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ABSTRACT

TIME MOTIVATION:
SELECTED THEORIES AS COMPARED TO MODERN REVELATION

Jill Judkins
Department of Psychology
Masters of Science

This thesis proposes that human beings by virtue of living in each new present moment are motivated to develop strategies to secure the best possible outcome in their lived experience. A personal account of the phenomenological experience of time is presented and a brief history is given. The implications associated with being thrown into the present moment make apparent the weaknesses of the current assumptions that the slices of the present moment form a continuity of past and future and create a coherent synthesis of life. The assumption that human beings are intentional, goal-directed, and prone to seek meaning in their lives is explored. The ultimate nature of human beings and what their responsibility is in this life is re-examined.

A personal experience that enlarged the author's understanding of the tentativeness of the present moment is investigated. In addition, five theorists are selected whose work is concerned with temporal constructs, existentialism, and the intentionality of each human being.
It is concluded that a theory of linear time cannot account for the time phenomenon created by human beings being thrown into the present moment. The continuity of the present with the past and future to form a whole life is only assumed, but not explained by current theories. The five theorists cannot account for humanity’s intentionality and search for meaning. Implications of the personal time experience are explained. Religious doctrines found in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints are examined to show how the gaps in the theories of time can be addressed by these beliefs. These doctrines include belief in pre-existence and an eternal afterlife, the reality of God and the Devil, and the power of faith and repentance.

In summary, the thesis defends the conclusion that the theorists and humankind all have some level of faith in God, and that the theorists are limited in developing accurate theories about human beings because of the erroneous and incomplete understanding of the character and nature of God. God as the creator understands the whole process and it is only through His revelatory process can we understand humankind. God loves His children and has prepared a way through the atonement of Jesus Christ that all might return to Him.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The hypothesis central to this thesis is that movement through time is a motivating factor in thought and behavior. According to the common linear concept of time, the present moments where we live out our lives are enclosed in time. Millions of these moments are strung together to make a lifetime. When one moment is lived, it moves into the past and a new moment appears. Each of the new moments is our present, filled with the remembrance of the past and anticipation of the future: a future that can never be reached. We still remember the past moment, but we are actually experiencing the remembrance of the past, in the present moment. The lines of past, present, and future seem to be connected into a flowing picture of a whole life. William James (1842-1910), psychologist and philosopher, described this flow of awareness as a "stream of consciousness" (James, 1890). It is in this process of consciousness, going through time, which motivates human beings to plan and strategize their next tentative present moment.

The existence of this sort of linear, moving time, is generally assumed in psychology, with no questions asked. Brent D. Slife, author of Time and Psychological Explanation, claims that, "With rare exceptions, time has not only managed to avoid systematic examination, it has scarcely been acknowledged anywhere in the field [psychology]" (Slife, 1993, p. 13). Psychology, as a young science in the late 1800's, adopted the Newtonian view of linear time that was used by the natural sciences. According to Slife (1993, p. 14) linear or absolute time as espoused by Sir Isaac Newton
(1642-1727), the English physicist and mathematician was conceptualized within a framework of five characteristics: objectivity, linearity, continuity, universality, and reductivity. Time is "objective" because it is "independent of human consciousness," or in other words, time is real; it is an external reality without our constructing it. Time is thought to be "linear" because it progresses sequentially from past, through the present and to the future. The past is primal in this sequence because it represents the lived experience and becomes (or houses), the "cause" in cause and effect relationships. Time is "continuous" as it seems to move along a line of passing moments that are uniform and smooth with no deviations or abnormalities. Because of time's continuous regularity, it is ultimately predictable and therefore, is "universal." Hence, we can assume that any empirical process will "retain its original temporal relationship because the passage of time does not alter its quality" (Slife, 1993, p. 29). It is also noted that only" reduced" pieces can be observed in the present along this time line. One is never observing the whole process in one instant, but instead this perspective suggests life is like a series of slides that appear momentarily in the present (Slife, 1993).

Before Isaac Newton, many cultures did not conform to the notion of time as we do now. Time was flexible and conformed to the needs of human experience. The importance of events marked the passing of time—the birth of a child, the year of the tidal wave, or the time it rained for two moons. Cyclical understanding was the concept of time for many ancient peoples: the changing of the seasons, the movement of the stars, the cycle of rebirth and the lunar cycles. But as humans gained more knowledge, increased in population, developed urban living, and underwent the industrial revolution, a need was created for more organization and rigidity. Christianity viewed God's world
as having a beginning with the creation and an end with Armageddon, and the birth of Jesus Christ as a unique, one-time happening. Christians thus divided time into sections (Slife, 1993).

The clock is one machine that had a tremendous influence in making time concrete. In the 1300's the mechanical clock was invented with an hour hand. By 1700, the clock had a pendulum, and a minute and second hand. Newton's work, and the development of the clock, were simultaneous events that merged and reified time. In the 1800's, time was further solidified by the emergence of mass produced, inexpensive watches. Time was now real; something that one could depend on. "Time," according to Slife, "existed like a line, independently of us, and virtually everyone accepted this reification without awareness" (Slife, 1993, p. 16).

Albert Einstein (1879-1955) revolutionized the scientific world with his theory of relativity in 1905. For Einstein, matter and energy were interchangeable, thus changing the Newtonian concepts of time, space, mass, motion and gravitation (Schilpp, 1963). Modern physics suggests the existence of a different time-world where linear time, objective time, and the continuity of events across time are disputed. Discontinuous change, or change without time passing, are possible in modern physics. Einstein's theory has revolutionized the world of physics, but much of the Western world still holds firm to the Newtonian world-view with its regularity and the concreteness of time (Slife, 1993).

Psychology had its methodological roots in Newtonian physics, which holds, in effect, that "human events are regulated according to linear time, so that the past causes the present and the future" (Slife & Williams, 1995, p. 137). Linear time is deeply
embedded in experimental psychology. Over dependence on linear time is not just a matter of changing some of the vocabulary, but it means overhauling the basic paradigm with all its assumptions and implications. So far, psychology is still holding fast to the Newtonian paradigm of linear time as being objective, linear, continuous, universal and reductive (Slife, 1993). Linear time does not answer all questions about time. Many of life's experiences and the experiences of others contradict Newton's description of it. For example, a friend who died while delivering twins and was resuscitated, spoke of her changes in behavior that were unexplainable in the few minutes of her after-death experience. Her obsessive neatness was relaxed, her sense of touch was heightened, her desire in seeking a particular melody was compulsive and her relationships with her family were less strained. These and other changes have been stable since her after-death experience, but cannot be explained using the linear time paradigm. Therefore, there is a need to reconsider our understanding of time, because time is a powerful force in life and it is universal to all human beings. One purpose of this thesis is to explore what other thinkers have proposed about time. This thesis will discuss time motivation in terms of my own experience, from the work of other theorists, and from perspectives of principles taught by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Five theorists were selected for inclusion in this study, three of whom were existentialists, and two of whom were pioneers in early psychoanalysis. The Existentialists, Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980), Ludwig Binswanger (1881-1966), and Medard Boss (1903-1990) were a natural choice since they focus on the nature of existence and employ temporal constructs, considering humans to be intentional, goal-seeking, and responsible for their own choices. Carl G. Jung's (1875-1961) theory of a
human being's powerful, intrinsic striving to achieve his or her intentions is, in some ways, close to the existentialists. The last theorist is Alfred Adler (1870-1937) who was optimistic about human potential, and developed a construct called the "law of movement" that united mind and body toward a goal-oriented life. Chapter 3 of the thesis includes my response to the theorist's basic ideas and assumptions and an integration of my own time experience with the scholarly world of these five theorists. Chapter 4 attempts to examine my time experience and the theories posited by the five theorists in the light of my own personal belief system as a member of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS). The fifth chapter will illustrate how the theorists reviewed left out or de-emphasized some of the major concerns arising from my experience and church doctrine. Consequently, the final chapter offers my conclusions about what can be seen to be lacking in the different theories. It sums up my findings and reflections on the importance of the theorist's contribution in comparison with my understanding of the gospel of Jesus Christ provided by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS). The conclusion deals with the implications of my own time experience.

My Time Experience

My interest in time began with an event that opened my mind to the possibilities of time motivation. I was in class during my first year of graduate school when Professor Brent Slife was discussing time and the implication of only living in the present moment. He cautioned us that Newtonian time could not explain some time phenomena and that modern physics opened up views of new possibilities. My mind escaped for a moment from his lectures as I was trying to imagine how it would feel to perceive being in only
the present moment. I had never thought about being a time traveler in the sense of experiencing the present, then losing that moment to the past while moving into a new present. Then doing this over and over again. If this were true, I would always be going into the unknown—it was inescapable. How would I prepare for that next moment, if it were always in the process of happening?

