension of the ethical does not mean that the ethical requirement itself is negated. There is a near-unbreakable bond between the ethical and the religious, in virtue of the horizontal dimension of every religion, Christianity, in particular: “The ethical will then be present every moment with
its infinite requirement.” On the contrary, it means that the individual finds himself incapable of realizing the task, for which he continues to be responsible, because of divine dictat made known to man clearly. That the ethical obligations are not negated throws light on the notion that the individual is in space and time, that the ethical obligations stand as a possibility, against which the eternal obligation however was freely and consciously chosen. Because the individual accepted Goli, the eternal obligation becomes the utmost priority. Since the individual is in space and time, he is subject to ethical obligations also, only now he sees these obligations in a different light, requiring its temporary suspension. He sees his life in such a way that his non-fulfillment of the ethical obligations does not in any way hamper the meaning of his life. On the contrary, his suspended ethical obligations gain higher importance, because they would be understood as what accentuate his religious obligations.

Kierkegaard deliberately keeps the question, if the individual remains content with the ethical suspension, open ended? It is understood that, with commitment in faith, the individual has achieved a deeper level of self-consciousness which includes within itself a finer aesthetic sensibility, more acute ethical sensitivity and a greater passion for the religious realities. With such level of consciousness it is hard to conceive that the individual will not be considerate for the fulfillment of the ethical obligations, if he must. With a new attitude, a higher and deeper sense of understanding of the good and the right, the individual is bound to see the ethical obligations with a greater clarity. This can be seen as the inevitable conclusion. Though he has left it open, one cannot ignore the implications of his stand.

In the Concept of Dread, Kierkegaard states that the individual must either remain imprisoned in ethical failure or discover the condition for its fulfillment beyond itself. He writes,

Either the whole of existence is locked up in the requirement of ethics, or the condition for its
fulfillment must be provided, and with that the whole of life and of existence begins afresh.  

It is clear from the last few words that Kierkegaard envisages a fulfillment of ethical obligations beyond itself. The religious does not supplant the ethical. The individual views the future in such a way that the temporal, or the ethical, obligations are not alien to him but is a part of his existence. By suspending the temporal, and that, too, in an extra-ordinary situation, he gains back the same. Now, he views the temporal as not being in conflict with the eternal, and, once he is without conflict, it is expressed in his interactions with the outside world. By being in harmony with himself, the individual is bound to be so with the outside world. Thus we have an individual in the man of faith, whose personality is modified and perfected in such a way that he is at peace with everything and everyone around him. Such a personality makes it possible for the individual to acknowledge the complexities and needs of his human reality. Such an existence can only mean to represent the word “afresh” used by Kierkegaard in the above quotation.

C. Functions of Dread

Dread is the gateway to the future, it makes possible the transition from the past by way of freedom. The individual experiences dread not by necessity: “If sin has come into the world by necessity, then there is no dread.”  

With sin, not a necessary but a voluntary act, freedom clearly introduces dread. This indirectly helps us to understand that dread is the outcome of sin. The individual experiences dread because he is a sinner. Sin is implicitly related to dread, sin expresses itself in dread. An individual, who experiences dread, is required to labour therefore into the innermost quarter of his being. When the individual is faced with the paradox, he comes to know that between himself and God there is a vast difference, and that he is imperfect, whereas God is perfect. Such self-examination brings him to the realization that he is in sin. In a way, the individual is not conscious of his sin prior to experiencing dread. Dread helps him to unearth what his
own reality is. What was previously hidden deep down in the unconscious is now brought to the level of consciousness.

Kierkegaard views dread as something peculiar. It is not the fear that has a definite object for its content. Dread is dread of nothing, meaning thereby that it is not as yet any actual thing or event; nevertheless, it is "something", in the sense of what is possible for man to spiritually do or become. Its hold is in its power of the possible. Kierkegaard, being a theistic existentialist, views dread as essentially a spiritual restlessness, having to do with spirit’s relation to itself and to God. For the atheistic existentialists however, who, too, do accept the category, dread is more akin to fear (an external dread) except that it has no actualized object. For the atheistic existentialists dread is a confrontation with the pathos, uncertainty and finitude of life. For Kierkegaard, on the other hand, it is rather a religious awareness of one’s relation to the eternal, and the consequent restlessness the relation concerned engenders: the relation goes anyway, positive or negative, to life or death. Hence dread can be the starting point for a spiritual realization, it helps one understand where one stands, where one ought to go, and thus it can prepare the way for the life of holiness, or of frustration and damnation. In order to understand the fuller significance of dread, we need to look into Kierkegaard’s understanding of “original sin”.

D. Dread and Original Sin

Kierkegaard’s notion of the original sin brings out the psychological implication of the concept of dread. Man is created, and as creature, he is imperfect in comparison with the spirit that his creator is. In the original state of creation, his is a state of innocence, not determined yet as spirit, but he is in a state of dreaming:

In this state there is peace and repose; but at the same time there is something different, which is not dissension and strife, for there is nothing to strive with. 9
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This is Kierkegaard’s way of explaining the creaturely status of Adam, a state prior to the fall, a state of “praeternature” of the first man. He places the possibility of freedom in this inchoate state. This something, Kierkegaard says, is “nothing”, and this produces dread in man. Dreamingly the “spirit” projects its own reality, which is expressed aesthetically with no sense of direction or purpose; it cannot even strive for it, because it does not have a concrete motive. The reality projected by the spirit is nothing, because it is not the actual reality. The spirit however cannot do away with this nothing, because it expresses itself through it, and, at the same time, flees it, because the nothing is not its true reality. The nothing that is projected is thus ambivalent. Kierkegaard defines dread as “sympathetic antipathy and an antipathetic sympathy”. The mental state of man, prior to his own act of sin, expresses this imperfection, which is signified by dread. For Kierkegaard, understanding dread is crucial, because it helps at once to understand the individual. Dread is the manner in which the self experiences the uncertainty of its future and the risk of its decisions.

Kierkegaard psychologically explains the transition from the praeternatural innocence to psychological guilt. Man is not guilty through his native imperfection, devoid of any decision as yet; dread merely laid hold of him. Yet he is guilty, for he sank in the dread, which he loved even when he feared it. Kierkegaard says that the transition is so ambiguous that only psychology can serve it right. Kierkegaard understood the transition in the light of freedom and the reality of the individual. It was wholly due to the individual’s own discretion that he became guilty, which, when taken religiously, transforms into sin. This reflection throws light on man’s innermost emotions at the unconscious level, through the leitmotif of the “myth of the fall”. Dread is not fear, but it is experienced, when one awakens to the innermost feelings in man. God’s judgement, “Thou shall surely die”, to Adam is inconceivable to Adam. He does not understand what its full implication is, because in his innocence he does not know what is good and what is evil. This knowledge of good and evil will befall only after his act of sin. If such is the case, then, Adam initially experienced only dread, a possibility of being able to become, (which is unknown to him), as its consequence.
In the first chapter of the *Concept of Dread*, Kierkegaard explains the psychological state of Adam in the garden of Eden. When Adam was prohibited to partake of the "tree of knowledge", it awakened a desire in him and, at the same time, alarmed him, because the prohibition awakens in him the possibility of freedom. He experiences a possibility of being able to become. What he is able to do he has no conception of. Adam is perplexed, because he is not capable of understanding the words of God, for he has not yet eaten "the fruit of the tree of knowledge". Hence, the innocence of Adam, in relation to the prohibition and punishment, expresses itself in dread. He is not guilty and, yet, he is in dread. Long before the advent of depth-psychology, Kierkegaard has stumbled on the hidden reality of the "unconscious".

**E. Dread and the Unconscious**

Kierkegaard’s contribution to the field of psychology is extremely significant, in as much as it can account for the ramifying thoughts of a number of psychologists that were to follow him. Kierkegaard’s thesis here is: “The possibility of freedom announces itself in dread” 10. Man in innocence has an obscure knowledge of his imperfection, the created givenness of his nature. His imperfection is repressed, and it is at the unconscious level. In his innocence however man gets a hint of his present state of reality, which is far from perfection, and this generates dread. That the dread is about nothing, because his reality is “nothing”, is an ontological truth of his being. His imperfection serves as a stimulus, and dread is the reaction to the stimulus. When the individual is faced with his imperfection, he encounters possibilities, which can however be actualized by exercising his freedom. When Adam was prohibited to partake of the “tree of knowledge”, it also generated a tremendous amount of dread, because he was faced with the possibility of freedom; It was the freedom to choose what he would will to do. Thus, at a juncture, when he is prohibited from doing what he is commanded not to do, it can be said that Adam became conscious of his freedom. The freedom was lying buried in the
unconscious, which manifested itself in dread. God endows man with moral freedom, and so it is up to man to choose.

II

A. Kierkegaard and Freud

In the years to come, men of literature were to vaguely hint at the existence of the unconscious till it was penetratingly investigated into and conclusively established by Freud. He is rightly known as the philosopher of the unconscious. Kierkegaard's philosophy of dread is subtly reflected in the philosophy of the "unconscious" of Freud. Two of the basic conceptions of the Freudian unconscious can be stated as: "(i) The consciousness as entirely composed of ideas that were conscious and have been repressed. (ii) The unconscious either as entirely composed of, or at least as including, some ideas that were not originally conscious but that would become conscious." 11

When God prohibited Adam from eating from the "tree of knowledge", it occurred to Adam that he has a certain freedom. If he is not endowed with freedom, there can be no sense in prohibiting him. Prohibition implies the possibilities that lay before him. Adam became conscious of the idea of freedom, which he was originally not conscious of. As though he were directly indebted to Kierkegaard, Freud says that the repressed states can be manifested, so as not to appear, except in distorted and indirect forms, and under special conditions, (such as day-dreaming), in consciousness. Otherwise they lay buried in the unconscious. Kierkegaard is of the view that the individual, in his innocence, dreamingly projects his imperfection. The individual is hinted at what his present reality is, namely the "untruth". The individual is not aware of his true personality, it is in fact repressed, and is vaguely manifested by his dreaming state. His repressed reality is manifested dreamingly. Freud likewise says that, in dreaming, man manifests his wishes, deeply repressed, but now seeking their substitute fulfillment. In reality man wishes for certain things which cannot be expressed in the open, (which is
part of his reality), and therefore they get repressed. To fulfill his wishes man has to have
dreams, lest he be psychologically sick. Freud developed a whole system of
psychoanalysis to treat the psychological sickness. Kierkegaard however took the
problem of the spirit's dreaming and spirit's sickness, at a spiritual level, to the realm of
ontology in his *Sickness Unto Death*, without overlooking psychology involved therein,
as is amply clear from his works cited.