And then, quite apart from myself, I felt the tenuousness of the process of living in the present moment. It was as if I were watching the process from afar. I was not in the world moving with time, but an outsider observing and feeling how others felt in the process of continually moving into the present moment. It was not just one person or a few that I felt, but the whole of humanity going through the moments of time. The intensity was diminished because I was experiencing through others, but safely apart from them. There was timelessness to the experience because I could see the whole of it in one moment, because I was not a part of it. I experienced their feelings of tenuousness, dread, unpreparedness, fear, but also hope, and a willingness to accept the challenge of living at any cost. Every new present moment was uncertain. That new moment could have a rich surprise or an ugly consequence. In that moment, though I was not experiencing it myself, I felt what others were feeling as they experienced the new moment.

Everything was moving. It was in a state of perpetual motion. There was excitement in the uncertainty as well as dread, a sense that anything could happen. There was also a feeling of commonality because every living thing has to experience these moments and all inhabit the same time dimension in which to live them out. I felt compassion because the experience is very difficult and takes great effort. I could also
sense competition because there was scarcity of power, intellect, beauty, position, wealth, etc. If some were smarter than the rest then they could get more of what they wanted. There was a constant striving for many not to be outsmarted but to be ahead of the game. I also experienced a deep knowing that I was not alone and that sometime, somehow, I had agreed to all of this, and that if I held on to my faith in God, and was obedient, all would be well with me. I did not have to get caught up in the frenzy of the moment, but I could be calm and peaceful because I had experienced existence before with God, and a part of me really did know what to do. I sensed that anyone who is alive is making a courageous effort to live in the tenuous present.

This experience has affected me deeply; the experience is always present with me and I can recall it and relive those emotions that I felt the first time. This has been very helpful to me because I have used this experience to interpret the information about time and the tenuous nature of life in the present moment; it has become a part of me. It also became clear that I could not extricate myself from the time experience, because in the moments of the experiencing, it was all one thing. If I try to imagine the experience objectively, removing myself from being a part of it, I lose the essence of it and it is simply not the same thing. Who I am is part of the experience. I am a woman born and raised in Salt Lake City, of LDS pioneer heritage. My father was the last of 18 children from a family of farmers. My mother was the eighth of 12 children and her father was a mail clerk and farmer. My father started a manufacturing business and my mother nurtured six children. I graduated from college in secondary education and taught Junior High School English and Speech. I was married for seven years, had three daughters, and then divorced. I reared and helped support my family until my children married. Then I
decided to go back to college and study psychology. As a member of the LDS church, I can never remember a time when I did not believe in God. My faith in a personal and loving God has been a constant force in my life. Who I was in this larger context was an extricable part of my experience with the phenomenon of time.

There is a scene in the movie *Indiana Jones and The Last Crusade* that captures the tentative feeling of going into the unknown present. The hero, Indiana Jones, is looking for the Holy Grail. He has a cryptic message that is leading him through a treacherous maze of potential calamities. He is told that he must take the first step, but he is at the end of the trail inside a cavern in a mountain and before him is a narrow ledge and very steep drop to the cavern floor below. He sees the adjoining mountain ledge 20 feet away and a door to enter, but there is no bridge. There is nowhere to go, because to turn back would mean a quick and certain death. He reads the note again and it tells him, essentially, to step out as if something were there. He does, and as he steps out, a supportive stone appears. He steps again and another stone appears. This continues until the stones form a bridge and Indiana crosses to the other mountain (Lucas, 1989). This is analogous to what we do as time travelers. We are walking into the unknown hoping that “a stone” will appear so that we can survive and hopefully find peace and happiness, but fearing that we could fall into the desperate unknown.

After my experience with time, I recognized that I was almost never consciously aware of this process happening inside of myself. There seemed to be awareness on some level, but the habit of experiencing life every moment numbs our thinking about it. I believe it’s something like breathing, unless threatened by the lack of air, we never think of breathing. But, given the linear conception of time, there definitely seems to be
some massive process going on moment by moment every day of our lives. What do I personally do to secure in the next moment what I want to accomplish? I must have a plan, a strategy. I am aware of altering, redefining, and redesigning my strategies to make things come out right. I am often frustrated because my strategies do not reflect realistic expectations, or because I am unwilling, or not disciplined enough to stay with the plan. I became increasingly aware that I have thousands of strategies, that I am planning all the time to be more successful. These strategies define and clarify my weaknesses and my strengths. Through this all, I recognize, in a powerful way, that I am deeply motivated to create strategies for the present where I live out my life.

Our nature is also spiritual, however, and temporal concerns can be overcome by our understanding of God's plan and His ultimate love for us. This is part of a dynamic of constant opposition that is created by our nature, existing as it does in two different dimensions simultaneously: the physical and the spiritual. The moments of the present are where we make decisions about both temporal and spiritual aspects of the course of our lives and where we actually live out our lives. These are critical moments to understand. The next section of the thesis will examine the work of five theorists which might be helpful in illuminating and clarifying ideas that have distilled from this personal phenomenological experience with time as lived in terms of a linear perspective.
Chapter 2
Introduction to the Five Theorists

All of the following theorists portray human beings as both goal-oriented and teleological, meaning they are purposive and directed towards some meaningful intended end (Rychlak, 1981). Since my own theory of human behavior is also teleological, and since the phenomenon of linear time as just explained compels us toward strategies to meet uncertain ends, there is here a starting point to compare my theory with theirs. It should be noted that all of the theorists except Sartre believed in some power, some God-like entity, beyond themselves. This belief does not appear in their theoretical work, but does appear in their personal writings.

Jean-Paul Sartre

Many modern existentialists regard Sartre as a leading light in theoretical development; for him existence is everything and his passionate search for meaning in existence was very compelling. Sartre had an amazing ability to sense the thoughts and feelings of the Europeans who had experienced the devastation of two world wars. He recorded in his philosophy and in his literary works their disillusionment with God for not having saved them from so much suffering. He chose to break away from trusting in anything but humans. Sartre was immensely popular in France and when he died, some 25,000 people attended his funeral, which indicated that he struck a resonant chord in the French people (Norton, 1994).

He was born in 1905 in France and lived through two world wars. Sartre fought in World War II, was captured by the Germans, and a year later was freed when the armistice was signed. He then taught philosophy in Paris and was active in the French
resistance during the remainder of the War. He never married, but had a long-term relationship with the writer, Simone de Beauvoir. He was a philosopher, teacher, playwright, novelist, and political activist. He spent much of his life reconciling existentialism and Marxism (Howells, 1998). He died in 1980.

Existence in Time

Existence for Sartre is a concrete, individual being here and now. Humans materially exist. He is noted for the saying, "existence precedes essence." Essence, according to Sartre, is merely what has been, or man's past, and therefore each man creates his own essence as he lives (Sartre, 1956 p. 630). Sartre thought that atheistic existentialists start from nothing but humanity itself and that all "existentialism is humanism" (Gaarder, 1996, p. 456). Man is the only living creature that is conscious of his existence and therefore, there is always a subjective quality to human reality (Sartre, 1956).

Existence can only mean the present because the past and present are only structures of time and we never exist there. Sartre said, "The three so-called 'elements' of time, past, present, and future, should not be considered as a collection of 'givens' for us to sum up—for example, as an infinite series of 'nows' in which some are not yet and others are no longer—but rather as the structured moments of an original synthesis" (Sartre, 1956, p. 107). If this were not so, says Sartre, "the past is no longer; the future is not yet; as for the instantaneous present, everyone knows that this does not exist at all but is the limit of an infinite division, like a point without a dimension." The only way we can study time or temporality is in its totality says Sartre.
"Being is. Being is in-itself. Being is what it is," said Sartre. As contrasted with Existence, being is all embracing and objective rather than individual and subjective. "There is Being-for-itself and Being-in-itself. For-itself is consciousness, which is free and spontaneous and conceived as a lack of being, a desire for being, a relation to being. By bringing Nothingness into the world, the For-itself can stand out from being and judge other beings by knowing what it is not. Each For-itself is the nihilation of a particular being" (Sartre, 1956, p. 629). For-itself is the nihilation of the in-itself. The for-itself cannot be separated from what it is conscious of, and therefore, it is "Nothing" in itself. Human reality, specifically consciousness, creates its essence through its acts; therefore, this essence is always forthcoming. "One of the characteristics of every human activity is to be unveiling and verifying" (Sartre, 1992, xlv).

In being-for-itself, Sartre maintains, consciousness creates a reality related to, but in some ways detached, from being-in-itself. This reality is reality for us, because when the for-itself is not intending (creating) something it is "nothing." When the for-itself intends someone or something, it becomes a part of the creation, and can, for a moment, leave the world of nothingness for that moment and forget it is creating and maintaining its own meaningful world. The for-itself is in and out of nothingness and intending and being a part of the world.

In being-for-itself we cannot escape consciousness; consciousness is intentional and directive and always pointing to a transcendent object other than itself. We are always conscious of something and consciousness is always engaged in the world of
which it is conscious, and in relationships with other consciousnesses. These relationships by their very nature are in conflict. They involve a battle to maintain the position of subject and to force the other to be an object. This battle is ongoing and inescapable because the other is always in competition with the me. This battle is the key to all human relationships, even those that appear to be peaceful, including sexual desire and love. Consciousness is always locked in a permanent struggle to maintain its freedom so it will not be the object, but to maintain itself as the subject (Sartre, 1956). Consciousness in itself is nothing until it perceives something; but our environment creates this perception as much as we do to ourselves. We select what we choose to perceive, so that the environment or situation doesn’t just present itself to us, but we have the freedom to choose what we want to perceive.

The main characteristic of the for-itself is its activity. It cannot be actively acted upon from outside of itself, and therefore, is continually exhausting itself by its own, meaningful acts. The in-itself is oppositional in nature to the for-itself because it is incapable of any relationship to itself for it is "opaque," says Sartre, and it "coincides exactly with itself" (Olafson, 1967, p. 291). Being-in-itself is non-conscious being. It is the being of the phenomenon, and overflows the knowledge that we have of it. It is plentitude, and, strictly speaking, we can say of it only that it is ” (Sartre, 1956, p. 629). Everything else that is not self-consciousness, is being-in-itself. Only through the for-itself of consciousness does the in-itself become a world. The in-itself will collapse if it does not become the for-itself. Imagination makes a world of the in-itself, and by doing it, it nihilates itself. Nihilation is a term used by Sartre to mean not annihilation but instead a special type of negation that consciousness undertakes when it intends an
object. Intending an object is to differentiate it from its surroundings so that one can know oneself not to be the object but the subject (Sartre, 1956).  

Being-for-others is part of the for-itself. "There arises here a new dimension of being in which my Self exists outside as an object for others. The for-others involves a perpetual conflict as each for-itself seeks to recover its own being by directly or indirectly making an object out of the other" (Sartre, 1956, p. 629).

How do being-for-itself and being-in-itself, which are radically different forms of being, make sense as a whole? One way Sartre explains it is to ask questions and receive a negative answer. Negation is not just a logical function of judgment. Negative judgments themselves require, according to Sartre, as a condition of their being possible at all, an extra logical part, which is nonbeing. This being is human consciousness, whose distinguishing feature is to constitute itself by contrast with its physical body, its past, and everything else. "By its self-detaching activity, it creates, as it were, a hole in being-in-itself, and the latter, as the horizon that surrounds this focus of negation, becomes a world" (Olafson, 1967, p. 291). Because consciousness projects in-itself against a backdrop of nonbeing, it inescapably apprehends actuality in the context of possibility. It also apprehends itself as a bridge between the actual and the possible and determines which of these possibilities is to be realized. The other way of possibility is human consciousness that is free because it is forced to think of itself as—and thus is—other than the world and unincorporable into any causal sequences it may discern within the world. The feeling of anguish comes from experiencing this freedom (Olafson, 1967).
“Being is terrifying,” (Sartre, 1992, xvi) says Sartre, but being is also enjoyable. To enjoy a thing is to create it in its existence. Enjoyment is to be present with it as we are present to ourselves and yet be distinct from it; enjoyment is being nothing except what we enjoy, and still not being what we enjoy (Sartre, 1992).

**Freedom and Bad Faith**

Sartre said that "freedom is the very being of the for-itself" and that the for-itself is “condemned to be free” and therefore, one is condemned to choose for oneself or to force oneself. Freedom does not mean that one gets what one wishes, but instead that one is capable of wishing. Success of the wish has nothing to do with freedom (Sartre, 1956, p. 631). But there is not real freedom in the sense that one can choose whatever one wants. In Sartre’s concept of facticity, not all facts about a person can be changed—e.g., age, sex, class of origin, race and the situation one was born in. Freedom involves a particular range of options that are circumscribed by one’s setting and personal history. Also the very act of creating oneself creates an essence or past that is difficult to escape because of others’ expectations and one’s fears of being different than one has been before. One’s actions and choices form a meaningful whole; if one tries to significantly change the whole, one hits a wall of resistance from already existing patterns of being and doing (Howells, 1998). Freedom, according to Sartre, is threatening to us because it opens up so many possibilities. So we run from them and choose our same old choices or those that others assign to us, this action creates “bad faith.”

Angst and dread are the by-products of going into an unclear, random present. This present world is not of one’s own making and therefore chaotic because one is not simply given meaning and purpose, and yet one is endowed with freedom to create it.
The uncertainty of the outcome and basis of creation create angst and dread. Freedom allows one the possibility to live authentically, but in the end the project of actually doing so for all people is hopeless.

**Conclusion**

Sartre’s atheism has no a priori similar to that found in Kant’s philosophy and his loss of confidence in rationalism leaves him nothing to secure meaning or hope for life in this world. The *being-for-itself* is moving either towards *nothingness* or intending someone or something. If the *for-itself* is intending someone, then a conflict is immediately created, because everyone is maneuvering to be the subject and not the object. War is constant in human relationships because of the nature of the *for-itself.* Human beings are also condemned to be free, and are responsible for the choices they make even though they have had no choice in their creation or the world they were *thrown* into.

*Throwness,* carries with it no consent and no agency, but one is simply *thrown* into the present with a set of boundaries and limits which Sartre calls facticity. (Sartre did not actually use the term *throwness*; Binswanger and Boss used it, as did other existentialists that followed thereafter. *Throwness,* as used here, is the whole person, or gestalt, being *thrown* into the present). There is nothing one can do about these boundaries; these are the facts of one's life. Yes, one has freedom to choose, but one's choices are limited by one's facticity, and there is much inequality in these limitations. Some are *thrown* into a world of pain and suffering with limited choice to alter their predicament; while others might enjoy life’s ease, and opportunities to learn and experience the best of our human culture. For Sartre, this was a cruel joke.
Humans are condemned to be free, and they feel alien in a world without meaning. Their existence is absurd. Sartre attempted to describe a mode of being in which one could find meaning and authenticity, but his attempt was necessarily doomed to failure. His fundamental imperative is to recognize and accept this irresolvable contradiction because it is the most honest account of what it means to be a human being.

Ludwig Binswanger and Medard Boss

The existential analysts, Ludwig Binswanger (1881-1966) and Medard Boss (1903-1990) were both physicians, both Swiss, both somewhat Heideggerian (Martin Heidegger, 1889-1976) in their philosophical views, and both trained in the classical (Freudian and Jungian) approaches to psychoanalysis. Their approach to “existence” and being can be understood to be more than that of physicians trying to help their patients to mental and emotional health. Unlike Sartre, they did not carry the weight of humanity on their shoulders. They dealt with one patient at a time and seemed to have a theory that worked for them.

Binswanger was the pioneer who incorporated existentialism into psychoanalysis. He was the founder of "Daseinanalyse," or existential analysis. He studied with Carl Jung and made a lasting friendship with Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) that continued even after his direction changed considerably from Freud. Binswanger thought that Freud’s theories about human behavior were too mechanistic and dehumanizing, but he held Freud in high regard for his contributions to understanding the human psyche.

Binswanger took over his father’s position as director of the Sanatorium Bellevue, and held the position for over 40 years. This internationally famous sanatorium was also a teaching institute visited by many noted guest lecturers and many leaders in the human
sciences. The fact that Binswanger was 22 years older than Boss and that he had stepped into an established career with many professional connections, established him as the pioneer leading the way for Boss and others. Binswanger practiced Freud’s psychoanalysis at his clinic, but he became increasingly dissatisfied with the results. His clinic accommodated about 80 patients, which gave him a large research base to test the efficacy of his and his associate’s treatment. It was after World War I that Binswanger realized that he could not accept Freud’s theories that dissected individuals into separate component parts. In 1922 he wrote a text, *Introduction to the Problems of General Psychology* in which psychoanalysis was never mentioned. In the 1920’s he was reading Edmund Husserl’s (1859-1938) book, *Ideas*, which developed a full account of phenomenology, and the work of Husserl’s student, Martin Heidegger. This led to Binswanger's development of existential psychology and Daseinanalysis (Kunkel, 1989).

Boss was born and raised in Zurich and received his medical degree there. It was excellent timing for Boss because Zurich was a center of psychological activity. He also studied in Paris and Vienna and was even analyzed by Freud. In London he studied with many of Freud’s inner circle. In 1938, Boss became associated with Carl Jung who opened up the possibility of a psychoanalysis that was free of Freudian interpretation. Boss read Heidegger’s work, and in 1946, he met and became close friends with Heidegger, which cemented his interest in existential psychology. He also cultivated a close working relationship with Binswanger, and together they refined the principles of Daseinanalysis, although Binswanger was the founder (Boeree, 1998).

Boss was professor of psychotherapy at the University of Zurich Medical School as well as the director of Daseinanalyse. Boss, for many years, was president of the
International Society for Medical Psychotherapy. His contributions to existential therapy have been profound (Boeree, 1998).