If we care to look at Kierkegaard's psychological and ontological insights and
Freud's formulation of the principles of psychoanalysis, we cannot ignore the common
concerns they share. Kierkegaard's work on psychology of the guilt, and its
transformation into sin illumines greatly the idea of Freud's unconscious. If Kierkegaard
shifts constantly from psychology to ontology, it is because he is basically an existential
ontologist. His understanding of the "contradiction" in the life of man is an existential
state of man, where the person concerned is deeply disturbed from within. Likewise the
conflict or trauma of the patient, viewed by Freud, is also a result of the imbalance of the
mental state. To cure the patient the psychoanalyst applies measures which relate to the
past experiences of the patient. Similarly, for Kierkegaard, too, to get out of the
"contradiction", the individual has "to repent" over his past sins. In both cases, at the
psychological level, self-help is the main thrust of cure. Only when the individual
concerned is willing enough to take the next step to liberation, can he escape from the
misfortunes of the spirit. The person must exercise his free will and willingly surrender to
the supreme spirit. Freud may view the whole of human existence in terms of the past,
but Kierkegaard, on account of his emphasis on freedom for God, can think of it in terms
of the future.

Though their approaches to understanding human being are often different, their
concerns are more often than usual the same, and they must not be ignored. Both are
intensely concerned about the human reality in its depth. For Kierkegaard, the true
individual is subjective, characterized by dread on account of the possibilities of freedom.
Man begins with the guilt consciousness, and ends with sin-consciousness, but finds
repose in God. Freud too wants to probe the inner depths of the unconscious, the repository of all the suppressed wishes. The goal is to help the human being to abreact the traumas due to suppression by way of laying bare the unconscious. Both Kierkegaard and Freud are concerned about the innermost state of the mind. For Freud it is the unconscious; for Kierkegaard dread emerges from the hidden depths of human reality. The dwelling place for dread is the spirit of the individual, whose existence is not easy to realize. Dread, like the unconscious of Freud, is inaccessible to the probing of the "conscious" and the "pre-conscious". It is, like the unconscious level, hard to access, and it can be known only through self-help and the removal of self-deception. Freud aims at self-knowledge, which can be attained by removing layers of self-deception with the help of psychoanalysis. Similarly, for Kierkegaard, too, it is certainly self-knowledge that comes by way of self-becoming in faith. He is of the view that, only when one is true to oneself, extricating oneself from the crowd, can one acquire true knowledge. For him the crowd serves as a deception to the individual, and therefore he denounces the crowd mentality. "Crowd" here is symbolic of the repose in the universal, the very antithesis of the individual, or the particular, in absolute relation with the absolute.

In studying Kierkegaard’s insight to psychology of the individual, we must take note of the similarities found between him and Freud on the discovery, if not the formulation, of the unconscious. Kierkegaard surely helped Freud in the discovery of the unconscious. However, the two thinkers express different views of the unconscious, too. Through its investigation, Freud’s psychoanalysis was instrumental in curing the mental disorders. He followed a system in which the patient was helped to relive the past traumatic experiences in the form of “story recitation”, or “free association” and “counseling”. This was expected to help the patient to overcome his fears, insecurity and all the negative experiences which were the cause of his instability. Once cured, the patient no longer goes through the traumatic ordeals, and will be relieved of the huge and demanding task of trying to overcome such pathetic ordeals. The patient will no longer be actively involved in overcoming the traumatic occurrences, because there will be no need for it. He is passive to any future traumas. But, for Kierkegaard, the individual is not
passive, but just the opposite. As he probes the depths of the inner being, he is all the more active, more active than ever before, because he is to discover that his being is ontologically grounded on God. God-relation is sustained by intense passion, subjectivity and inwardness. This will be clear when dread is viewed from a perspective of time, a structure of human existence.

Dread in the individual can be related as corresponding to the three dimensions of time, namely, the past, present and future. The past represents the actuality of the individual; the present, the possibilities that are before the individual; and the future, the freedom, or the course of action that is to follow. Kierkegaard says,

The synthesis of the soulish and the bodily is to be posited by spirit, but the spirit is the eternal, and therefore this is accomplished only when the spirit posits at the same time, along with this, the second synthesis of the eternal and the temporal. 12

Kierkegaard brings in the category of the "instant" or the "moment" to highlight how the spirit is posited, along with the synthesis of the temporal and the eternal. The instant is the situation where the individual is confronted with the possibility of choice. So long as the eternal is not posited, the instant is not. Therefore, since in the state of innocence the spirit is characterized merely as a dreaming spirit, the eternal manifests itself as the future, that is the freedom which generates dread. Kierkegaard understands the temporal as the possibilities of choice before man. Kierkegaard writes,

If time and eternity are to touch one another, it must be in time -- and with this we have reached the instant. 13

It is in the instant, when man is faced with possibility of choice, that the temporal and the eternal are synthesized.
Thus the past represents actuality, present represents possibility, and the future represents the freedom of the individual. Unlike Freud, Kierkegaard understands the individual from the perspective of the past, present and future. It is through the individual’s past and present reality that his future is posited. The individual has to live his past and present in such a way that he enjoys a blissful future, to which he looks forward with hope. Kierkegaard says,

If I am in dread of a past misfortune, this is not in so far as it is past, but in so far as it may be repeated.\textsuperscript{14}

The past generates dread, because we fear that it can be repeated in future, if not, it can pass only as a pathetic memory. This indicates that man constantly looks towards the future. As such man has to establish an appropriate relationship among the past, present and the future, a kind of equilibrium, and become fully aware of the significance of one’s “lifetime”, because it is one single whole.

Dread is understood as announcing the possibility of freedom of the individual. “Possibility” implies that something can happen in the future. It brings out the significance of the element of future for the individual. As time, taken as a whole, includes past, present and future, the individual, who is in time, should be understood in terms of these three dimensions of time. There cannot be any future without the past and present, in fact, future, in a sense, constitutes past and present. Thus future, in the final analysis, is the framework of time. The individual, who is in time, can be best represented by the future, because future reflects on both the past and present. That which is cultivated in the past and present manifests in the future. Thus, an individual is best understood, and best represented, as one who lives with a vision for the future. To have a vision for the future consists in hoping for a future, which would constitute the individual’s active participation. In view of this, an individual is understood as having hope and faith, because, with faith, hope comes into the picture. Because the individual holds on to the paradox with all his faith, he hopes for a blissful life. His past, or his actuality, generates the dread; likewise, his present, or the possibility to become,
generates dread; and his future, or freedom, is established by acting upon his free will. By exercising his freedom, the individual becomes a true being in God, in choosing he chooses God. The individual sets himself free in the future. The individual is in truth, only when he expresses himself in action, in other words, in freedom. Only when he is willing in the deepest sense to recognize truth, and let it permeate his whole being, is he in a position to experience his authentic existence.

When the individual becomes aware and comes to know of his past, and is conscious of his present situation, he is overwhelmed with trust in God, and this generates hope for a future, he hopes to live right by constantly keeping in tune with his Master. His future awaits him with a need for inwardness and self-will, which should yield the right decisions, on his part. In other words, the individual is constantly active. He is active to the point of effecting a re-birth for himself. Because, by knowing himself, it would be like discovering a new person within him. In a sense, he will have brought about a radical transformation, or modification, within himself: he discovers himself anew. He finds himself seeing things around him in a way he had never seen before. He overcomes his conflict by seeing his temporal and eternal obligations not as contradictory, but as complementary to each other. In order to accomplish this balance, he has to strive constantly, never losing sight of his consciousness, but looking up to the almighty for all the strength required. His right choice, free decision will follow.

For Kierkegaard, to become a true individual, one has to consciously depart from his past life, and the present should serve as the medium, in which he takes the leap of faith with a resolve to start a new life. In doing so, the individual is inwardly changed. He no longer is what he was, but has become what he all along had been in the depth of his being. He is changed, in the sense that he is conscious of what was unconscious to him hitherto. The unconscious, which has become conscious and explicit, is something new to him, because he is experiencing a kind of life, which was not experienced before. Kierkegaard has arrived, through an altogether different route, where Freud, the psychoanalyst, reached in his own way. In his own language, it can be said that the individual
was leading so far a pseudo-existence, deceiving himself and refusing to exercise his freedom, but now he is transparent to himself in the exercise of freedom. If the individual wishes to live an authentic life, he should renounce first of all self-deception in refusing to accept his freedom.

B. Kierkegaard and Adler

Kierkegaard's impact on other important psychologists has been equally significant. Alfred Adler, the one-time associate of Freud, on parting company with Freud, gave his school the name of "Individual Psychology". This was a big set back for the depth psychology of Freud, and this, not without reason. It was increasingly felt that the epochal discoveries of Freud were not without serious blemishes. Though initially Adler and Freud worked together, serious differences in opinion, centered around Freud's view of personality, surfaced between the two stalwarts, thanks to the emphasis laid by Kierkegaard on the concept of the individual. Freud's view of the personality development implies a learning, in which emphasis is laid upon the influence of memories on the perception of contemporary stimuli so that all present perceptions are determined by the past perceptions. All behaviour is motivated and goal-directed. Even the slips of the tongue and the memory lapses were shown by Freud to be unconsciously motivated. Man strives only to obtain gratification of instinctual drives and to avoid frustration of these drives.

Freud was not averse to advocate the principle of psychic determinism, given his own training in Bruke's institute of Physiology, where freedom and spontaneity were largely suspect. The second major assumption of Freud was the unconscious motivation. He postulated an unconscious mind, not only as a repository for many of the instincts for pleasure and destruction, but also as a repository for ideas, feelings and wishes, which the individual would be ashamed to accept about himself openly. These feelings, wishes and ideas were supposedly dominated by the sexual drives represented by the "libido" and the "Oedipus complex", and even the "infant sexuality". Moreover, Freud also
explained dreams as wish-fulfillments of sexual desires. He postulated two general sets of instincts, the first being the sex instinct, or "life instinct" (Eros), and the second being the "death instinct", or "aggression instinct" (Thanatos). The Eros instinct includes within itself the drive for self-preservation, too. The Thanatos instinct is a force, which is constantly working destructively in forms of aggression, whereas the life instinct is a creative force.