Existence, Being, and Dasein

Existentialist psychologists' fundamental constructs are existence, being-in-the-world, and Dasein. All of these terms are somewhat synonymous for they are all concerned with being. For example, where Sartre uses the term consciousness, Binswanger and Boss use Dasein (Binswanger, 1967). Binswanger and Boss have different theories of how Dasein is experienced. Binswanger holds that the phenomenal experience is “endowed” with meaning by the human being’s most fundamental ways of perceiving it. To “endow” means to give something that in turn makes something else happen (Rychlak, 1981). Boss sees this process differently. Instead of existence “endowing” meaning, he says it “discloses” it. Boss uses the analogy of the light to describe how Dasein discloses itself; it is not how we look at the experience that is important, but how existence reveals itself to us. We are not isolated beings according to Boss; we live and interact with and illuminate one another. If we look at a cat, Binswanger would say, our phenomenal frame of reference “endowed” the cat with meaning. Boss would say that the cat was disclosed to our phenomenal awareness. Binswanger and Boss understood and describe phenomenal experience in ways that are importantly different, and their approaches to therapy also vary (Boeree, 1998).

Binswanger theorizes in terms of an a priori ontological structure, or in other words, a beginning frame that “comes before” experience. This structure is a frame of reference the person has in coming at life. This assumption about life Binswanger calls “world-designs.” For example, an optimist, Teeny, sees the world with the expectation
that things are going well, while her sister, Joan, pessimistically expects the worst to happen. Teeny and Joan endow their existence with these different expectations. Binswanger says we start very early in life making assumptions about living and we do this with very little understanding because our experience is so meager. For an infant the world represents something to be sucked or tasted because that is the extent of their experience. (Rychlak, 1981)

Boss thought Binswanger had interfered with existence by proposing his theory of world-designs. The concept of a world-design was an unnecessary structure. According to Boeree, “Boss felt that the idea of people coming to the world with preformed expectations distracts from the more basic existential point that the world is not something we interpret, but something that reveals itself to the “light of Dasein” (Boeree, 1998, para. 4). Boss said that existence is not predicated on anything. It just happens. The definition of “phenomenon” literally means, “to shine forth, to come out of darkness.” According to Boss, “That humankind essential structure consists of the understanding of being is not a theoretical postulate, but a fact” (Binswanger, 1967, p.21). And how could anything come forth and last if it did not have a lightened place in which the happening could occur (Binswanger, 1967).

Boss envisions Dasein as an "illumination that brings things to light" (Boeree, 1998, para. 5). Human beings and the concrete world illuminate their experience with light by shining forth, appearing, and coming out of the darkness (Boeree, 1998). Boss explained that:

Indeed, man’s essence is illuminated by himself as being-in-the-world—
not through another Being, but in such wise that his essence is the light. The
Dasein carries "within him" his sphere of illumination, his "there" which both as a matter of fact and essentially cannot be abjured. Only such a Being could have access to what is on hand in the light and [what is] hidden in the dark. Because man is in such a manner himself the illumination of being, Heidegger chooses the term "Dasein" as the expression of the being of this being (Binswanger, 1967, p. 21).

Boss's and Binswanger's views of Dasein as disclosing or endowing are fundamentally different, but they both agree that a person is in some sense choosing meaning in both instances.

As therapists, both Binswanger and Boss were optimistic about their ability to help a patient achieve a more normal and mature mental life. Binswanger's world-design is a beginning framework, but as the person matures the design becomes more complex, and is, therefore, vulnerable to error. If these world-designs are underdeveloped, based on a lie, or are not securely formed, then Dasein is going to be restricted and the individual is going to have problems. Binswanger was concerned with the whole individual being in the present, in their particular historical context. Then, from that perspective, he could assist the patient in strengthening his or her world-design so that, first, they were free to choose and therefore transcend, second, they were mature in outlook, and third, they were independently responsible (Rychlak, 1981). Boss, in contrast, was concerned with not allowing the light to shine freely. Boss claimed that people try too hard to stay in control of their lives, and before they know it, living gets too much for them. Boss urged his patients to trust in fate and jump into life instead of appraising every possible outcome. Boss encouraged his patients to loosen up instead of
"keeping the light of Dasein tightly focused," and his most common suggestion was to "let things go" (Boeree, 1998, para. 7).

*Thrownness*

Binswanger’s notion of *thrownness* is softer than Sartre’s notion of being condemned to freedom amidst facticity. There is the possibility to make more of a difference in the world with his constructs than with Sartre’s. We are *thrown* into an existence laden with historicity or facticity, says Binswanger, but world-designs and related assumptions have been worked out and brought to life by our ancestors, and exist now in our Dasein. The world is a better place because of those people who have lived authentically in the past and have made changes that have influenced our Dasein in the present (Rychlak, 1981). This concept creates more meaning for living persons because they can create possibilities for themselves in the future and for all people who live after them as well. Binswanger called this construct *being-able-to-be*. This softens the "dread" of *thrownness*, *because* there is some organizational structure to help the person be more adaptable (Binswanger, 1967).

Binswanger said that Dasein was a total gestalt consisting of three different aspects of the world (welt). The first is "eigenwelt" the self-world of inner feeling and affections—our inner world inside our bodies. Teeny would content and at peace in her love for life, or her "eigenwelt." The second is "umwelt," which is the environment around us. Teeny sees flowers, highways, and people strolling on the avenues. The third is "mitwelt," the social world, the interpersonal world peopled by society and culture. Teeny sees a friend she knows and enjoys conversing with him. Boss agrees that the "mitwelt" is the primary world we live in; we are social *beings* (Rychlak, 1981).
If our Dasein can be affected by the intent of our ancestors, then our *thrownness* can be altered. This possibility extends our search for meaning and purpose because we can extend our fulfillment into the future so those who come after us will have a better life, and hence Binswanger's point of *being-able-to-be*. According to Binswanger, a person achieves greatest authenticity when he or she can actualize these possibilities. Conversely, if we live inauthentically when we are simply thrown into a situation and do nothing to improve on it, then we can leave less possibility for those who follow (Rychlak, 1981). This "unfreedom" to reach one's individual potential creates what Binswanger called existential guilt. Binswanger thought this was a good thing because, as a therapist, it alerted the person that something was wrong.

Boss said that we must think for ourselves and not be deceived by unwise traditions or commands from authoritative governments or any other force that hinders us from acting responsibly. Anyone who does something inhuman cannot say, "I was just following orders." Existentialism demands that a person exercise his humanness, and look forward to the next generation by making personal growth towards a better life. "It is in the future that we modify the past by which we are being thrown" (Rychlak, 1981, p. 637). According to Binswanger, the person denies freedom when the "Dasein no longer extends itself into the future, is no longer in advance of itself, but rather turns round in a narrow circle into which it is thrown in a meaningless, and that means futureless, fruitless, repetition about itself" (Binswanger, 1967, p.116).

*Motivation as Thrownness*

Motivation cannot be reduced to a certain part of the person, as instincts or libidos because the whole person comprises Dasein. *Thrownness* is the whole person or gestalt
being thrown into the present. Describing the psyche or the unconscious and their role in thrownness would be absurd to the existentialists. Energy is sometimes used to explain the putting forth of an effort to achieve an end. Boss thought that an emotion could affect one’s Dasein; he described this affect as “pitch.” For example, if Joan is in pain because she stubbed her toe, then she will relate to others differently than if she were not in pain (Rychlak, 1981).

Motivation, for Boss and Binswanger, is a person’s hopes and plans for the future. The hope, the possibility for something better in Dasein, motivates a person to transcend him or herself by learning and achieving more not only for oneself but also for others. It is like the roll of the dice; in one moment one could win a lot of money and change one’s Dasein. Even in the face of the negative odds, people persevere for the chance of changing their existence. Kent sees in the future the possibility of owning his own business. His Dasein then is filled with this planning, and Dasein is illuminated by the possibility. This creative ability is what distinguishes us from the animal kingdom. We can plan and hope to improve our future lot in life. Our very Dasein can be filled with more future planning than present living. What we want to be can be more powerful than what we are right now. Boss commented on future possibility by saying, “in reality, man exists always and only as the myriad of possibilities for relating to and disclosing the living beings and things he encounters” (Rychlak, 1981, p. 641).

While Sartre’s being-in-facticity ultimately created a world of unfairness because there was no choice in the condition of one’s thrownness, Binswanger and Boss as therapists, deal with mental illness as the aberration of thrownness and Dasein and neurosis. Their focus is helping the patient lead a normal and productive life so they look
at *thrownness*, Dasein, and facticity as clues to unravel a mystery and help the patient get well. Mental illness is created when the person's Dasein no longer freely relates to its own facticity. Or in other words, when Dasein becomes estranged from its own *thrownness*, it thus creates a "self-chosen unfreedom" (Binswanger, 1967). Boss declared that to recognize and accept the possibilities of one's own Dasein and literally lead them to facticity in a unique and free way is the very heart of authentic living (Rychlak, 1981).

It is in the concept of "continuity" that was see how Dasein creates and relates to its world. This deals with the necessary way in which language is expressed and shapes the world, the way space is structured meaningfully, and the way past, present, and future as such, are experienced. If the mentally ill person creates a world-design that is distorted, it is because, out of his own freedom, he created it, and it follows that the *thrownness* becomes a chosen unfreedom. “This paradox of self-chosen unfreedom, of surrender over to a world of one’s own structuring is what, for Binswanger, most essentially characterizes the psychotic” (Binswanger, 1967, p. 118).

The concept of continuity is pivotal, especially considering the fragmentation that is created by the act of thrownness. Moments need to be connected and Sartre connected them by being or consciousness. Sartre held that we couldn’t escape consciousness, that we are always conscious of something (Sartre, 1956). Therefore the past, present, and future are one continual whole by the continuity of consciousness. Sartre's definition of time underscores the organization of the moments into a structured wholeness. He defined time not as "an infinite series of 'nows' in which some are not yet and others are no longer—but rather as the structured moments of an original synthesis" (Sartre, 1956, p. 107). Binswanger puts continuity of Dasein on center stage in his therapy.
Binswanger thought that if a person chose inauthentically and created a world of non-freedom then constancy would be broken because the patient would not be connected to his true reality.

Binswanger’s view of *suddenness* is important in understanding the temporality of Dasein in *thrownness*. Everything that happens must happen suddenly, and therefore, any event has the potential of creating anxiety. Dasein can overcome this by subsuming all events under the condition of *always-having-been*. In this way time is brought to a “standstill.” This always-having-been forms a continuity that is tantamount to freedom, to existence, or to the formation of the authentic self, and to communication (without which authentic existence is not possible). The negation of continuity means unfreedom and being possessed by the *overpowering sudden*, which results in a loss of independence and a weakness in communication. Existence under these conditions means that *thrownness* is doomed to be isolated (Binswanger, 1953). According to Binswanger, the psychotic lives in a world of unfreedom.

If one’s Dasein or consciousness has constancy by living authentically, one can expect a similar Dasein in the present, or at least a confidence that one is capable of handling any *thrownness*, in a responsible manner. Habits of living authentically are formed, and so one does not have to rethink every choice, because one has chosen this similar alternative before. Hence, in *thrownness* one can have freedom of choice because one can choose how to act in the present if one is not reacting fearfully or without some kind of plan that is goal-oriented, and if one understands the tentativeness of *thrownness* (Sartre, 1953).
"Our freedom begins," according to Binswanger, "in the commitment of Dasein to its 'thrownness' " (Binswanger, 1967, p. 116). By accepting the thrownness, we can see it for what it is, and oppose it. It requires us to change the accepted ideas in the rigid past. This process of saying no to the thrownness that we are in and confronting it with the possibility of another reality will negate the thrownness. For example, if we project ourselves into the future and see our possibilities, and yet at the same time, have a responsible understanding of our own thrownness, we can succeed at transcending our past and the facticity of our thrownness. This commitment to transforming our Dasein and, in turn, our society, is demonstrated in the United States by making our laws more just, freeing the slaves, protecting children by more humane labor laws, and giving women the right to vote (Binswanger, 1967).

Boss explained that accepting the possibilities of one's own Dasein and then changing it to a new facticity of one's own choosing is living an authentic life. Too many people are afraid to change Dasein, and so they live out the lives that others have chosen for them; this is inauthenticity. In conclusion, Boss said that, "man's option to respond to this claim or to choose not to do so seems to be the very core of human freedom" (Rychlak, 1981, p. 642).

Conclusion

Binswanger and Boss accounted for motivation as the product of being thrown into the present, and thus being motivated to plan for the future in order to be more successful. The person is not divided into parts such as the psyche, libido, instincts, or physical body, but is only considered as a whole person. Binswanger and Boss connect
the future to the present by showing how the choices we make in the present not only change our future, but the future for succeeding generations. We have memory of our past, which connects us to the present, but in addition, Binswanger connects us to a pre-existent past with the concept of an a priori state in his world designs. Constancy for Binswanger is created by the always-having-been, which subsumes the conditionality of Dasein and connects all the moments into an integrated whole. The overpowering-sudden is overcome by the constancy of the always-having-been and strengthened by habit in living repetitively in the present.

Carl Gustav Jung

Carl Gustav Jung was born in 1875 and died in 1961. Binswanger and Boss both studied Jung; and Jung and Adler were close associates of Freud around the same time. Jung was an avid reader especially in philosophy, history and science, which perhaps accounts, in part, for his historical approach to humans. He chose medicine as a career mainly for practical reasons. His family was poor and medicine was a reliable profession. Jung went on to become a world authority on the psychology of the abnormal and the normal person (van der Post, 1975).

When Jung first became interested in Freud's writings he was planning an academic career and had finished a paper that would further advance his career. According to Jung, "Freud was definitely persona non grata in the academic world at that time, and any connection with him would have been damaging in scientific circles" (Jung, 1965, p. 148). Jung read Freud's Interpretation of Dreams in 1903 and he was amazed how compatible the book was to many of his own ideas. Jung later wrote a paper defending Freud's theories and was warned by some of his colleagues that this defense
would harm his academic standing. Jung began a friendship with Freud, and was
considered Freud’s heir apparent, until, in 1913, he broke away from Freud because their
theoretical paths were becoming too divergent. Three main concepts made their
professional relationship difficult: 1) Jung disagreed with Freud’s limited concept of the
libido as being a source of sexual energy. 2) Jung disagreed that all symbolism was
somehow sexual. 3) Jung disagreed with this imposed sexual interpretation. Jung was
also working on his theory of the collective unconscious, but Freud felt that this
controversial concept might endanger the acceptance of his sexual theory so he refused to
entertain the inclusion of the collective unconscious in his work (Rychlak, 1981).

Jung published his book, The Psychology of the Unconscious, and he felt that this
work cost him Freud’s friendship. The years from 1913 to 1917 were a very difficult
time for Jung. He was labeled a mystic, and his work considered “rubbish” by the
Freudians (Jung, 1965). Exiled by the Freudians just before the outbreak of World War I,
Jung undertook his own self-analysis. He said his only satisfactions during that period
came from the love and support of his wife and children (Rychlak, 1981).

Jung was not an existentialist. He was a teleological theorist, which meant that
humans were directed towards a purposive end for the sake of someone or something.
Jung believed that we are intentional by our very nature that we always intend something.
The mind or psyche is a framer of meaning since birth. It is an inherent, a priori,
fundamental quality of the psyche to express meaning and symbolize human existence.
He developed a very descriptive and complex theory of personality and created a system
of psychoanalysis that was unique. His theory of the psyche includes the collective
unconscious, which consists of the historical images of humans from the very beginning.
Jung’s emphasis is on the past, and how the collective unconscious discloses images that then have to be symbolized by the mind to enlarge our understanding of ourselves while living in the present. Jung described his construct of archetypes as “a priori categories of possible functioning.” These categories are inherited before birth and therefore are a priori within the person as a “possible but not necessary functioning a priori” (Rychlak, 1981, p. 194).

Motivation and Instinct

Jung’s motivational constructs rely upon derived instinctual energy from the mind and body. The mind takes the psychic energy of the libido in the form of value intensity or desire, which is actualized in the form of symbol formation, thinking, willing, etc. The body accounts for the physical energy, in the form of force and intensity that is actualized in the form of action formation, behaving, doing, etc. Instincts at first seem very mechanistic, but Jung’s interpretation is different. Always he says that life is an energy process directed towards completing a goal. Life is saturated in purposeful goals, in deep-rooted intentions that are always seeking to fulfill themselves. Energy is expended to achieve an intentional goal, which is brought to fruition both physically and in the psychic realm (Rychlak, 1981).

The implication of this action is that there is willful choice in bringing about a goal. Because Jung describes both the psychic energy and the physical energy as instincts, he moved away from the normal definition of instinct as unconscious awareness to a more open and changing view that was in revision for most of his life. Jung explains this “will” as an ego function in the personality and “instinct” as the direct opposite of the will. In other words, if the ego is involved, a process is not instinctive because instincts
behave automatically. But, evidently, there was an evolution of thought concerning instincts, and Jung includes the instinctive archetypes into the mind from the outset. Jung wrote:

Instinct is not an isolated thing, nor can it be isolated in practice. It always brings in its train archetypal contents of a spiritual nature, which are at once its foundation and its limitation. In other words, an instinct is always and inevitably coupled with something like a philosophy of life, however archaic, unclear, and hazy this may be. Instinct stimulates thought, and if a man does not think of his own free will, then you get the compulsive thinking, for the two poles of the psyche, the physiological and the mental, are indissolubly connected . . . . Not that the tie between mind and instinct is necessarily a harmonious one. On the contrary, it is full of conflict and means suffering (Rychlak, 1981, p. 197).