Freud applied selectively, so it was thought, his principles of psychology in his theory of individuality, or personality. The individual's character-structure was seen as a result of the struggle between the external world and the individual's hidden desires, which are largely libidinous. Ultimately the individual's character was projected as compatible with the demands of the outside world. Determinism is inbuilt in the development of personality. Individual's capacity, if any, is repressed by his instinctual drives so as to make himself compatible with the forces of the outside world, both physical and social. The id operates according to the pleasure principle, the ego holds the id in check with its reality principle, and the superego operates according to the morality principle exerted by various types of societal and religious authority. The growth of personality is determined by the resultant repressions of the instinctual drives.

Adler was to rebel against some of the assumptions of Freud, especially when it came to the development of the individual. He retained Freud's view that behavior is motivated or directed toward some goal. What Adler objected to in Freud's view was the latter's emphasis on the sexual motivation as primary in human beings, not sparing even the infants. He opposed, again, the notion that instincts themselves are the sole determiners of human behaviour. Freud's "pansexualism" and determinism was abhorrent to Adler. Adler presented his own brand of psychology, based on the thesis that human behavior can be explained in terms of a struggle for power in order to overcome the feelings of mental or physical inferiority. The individual has to be understood in terms of the struggle to overcome inferiority. He strongly believed that neurosis was a disorder of the total personality, and not merely of the aberration of the
sexual drives; that non-sexual factors can also lead to conflict in a person. This had a lasting impression on the study of depth psychology, even on psychoanalysis. This is visible in the expressions of many humanistic psychologists, that were to follow suit and think creatively on the human personality. Adler's own concern for the human personality is immortalized in the title he gives to his school of thought. It is not denied that biological factors are important, or that mental energy must ultimately be rooted in the body. But what is sought to be denied by Adler and others is that all behaviour is directed towards the satisfaction of biological needs, in particular, sexual needs, as is suggested by Freud.

"Freud believed in the person as a social atom requiring community only as a means to the satisfaction of his needs."15 Freud's "biologism" led him to a conviction that the source of man's trouble lies deep within himself, and is not simply the result of adverse social or material conditions. However, Adler emphasized on what he called the dynamics of the whole family, and placed much more emphasis on the importance of sibling position and family, in general, as the factors behind determining a person's mental, or psychological, inferiority, which had to be overcome for the personality growth. Adler had begun by repudiating Freud's theory of the primacy of the sexual drive. His writings made it clear that his emphasis was on the person as a whole individual, with several aspects that are too interconnected for meaningful examination to be seen exclusively apart from one another. Freud's mistake was then exclusivism, in particular, of pan-sexuality.

Adler's commitment to "individual differences" is seen in the label he affixed to his brand of psychology. This is one concern that he shares with Kierkegaard: The individual is a particular, not a universal, not to be submerged in the crowd, the universal. It is an attempt to recognize the different effects and meanings that can affect different people. While Adler did not deny in-born qualities, the important factor that he emphasized was, "not what one is born with, but what use one makes of that equipment."16 Kierkegaard gave us an elaborate philosophy of what one makes of possibility by way
of freedom. Adler however viewed the basis of individual differences as psycho-social, as distinct from hereditary, and saw people as unified, indivisible wholes, each with his or her unique pattern of behaviour that are designed to reach a goal. Kierkegaard, we have seen, fully develops the notion of transcending the givenness to the realm of freedom. He is not adverse to the psychological factors. He incorporates the hereditary, and community factors at a much deeper level. His transformation of guilt-consciousness into sin-consciousness is an instance of his depth analysis of human predicament.

The difference between Freud and Adler may be traced to an important factor: While Freud sought to account for all human behaviour in terms of the past, Adler set his face towards the future. To Freud, the unconscious is the repository for the past repressed wishes, in terms of which personality is explained; personality is regressive, retroactive. But, Adler’s emphasis is on the unity of the individual, formed prospectively, because of his concern for the future of the individual. The idea that the individual is a totality, pushing forward towards something better lying in the future, is central to him. Adler firmly believes that man is ever moving towards some significant goal. All human behaviour is purposive and goal-directed, it is teleological. A goal orients the individual’s personality towards the future expectations, and not the past. This is made possible, because the personality results from the activity of the creative power of the individual. “Thus, each of us is the sculptor of our own personality.” 17 Freud, too, may have talked about goal-directed behaviours, but such behaviours are rooted in the gratification of his instinctual drives, which are already determined in human nature. However, for Adler, the goal-directed behaviours are rooted in the quest for perfection. He is of the view that feeling of inferiority generates a struggle to overcome it and acquire perfection. As a result there is always a great forward move towards perfection, and such movement forward is towards the future. It is a movement from an uncomfortable and unwanted state to a much brighter state of personality.