Later, in his book, The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, Jung says that, "Instincts are typical modes of action, and wherever we meet with uniform and regularly recurring modes of action and reaction we are dealing with instinct, no matter whether it is associated with a conscious motive or not" (Jung, 1960, p. 135). Instincts are not as simple for Jung as they are for Freud and the other theorists. Adler decided against using the instinct concept in his theories. Jung felt that we would never know about instincts because they have become convenient labels for organic and psychic factors that we do not understand. Jung disagreed with Freud’s conclusion that the sex instinct is the only motivational instinct. Jung insisted that there are other instincts, some of which are nutritive and species preserving (Rychlak, 1981).
Motivation from Libido and the Principle of Opposites

Jung created a mind-body dualism with his concept of the libido (psychic energy) as the mind’s form of energy and as physical energy for the body. He says:

The concept of libido which I have advanced has met with many misunderstandings and, in some quarters, complete repudiation…It is generally recognized truth that physical events can be looked at in two ways: from the mechanistic and from the energetic standpoint. The mechanistic view is purely causal; it conceives an event as the effect of a cause, in the sense that unchanging substances change their relations to one another according to fixed laws. The energetic point of view on the other hand is in essence final (telic); the event is traced back from effect to cause on the assumption that some kind of energy underlies the changes in phenomena, that it maintains itself as a constant throughout these changes and finally leads to entropy, a condition of general equilibrium (Jung, 1960, p. 2,3).

Jung said that the flow of goal-oriented energy follows a path that cannot be reversed. This energy is not like a substance moving in space. The concept is not founded on the substances themselves but rather on their relations (Jung, 1960). Jung described libido as the general tension in the energetic sense, an impulse for one to move toward valued goals. For example, if one values an activity such as swimming, the person has a high concentration of libido towards it. Libido is that organizing force in the psyche that makes complex formation a possibility. Libido organized the personality through the principle of opposites (Rychlak, 1981).
The principle of opposites is extremely important to Jung. It is central to his concept of motivation. Jung uses the term energy as another term for motivation as quoted in Rychlak:

I see in all that happens the play of opposites, and derive from this conception my idea of psychic energy. I hold that psychic energy involves the play of opposites in much the same way as physical energy involves a difference of potential, that is to say the existence of opposites such as warm and cold, high and low, etc. (1981, p. 198).

Jung thought that repression was a product of the psychic balancing of opposites. For every wish there is an opposite one to counter it. This is energizing because the psyche cannot be at rest. It is involved in the constant process of balancing everything from one end of the pole of opposites to the other, and everything that is in between. Since every good intention has a bad one, then some of these intentions will have to be repressed. Repression is a constant reality but is not the basic motivator as is the principle of opposites (Rychlak, 1981).

To explain how psychic energy is created, Jung borrowed from the physical sciences the principles of equivalence and entropy. The principle of constancy provided the foundation for equivalence and entropy because it explains the redistribution of energies in a closed system. The principle of constancy states that “the sum total of energy remains constant, and the principle of equivalence states that for a given quantity of energy expended or consumed in bringing about a certain condition, an equal quantity of the same or another form of energy will appear elsewhere” (Jung, 1960, p.18).

Entropy for Jung signified an equalization of differences in the psyche which would
vacillate more or less violently between the poles until a state of balance or homeostasis were reached. Thus if Teeny decides to buy a dress and her oppositional side says to save her money, there is energy created that goes against her first intention. Even though she decides not to buy the dress, the repressed desire to buy the dress turned loose free libido in her unconscious that still exists and can affect behavior in the future (Rychlak, 1981).

This is how complexes are formed; free libido can gather together (agglutinate) and create a complex. The more honest Teeny is about her desire to buy the dress, the less need she will have to repress the inconsistency in her thought and actions and thereby the less libido is released to cause negative behavior later on. Entropy is the principle that helps the psyche return to homeostasis.

*Time and Synchronicity*

Although Jung’s theory of time, synchronicity, was mentioned, and alluded to in his writings, he postponed working it out on paper for many years. It was not clear in his mind whether the cause-effect principle that demands a linear time construct could account for all human phenomena, for example, extrasensory perception, telepathy, and clairvoyance. Only after the coaxing of many of his followers did Jung work out his theory of time on paper. In his words, “Synchronicity therefore means the simultaneous occurrence of a certain psychic state with one or more external events which appear meaningful parallels to the momentary subjective state—and, in certain cases, vice versa” (Jung, 1960, p. 441). The two examples he gave are different in their simultaneity, but still fulfill his definition.

Jung reports, “A young woman I was treating had, at a critical moment, a dream in which she was given a golden scarab. While she was telling me this dream I sat with
my back to the closed window. Suddenly, I heard a noise behind me, like a gentle tapping. I turned round and saw a flying insect knocking against the windowpane from outside. I opened the window and caught the creature in the air as it flew in. It was the nearest analogy to a golden scarab that one finds in our latitudes” (Jung, 1960, p. 438).

The second example happened to the wife of one of his patients. Jung said, “He told me that at the deaths of her mother and grandmother, a number of birds gathered outside the window of the death-chamber. When he was finished with his therapy, I noticed a few symptoms that may be related to heart disease, so I sent him to a specialist who told him that his heart was just fine. On his way home from the doctor’s office, he collapsed in the street. They took him home in a grievous state and his wife was already deeply disturbed because soon after her husband had gone to the doctor, a whole flock of birds landed on their home, and she feared the worst. Her husband died” (Jung, 1960, p. 438). In the example of the scarab the simultaneity is immediately obvious (Jung noted that this was an important event in the patient’s therapy because she was resisting change and this symbol was one of rebirth.). In the bird example, the simultaneity was not at the same time, but was very important in signaling the death of the husband. The birds likewise have archetypical meaning because they are associated with dead souls in Babylonian and ancient Egyptian records. These along with many other examples and a controlled study in astrology led Jung to develop this time theory.

Conclusion

Jung as a teleological theorist believed that humankind was directed toward a goal for the sake of someone or something. The psyche is a framer of meaning since birth. It is an inherent quality of humankind to seek for meaning and symbolize human existence.
Motivational constructs are derived from instinctual energy from the mind and body, and from the role of opposites. Instincts are manifested in the psyche in the form of desire, and in the body as behavior. Psyche and body work together in an energetic process that is saturated with purposeful goals. Jung’s play of opposites is central to psychic motivation. Jung explains the flow and stabilization (homeostasis) of oppositional energy in terms of entropy, equivalence, and constancy. Jung brought temporal depth to the “present” with his construct of the “collective unconscious.” Jung thought that human action could not be explained simply by what happened since birth. Somehow, stored as images in the unconscious, is our past from the beginning of human history. This is evidenced by a rich collection of myths and archetypes that were thematically and symbolically similar throughout the world’s cultural history. Jung explored synchronistic time because linear time, seemingly, could not account for all human phenomena.

Alfred Adler

Alfred Adler (1870-1937), a contemporary of Jung and also once an fallen heir-apparent to Freud, created a goal intensive “life style” that emphasized the future as the guiding force in a person’s life. He was born in Vienna, the son of Hungarian Jewish parents. He felt the Jewish community to be isolating, so as an adult he turned to Christianity. He came from a family of six children, and he was the second son and third child. He did not have good health as an infant, because of rickets, and he didn’t walk until he was four years old. He almost died of pneumonia in his fourth year and at that time he vowed he would be a doctor—a promise he kept. He did not have a close relationship with his older brother and because of this, and other factors, he said that his childhood was not particularly happy. He was very competitive and gregarious, and
wanted to excel and prove himself. He had a close relationship with his other siblings. He had a special bond with father and spent a good deal of time with him (Bottome, 1957).

While at the University of Vienna Medical School, he met and later married Raissa Timofeyewna Epstein. She was a Russian intellectual who was politically active, and together they had three daughters and one son. Their divergent cultural and political background complicated their marriage, but during the latter part of their lives, they were very close. Adler promoted the equality of women (Selesnick, 1966).

Adler was invited by Freud to join in the Wednesday night discussion group, which was to become the first psychoanalytic society. Adler was eloquent and well versed in German philosophy, the Bible, Shakespeare and Greek tragedies. He was gregarious and engaging and held his own in this esteemed group. Adler was a physician but he had not studied psychiatry. Adler and Freud differed on the emphasis Freud placed on the importance of the sexual instinct. The “Oedipal Complex” was something that Adler could not accept. Adler worked on the construct of “organ inferiority,” and the “aggressive drive” with Freud, but, increasingly, he was moving away from drive and instinct theory toward a self-determining construct of human behavior. By 1911, these and other differences culminated in Adler’s abrupt departure from Freud's first psychoanalytic group. Nine other members followed Adler, and they started their own society (Selesnick, 1966).

After serving in World War I as a doctor, Adler came home a changed man. He was dedicated to the concept of social interest among human beings. Adler believed that, “Human beings must fulfill the potential that evolution was nurturing within their very
bosoms and cultivate a sense of responsibility and care for their fellow human beings” (Rychlak, 1981, p.125). Evolution took on the status of a fact rather than a mere theory, and seemed more like a religion than a man-made construct. Some of Adler’s notable constructs are the inferiority complex, the aggressive drive, masculine protest, birth order, organ inferiority and psychical compensation, female equality, adult education, and group therapy (Bottome, 1981).

Law of Movement

Adler saw the human being as a unity of body and mind. Like the existentialists, Adler celebrated the wholeness and uniqueness of each human being, and from these roots, his basic concept of “individual psychology” was created. The “law of movement” unites the mind and body. Adler said, “All moving beings, however, can foresee and reckon up the direction in which to move; and this fact makes it necessary to postulate that they have souls...This foreseeing the direction of movement is the central principle of the mind” (Adler, 1931, p. 26). Thus the anticipation of the direction of the movement has to be the central principle of the mind and the defining features of human beings. Adler’s psyche, or mind, is couched in functional terms, as a locus of movement or action that is acted out in the context of interpersonal relations, or strategizing for achieving or getting more than someone else. “All our strivings,” says Adler, “are directed towards a position in which a feeling of security has been achieved, a feeling that all the difficulties of life have been overcome and that we have emerged finally, in relation to the whole situation around us, safe and victorious” (Adler, 1931, p. 27). The mind is compelled, goal directed, to be secure and safe and, likewise, the body acts in the same goal directed manner. Mind and body are in a partnership for the same goal. They
are one in purpose and action. Movements are always movements toward goals or ends (Adler, 1931).

Although Adler does not use existentialist terminology, his law of movement has some similarities to thrownness; it has urgency because it must move; it is goal-directed; it is in competition with others, compelled to strategize to get more than someone else, so that a feeling of security can be achieved. The law of movement has the similar motion, the same goal-directed urgency to achieve security and balance, as thrownness.

**Individual Psychology**

Adler defined individual psychology as follows: “...I have called [my approach] comparative individual psychology. By starting with the assumption of the unity of the individual, an attempt is made to obtain a picture of this unified personality regarded as a variant of individual life-manifestations and forms of expression. The individual traits are then compared with one another, brought into a common plane, and finally fused together to form a composite portrait that is, in turn, individualized” (Rychlak, 1981, p. 131).

The traits of the individual are not inherited, but are created by the person in the process of living out the successes and consequences of the strategies inherent in the prototype or the "complete goal" of the life style (Adler, 1931, p. 59). Adler believed that people do not desire “sameness.” People desire individual significance, which means they need to be unique. Each individual is whole and different from any other individual. There are similarities, but when the totality of factors is considered, each individual is uniquely different from others (Adler, 1931).
Adler said that the role of individual psychology is to educate and train the individual to understand the developmental process toward accepting the responsibility of social interest or "a man should love his neighbor" (Bottome, 1957, p. 21). Adler not only educated the child, but also the parents and teachers. He felt that teachers should be sensitive to the individual differences of each child, and recognize what methods of teaching should be directed toward that individual child. Adler was a strong advocate for "adult education." He spent a tremendous amount of time teaching parents, teachers and the students, in his fortnightly evening meeting associated with his "child guidance centers" in Vienna. Those child guidance clinics were associated with 30 schools with children between the ages of four and fourteen and were started in 1921 and closed by the government in 1934. Any child in those school districts who was having problems could go to the clinic and receive help from the mostly Adlerian-trained therapists. Juvenile Delinquency noticeably dropped in those Vienna schools where the child guidance clinics were in effect (Bottome, 1957).

**Goals, Prototype, and Style of Life**

Living is goal-oriented, and the psyche's function is a teleological process moving with purpose and intention. How does Adler account for these individualized intentions? Social interest, for Adler, is inherent in the human being; it is a product of organic evolution. Social interest is in each individual, and comes to life and becomes productive through the creative power of the child. It must be developed by the child while living in the flow of life with all its social contexts. The goal of perfection is part of social interest, innate but needing to be developed. Striving for perfection is the doorway that
leads to the ideal of social interest that all human beings are ultimately designed to fulfill through their evolutionary inheritance (Adler, 1931).

Adler uses accepted evolutionary theory to incorporate innate moral values into human beings. It seems that Adler, through his life's experiences, understood that humans were, and had to be, capable of higher principles of human conduct than accepted evolutionary theory would dictate. Belief in God, and humans as the children of God, would not be accepted in scientific circles; Adler put religious values into evolutionary theory, which no one seemed to question.

Adler's construct of the prototype is how he explains why a person is motivated to act in a particular way. The prototype is developed by the individual as a strategy for adapting and getting the most out of life. Between the ages of about three and five, the child assesses his particular life and conditions surrounding it, and creates a prototype of a plan of action or style of life. This plan is rarely understood fully in the conscious mind. It is also in the unconscious in the form of goal and a strategy for achieving that goal. Adler extends this prototype and style of life as the child's permanent goal and strategy. Everything that a person will do for the rest of his or her life will be for the sake of that original style of life. This is not to say that there cannot be confusion in interpreting the style of life and in carrying it out. Hence the need for therapists to aid the client to understand the style of life, the strategy and resultant law of movement to carry it out and, lastly, to help the client recognize whether the strategy is appropriate for achieving the goals toward which their style of life is motivated (Adler, 1931).

The style of life is intrinsically full of meaning. Adler claimed that we do not experience pure circumstances; instead, "We experience reality always through the
meaning we give it—not in itself, but as something interpreted” (Adler, 1931, P. 3). No one is entitled to the absolute meaning of life because, for Adler, all meanings are on a continuum between two poles. We as a people can decide on the better or worse meanings, but Adler says, "true" means true for humans, true for the purposes and aims of human beings. There is no other truth than this; and if another truth existed, it could never concern us; we could never know it; it would be meaningless” (Adler, 1931, p. 4).

The family, and especially the mother during the early years of her child, is extremely important in loving and providing a secure environment for the child so that he or she can create his or her individual prototype, or life style, that will endure throughout his or her lifetime. The importance of the mothering role and the family could not be overestimated for Adler. The child should be educated with the idea of bettering the community rather than pursuing his or her own private successes and pleasures (Bottome, 1957). Adler lamented how, in his time, the so-called intellectuals had diminished the role of the mother. Adler believed that each generation should leave a gift of an improved society to the next generation. The only thing that can stop this evolutionary thrust is the breakdown of the family (Adler, 1964).

Adler is the only one of the theorists reviewed here who puts the family at center stage in his theoretical work and in the success of his therapy. It was evident in the work of Binswanger, Boss and Jung that the love and support that a child received in the early stages of life was extremely important in the child’s growing up to be a mature adult, but it was not a basic tenet in their theoretical work. Adler also delivers a warning to all those who do not uphold the strength of the family.
Conclusion

Adler created the theory of "Individual Psychology," which united the body and mind as a whole and considered each human being unique. Life is goal-directed and the psyche is always moving with purpose and intention. Adler's law of movement stated that foreseeing the direction of movement is the major principle of the mind. And thus the anticipation and importance of this movement is very similar to thrownness. The mind and body acting as one are compelled to be goal-directed and to find security. Although, Adler said that the traits of the individual are not inherited, but are created by the person in the process of living, he did believe in drives such as desire for perfection, for personal uniqueness, and social interest. Adler's Individual Psychology was a "common sense" approach and its role was to educate and train the individual to accept the responsibility of social interest. He was concerned how his theories could be the most useful to the general public and not to just a few in private practice.
Chapter 3

Reflections on the Five Theorists and My Time Experience

The theorists were constant and determined in unraveling the mysteries of human existence. There seemed to be no retirement or pause in their quest; they continued thinking and pondering the mystery of humans to the end of their lives. The theorists are diverse in their approach, but have some important similarities, which provide a common foundation for discussion. They all believed that human beings are intentional and goal seeking. They all generally accepted the Darwinian view of evolution, and, except for Sartre, they all believed in God in some form although their belief was of a personal nature and is not found in their theoretical arguments. They were all supportive of the uniqueness of the individual and the power each person has to make a difference. All believed, that for the most part, humans are agentic and responsible for their choices.

I have briefly described their major similarities so that I could understand the foundation of their thoughts and then compare my own experience to their accounts. There are some important factors that make my experience with time difficult to explain in the theoretical terms offered by these theorists. First, I am a woman, English speaking, and an American. I was older in starting my formal studies. In terms of natural scholarship, they all excelled, and I struggle in comparison. I am very curious about human behavior, but from a woman’s vantage point. But the most fundamental difference is my faith in the gospel of Jesus Christ and the knowledge I have of the truth that is contained therein. Though these truths cannot be empirically proven, they are the foundation for all of my thoughts about the meaning and purpose of life and human capabilities. No one can prove the existence or non-existence of God, so my assumption is no less sound than that of the
other theorists. Each theorist must choose his own or her miraculous explanation for the how and why of human existence. I believe my choice is superior because, according to my LDS faith, I have the advantage of God's words given through his prophets to lead and direct my learning, and personal revelation to understand God's teachings about the true nature of human beings.