In a way, the individual creates himself by the attitudes he adopts in interacting with the society. The individual can be said to have his own style of life. Adler may be
said to have given a new direction to psychology, when he highlighted the importance of 
the non-sexual factors as leading to conflict in the individual. This paved the way to 
viewing man from a much wider perspective than what was done by Freud. Adler 
particularly highlighted the environmental factors, both social and physical. Man does 
not exist alone, he is in a society, and the surroundings do affect him and his attitudes. 
Man, it is true, has biological drives, but that is not the whole story of man. He is a 
complex being with so many factors, at once influencing him and moulding him. This is 
the reason why Adler recognizes the need for “social interest” in the understanding of the 
development of the individual. By social interest he means the individual’s identification 
with society. It is at once a feeling for others, as much as the desire to make contributions 
to the well-being of the society. He asserted that all human beings are capable of such 
social feeling, and the experience of such feelings developed the potential of the 
individual. On the whole, it was a central factor in determining the quality of man’s 
adjustment in the society; and the measure of social adjustment was indicative of his 
personal development, too.

C. Kierkegaard and the Humanistic Psychologists

(i) Erich Fromm

Humanistic psychologists were to greatly benefit from the new direction given by 
Adler to depth psychology. Erich Fromm, a humanistic psychologist, also highlights that 
the fundamental problem of personality has nothing to do with the mere satisfaction or 
frustration of the instincts, including that of sex. He, too, like Adler, draws our attention 
to the importance of the societal relations. He however observes that the relationship 
between man and society is not static, but that it constantly changes. The development of 
the individual is determined by the relatedness of the individual towards his world, 
adopted from time to time. Although there are certain in-built drives, which are common 
to all human beings, for example, hunger, sex etc., it is obviously the case that those 
traits, which make for the differences between individuals, for example, love, hate, desire
for power and others, are produced in us by the social processes. Society not only suppresses the in-built instincts, but also creates the new ones; and the development of the individual is a product of all these factors. The development of the individual may be limited, but cannot be completely explained by what is given in our biological nature. The differences among human beings are thus more important to Fromm. It appears that Fromm is willing to discuss the human personality beyond the Freudian determinism of the biological nature. It is here that he may be said to go along with Kierkegaard’s perceptions.

It is clear that Fromm emphasizes the uniqueness of every individual and the power the society has to influence the individual. The biological factor, which plays its part in moulding the individual, is not ignored, thanks to Freud. However, Fromm also talks about how man’s energies serve as a productive force in moulding the individual. Thus, man is not merely passive, but active, in history. His assertion, “Man is not only made by history, history is made by man,” is well taken by the social scientists, psychologists, in particular. When he talks about man’s energies, he refers to the freedom of the individual, making a common cause with Kierkegaard, although for Kierkegaard, it is primarily personal rather than social history. With freedom man is able to keep pace with the ever changing society, because, with freedom as a tool, he is instrumental in bringing about changes within and around him. But, what is significant is that man effects changes within himself by the exercise of freedom.

In his book, _The Art of Loving_, Erich Fromm argues that love is the only answer to the problem of human existence. He begins his reflections, saying that “Love is an art, just as living is an art.” Existence, for him, is not a system, but a learning process. This Kierkegaard had repeatedly asserted against the Hegelians. Fromm says that the deepest need of man is the need to overcome his separateness, to leave the prison of his aloneness. This need arises due to his quest for an identity. He seeks to achieve this aim through union with groups, or through creative activity of an artist or an artisan. It is a union in which the individual self disappears, to a large extent, and the aim is to feel the
“belongingness” to a group. Kierkegaard, however, may be very different here from Fromm. Fromm’s existential man seeks his identity in union with the group, with the creation of art etc. Kierkegaard has gone beyond the humanism of Fromm. Kierkegaard would see such unions as a reversion into the universal. True individuality has to assert its particularity, even when it seeks union with the absolute. Kierkegaard’s view is much more radical on account of his “personal theism”. However, at some stage, Fromm is prepared to acknowledge that social unions at times give no answer to the problems of existence. Such unity is only a pseudo-unity, only partial answer to the problem of existence. “The full answer lies in the achievement of interpersonal union, of fusion with another person, in love.”

This desire for interpersonal fusion is the most powerful striving in man. The failure to achieve it leads to “insanity” or “self-destruction”, on the part of the individual. Fromm’s is the finest of all ethical humanism. Kierkegaard, however, thinks of human individuality taking shape beyond the ethical realm. Theism has put Kierkegaard on a distinctive plane.

Fromm makes a distinction between symbiotic union and mature love. In symbiotic union, the bodies are independent, but attachment exists psychologically. There is an element of submission in such passive union. The individual escapes from the feeling of isolation and separateness by voluntarily making himself part and parcel of another person, who directs him, guides him, protects him, and so on. He is nothing, except in as much as he is a part of the other. An active symbiotic union is however characterized by domination. One, who seeks to escape from his loneliness by forcing another person to be a part and parcel of himself, is a sadist. The sadistic person, too, is dependent on the submissive person as the latter is on the former. Neither can live without the other. But the union in mature love is different.

“In contrast to symbiotic union, mature love is union under the condition of preserving one’s integrity, one’s individuality.”

In symbiotic union, the individual loses his individuality, his dependence on the other makes it impossible for him to be an independent person. This independence however is demanded of, if one were to
overcome the problems of existence. Fromm thinks that the answer to problems of existence lies in mature love. Love makes man overcome the sense of isolation and separateness, and, yet, it permits him to be himself, to retain his integrity. Love is active, because it refers to the use of man's inherent power, his freedom. Love, at the same time, retains man's integrity, because in love man is exhibited as a free agent. As such, "Love is an action, the practice of a human power, which can be practised only in freedom and never as the result of compulsion"^{24}. The active nature of love is explained by Fromm, when he says that "Love is primarily giving, not receiving."^{25} Giving does not necessarily mean giving of material objects, but of one's joy, interest, understanding, knowledge, time, convenience, comfort, humor, sadness etc.

The concept of love can be applied to various objects. Fromm has no inhibition of talking of self-love. He vindicates his concept of self-love, saying, "If it is a virtue to love my neighbor as a human being, it must be a virtue – and not a vice – to love myself, since I am a human being too"^{26}. Fromm further argues that, unless man loves himself, he cannot love others. Love should be directed inward, so that it can be reflected outwards in its fullness.

Fromm, by emphasizing on the active force of love as the answer to all problems of existence, implicitly points to the dynamic energy of man, which is his freedom. Being free, the individual is in a position to bring about changes, which results in the development of his personality. He moves forward towards the future. To be sure, he is influenced by his biological drives, the society, too, influences the individual, but, ultimately, it is the inherent energies of man, or rather his freedom, which has the final word. Man's freedom comes about as the most active and positive force in determining the development of man's personality. His existence will be meaningless, if he is deprived of his freedom. By emphasizing on the future of man, it is also implied that it is the individual, and not the crowd or the group, who has existence. The redeeming feature of Fromm's psychology is that he tends to identify love and freedom as the creative energy of man. This has a practical significance for harmony in one's personality. But the
analysis lacks the conceptual clarity and distinction between love and freedom. But Kierkegaard proves himself to be both a philosopher and a psychologist, when it comes to the conceptual clarity, here. Freedom to him is a possibility which is exercised in works of love.

(ii) **Binswanger**

Ludwig Binswanger’s analysis of *Dasein*, in the field of psychology, also echoes the importance accorded to the individual. He contends that man’s nature cannot be completely described in objective terms, much less, in instinctual drives. He claims that each person is unique in his own way, and has his own peculiar “private” world. Understanding the development of the individual requires apprehending the world of the individual, as is experienced by him. Each individual approaches and responds to his environment in a unique way. His environment plays an important role in determining the development of the individual. Binswanger accepts much of what Heidegger has to say about *Dasein*, the human reality circumscribed by space and time. *Dasein*’s being-in-the-world gives rise to the experiences of the individual. This existential *a priori* constitutes the total experience of each particular being-in-the-world. What Binswanger wants to assert is that “thrownness” is a constituent of the individual, which has its bearing on the development of the individual.

The aim of Binswanger’s psychology was an attack on the dominant tendencies of experimental and objective type of psychologies. His psychology would take into account human subjectivity by insisting on the validity of intentions, motives and beliefs in the explanation of behaviour. Human experience can also extend to religious and moral spheres of life, where man can attain development by submerging himself in the events surrounding him. Society becomes an important ingredient in the development of the individual. It was his contention that man must find himself in an area of life, that includes also the spiritual dimensions of man. In this way, man will “be able to retain and
regain the comprehensive and total approach to life”27. Binswanger found in all his clinical cases the desperate striving for some ideal, or life-goal, on the part of his patients. It was in reference to this life-goal or ideal that the patient felt inadequate and suffering. The feeling of inadequacy came in the way of their efforts to become something good. This state Binswanger describes as “the loss of self”. This is a loss of the self, because the individual fails to recognize his positive self, rather he sees in himself only the vices, worthlessness and other negative traits that deter his work for betterment.

We could say that the individual lost his sense of freedom, because he failed to exercise freedom. He only needs to make the choice of being positive, and resolve to work on his life. He fails to love himself, or he fails to become a free man, while, in love, he is always free. “For Binswanger the complete truth can be realized in love, which aspect made man total and complete.”28 Man is always striving for a meaningful existence. In order to achieve it, he must be honest first of all to himself. In all, man’s meaningful relationship involves with the environment, his fellowmen and with himself. There is much in Binswanger that is in substantial agreement with Kierkegaard. The agreement especially is in the area of the analysis of the existential predicament of man. However, the negative traits that Binswanger discovers in the self is still the guilt-consciousness that has not yet become the sin-consciousness through dread. For Kierkegaard any amount of human liberation cannot be equated with the divine salvation through faith and grace. His personal theism has so radicalized the God-relation that it transcends all ethical humanism, including all “religion of immanence”.

(iii) Erikson

Erik Erikson is a psychologist much in line with Fromm and Binswanger, in as much as he too may be considered as a humanistic psychologist. He stresses on the strength and capacities of ego29. This shift from the id of the depth-psychology in Erikson came to be known as “Ego Psychology”. Erikson retains, but de-emphasizes, the
influence of instinct and libido on personality, but prefers to stress the role played by ego and the superego of the societal forces in shaping the human personality. To Erikson, the ego is far more than a mediator between the id and superego, between the ego and the environment; its capacities extend beyond a defense against the illicit instincts and drives. One crucial function of the ego is to preserve a “sense of identity” 30. The overriding message in Erikson’s writings is that identity is a dynamic process, not a static unity. Personality changes and evolves over time 31. Man is able to continually expand and broaden his horizons with much benefit to himself and others. Erikson is of the view that personality development continues from infancy to old age, unlike Freud, who claims that development virtually completes by about five years, and that personality has to be understood in terms of these past five years and the forces of the id thereafter. Throughout the development of personality, avers Erikson, the individual forms a variety of fragmentary self-images which are actively integrated by the ego into a meaningful whole, producing a sense of inner harmony and oneness as the individual grows and develops. Erikson holds that identity crisis leads to neurotic behaviour, and that this sense of the ego identity leads to a healthy development of the personality. Erikson rejects Freud’s conception of a negative society, as a source of frustration and conflict, since illicit id impulses must be sublimated. On the contrary, society is not necessarily a source of frustration and conflict, but it plays a prominent role in moulding the developing ego. The functions of the ego are constructive, because the nature of its role is both positive and optimistic. While the Freudian view of human nature is pessimistic, because he emphasizes on the powerful illicit id impulses, Erikson’s view is optimistic, in as much as he emphasizes on the greater strength of the adaptive ego.

It would appear to me that, in comparison with Freud and Kierkegaard, the swing of the pendulum in Erikson’s philosophy has tilted to the other extreme. In his eagerness to assert the rights of the ego, he has downplayed the unconscious and the dread. We know it too well that there can be wrong and evil assertions of the ego, that have been detrimental to the growth of personality. If the sense of the right and wrong is not anchored on an indubitable moral concept, say, a moral presider like God, a mere
humanism is bound to fail like a spring that aspires to the moon. This perhaps is the message of Kierkegaard’s philosophy of the individual.

(iv) Rollo May

Finally, a word about Rollo May, an equally important humanistic psychologist. Rollo May believes that each of us has an inherent need to exist in the world, into which we are born, and to achieve a sense of ourselves as an autonomous and distinct entity. The stronger the sense of being-in-the-world, the healthier the personality. Developing one’s personality requires constant effort, and courage to affirm and ascertain one’s being-in-the-world. Because every man is unique and distinct, each one must discover and assert his own potentials and values. This can be done by experiencing each moment actively, and accepting freedom and responsibility to choose one’s own path in life. Death, which none can escape, is one absolute fact about Dasein. The awareness of an eventual end to our being evokes the painful emotion of anxiety. For Rollo May, it is the fundamental clash between being and the threat of non-being that is the inevitable aspect of human nature. Man is, to some extent, impelled by forces from his infancy and childhood, yet, he also has the freedom to strive towards those goals that he selects. An individual can imagine some desired future state, and then organize himself to move in this direction. The individual moves with a definite intention, which, in turn, makes him responsible. Thus far Rollo May may be said to paraphrase Heidegger.

Further, Rollo May believes that love is another reality of man, which helps to usher in an essentially holistic approach to personality. Personality development results due to the contributions made by the society, culture, family, especially, parents, and, above all, by the individual’s own efforts. Such understanding of the individual personality can be espoused not only by a humanist, but also by an agnost. To Kierkegaard, however, the true meaning of freedom, and, through it, the flowering of personality, is made possible only in faith in God, because human freedom is ontically a freedom of man, but it is a derived freedom from and for God.
To conclude. The concept of the individual in philosophy gained new significance, because man ultimately had to fall back on himself after everything failed him. Mankind had to focus on itself to rejuvenate life. Existentialism of Kierkegaard and others is to be situated here. To understand oneself, one has to analyze oneself. Here, psychology is a great help, but the final word is not that of psychology. By discussing the concept of dread, as propounded by Kierkegaard, along with Freud's Unconscious, we come to the conclusion that the unconscious of Freud was a later development of Kierkegaard's concept of dread. Kierkegaard's insight clearly exhibits the elements of the unconscious human moorings. He uses the term "dread" in much more comprehensive sense so as to relate it to the concept of the "possible". He studies it in the perspective of past, present and future. Kierkegaard's views may be said to have prefigured those of the depth-psychologists' unconscious, in particular, of Freud and Adler. Humanistic psychologists have only reaped a rich psychological harvest. Kierkegaard's view thus had a far fetching influence on the post-Freudians, beginning with Adler and ending with the humanistic psychologists. The inadequacies of the humanistic psychologies are laid bare by the "trans-personal psychologies". A discussion of this is beyond the scope of my thesis. Freud, Adler and the humanistic psychologists share their stand in one way or another with Kierkegaard: the development of the individual takes a holistic approach and formulations, and, in doing so, directs the individual towards the future. Kierkegaard's influence can be seen on Rollo May,Binswanger, Erich Fromm and Erik Erikson. They all stress on the existential element of the individual as influencing his development. The individual is unique, in Kierkegaard's language, the individual is "the particular in absolute relation with the absolute".