It is my contention that our thought about the creation of humans makes all the difference in any explanation of understanding of behavior, and ultimately directs all our critical theorizing. The five theorists chose evolutionary theory as their foundational starting point for the creation of humans and all of them solved their theoretical problems without referring to or giving credit to God. Belief in God, was a personal issue, which they chose not to include in their theoretical constructs. Science had predominance in their rational world, and religion was relegated to the mystical world where nothing can be verified, and, therefore, is not to be considered seriously by rational human beings. But if their assumption about humanity's chance evolutionary beginning is incorrect, then their theories are based on a faulty foundation, which cannot be overcome, by wit, wisdom, or creativity. They can describe what they observe and organize their observations into thoughtful patterns, and they can arrive at moments of truth and understanding, but the theory cannot be whole and complete. If the theories do not describe how things really are, then they create confusion in our understanding of ourselves. Developing a theory is serious business because it can persuade humans to believe falsity rather than truth.
But if there is no God— no source of truth, then humans are compelled to analyze their own existence and to attempt to discover the regularities of the natural world, and in view of those regularities, attempt to make life better for themselves. Human wisdom and science have free rein in a godless world, or a world where God does not interfere. But if God does exist, then there are serious consequences (even intellectual ones) for denying him.

In regards to the five theorists, all but Sartre believed in God in some way. Jung and Adler felt a close connection and mentioned it in their personal discourse. Binswanger and Boss believed in a spirit, an I-Thou relationship, and in general, supported the religion of their patients. In accepted intellectual and scientific discourse, God is not an appropriate subject of discourse and so scholars have to separate the secular and the religious world. This appears to be a fair solution to the problem for the protection of scientific rigor and personal belief. But reality can be misinterpreted when scientists agree that belief in God should not be considered in the argument, because if God does exist, then the scientists are in error about the foundation of human existence.

The Five Theorists

Jean-Paul-Sartre

In response to Sartre's argument about God's non-existence, I would counter that God's existence is still in question because it cannot be proven either way by rational analysis, or commonly accepted kinds of empirical experience. If God does exists then to ignore God is to close the door to all the possibilities that God opens to us: our potential as children of God, communication through prayer, divine intervention, knowledge and assurance of God's love for all his children, ultimate justice for all, etc. Sartre's person is
the creator of everything. We come into the world for the very first time and immediately seem to have a driving force to find meaning and purpose. Sartre never explains how or why. Sartre's person, in my view, is incapable of doing alone all that it required in the process of living. The task of living is substantial; we have to figure out the way the world works and how we fit into it, plus we have the pressure of living in the precarious present which is extremely tenuous and we have to secure the physical necessities of food and shelter and a social existence in an competitive world, and then we have to imbue our lives with meaning all in the present moment. I do not think it is possible, in our present moments as humans, that we can start from nothing and be capable of doing all that is required for human living—alone. The concept of linear time, sequential moments, and past, present and future simply cannot tie human beings together as a whole entity without a power outside of them.

Sartre's consciousness cannot maintain a chance, random world containing billions of people. George Berkeley (1685-1753), an Irish churchman and an idealist philosopher thought deeply about God's necessity in relation to the world. Berkley believed, in effect, that all that is real is our perception of reality. "The chair exists because I am perceiving it," declared Berkeley and further, "If I leave the room the chair continues to exist because God is perceiving it. God perceives everything including our perceiving minds and thus assures their existence" (Osborne, 1992, p. 84). I think Berkeley was right to conclude that God is essential to maintain this world every moment of its existence. The laws of physics concur that disorder is the norm and something must be keeping this world in order. The second law of thermodynamics states that everything runs down, which means that any kind of order is unlikely and happens only
by chance happenings. Lyle Watson, an English biologist, wrote, "Left to itself, everything tends to become more and more disorderly, until the final and natural state of things is a completely random distribution of matter" (Nibley, 1992, p. 2). Human beings, in my view, could not come into being from nothing and be capable of developing themselves in relationship to the rest of humankind with no help from any other source.

Sartre's sense of the integrity of being required that one could in some sense recognize the whole of existence in a present moment in order to respond to it authentically. According to Sartre, this is what the for-itself is able to do; it detaches and becomes nothing so it can appraise the wholeness of the present, which includes the past and the future. If one were totally absorbed in the moment, it would be impossible to consider the whole of life, which the past and future offer. One could argue that Sartre had to devise this somewhat arcane version of existence because he had no place in his theory for a creator. According to Sartre's unfolding logic, if God is not the creator (of essence), then humans become the creators and receive all the credit whether good or bad. Human beings (existence) take center stage, and God fades into the shadows, leaving us with an absurd, potentially cruel and irredeemable world. And yet there is honesty in Sartre, in that, as he followed his line of logic that dethroned human rationality and dead-ended in a hopeless condition, he did not turn aside his conclusions and create another ending. But I think he felt he had found an escape route for humankind in Marxism, because it offered a philosophy of action that one could lose oneself and forget life's unforgiving predicament of freedom. Noble causes such as that, presumably offered by Marxism, also engage the for-itself in a reality greater than it and beyond its
own creation, thus allowing the for-itself to act within that noble cause and forget its freedom and act authentically at least for a brief time. This giving up freedom and adhering to Marxism is an example of Sartre's disillusionment regarding humankind hope for personal authenticity, which he recommended, perhaps, for some level of peace or lack of continual conflict. It is ironic that Sartre would give up personal creation, the foundation of man's responsibility, for Marxism that denied personal freedom. Sartre said, "People who refuse their own freedom, who hide the truth from themselves, who live a bourgeois life, show bad faith" (Osborne, 1992, p. 159).

Sartre's explanation of time directed my thinking towards the wholeness of time instead of viewing it as the product of separate dimensions of past, present and future. Sartre simply stated that, "these dimensions form an infinite series of 'nows' in which some are not yet and others are no longer; the future is not yet; as for the instantaneous present, everyone knows that this does not exist at all but is the limit of an infinite division, like a point without a dimension" (Sartre, 1956, p. 107). Sartre's description of time has a deep sense of continuity to it as if, at some level, he understood the wholeness of time. My own opinion is that this aspect of Sartre's understanding arises from the fact that Sartre, as a human being lived in a spiritual as well as a physical sphere and therefore, had some level of faith in God. Humans who live only in the present moment cannot create an eternal continuum of time; only God can create eternity.

Sartre was not concerned about securing the theoretical underpinnings of his system of ideas. Some have noted the "grossly metaphorical character of many of his leading ideas;" and that Sartre makes little effort to defend his theoretical work (Olafson, 1967, p. 293).
Sartre's work was relevant for my understanding of my time experience because it provides a very clear description of human existence without a spiritual counterpoint to the temporal world and without God, thus offering a sort of oppositional analysis to my own theory. Sartre's strength is in describing the plight of the modern person in a meaningless world. His concluded that humankind is in a hopeless predicament with no way out except to be honest about their existence. Hence humans live in a personally responsible world where inhumanity, one toward another, is nevertheless an existential fact. Sartre's dismal conclusion reaffirms my argument that we do need God in order to have meaning and goal-intending direction.

Without using the term, Sartre amplifies the construct of *thrownness* in a way that intensifies my understanding of traveling into the tentative, unknown present. However, Sartre's concept of a human being, isolated and alone in one's own facticity, condemned to be free and utterly unprepared to face this freedom, is not the same as my vision of the possibility of a human being as he or she is being *thrown*. Sartre's *thrownness* conjures up a picture of humanity that depends totally on the capacity of each human being to arrive at solutions to his or her own life and live authentically, while realizing all the time that the task is ultimately impossible. My time experience substantiated my whole *being*, both physical and spiritual, going into the next moment. I never felt alone in the "thrownness." There was uncertainty about what would happen next, but I always felt a part of a larger existence. It was a knowing that I did not totally comprehend, but I knew that I was not alone, and I knew I had the responsibility to choose what I was going to do in that moment. The choice was colored with fear, and dread, but also hopefulness and opportunity.
Sartre's *being-for-itself* is in a constant struggle to be the subject and not the object in relation with other beings. I know that I have felt a struggle to control my situation by maneuvering myself as the subject, but I also recognize that it is not a constant pattern with me, as Sartre claimed it must be. More often, I am at peace with the natural unfolding of my interactions with others. I was not afraid of others making me an object during my time experience. I was aware of the possibility, but I was aware of my personal capacity to maintain myself. There can be more than one subject in a personal interaction. Having both a spiritual and physical embodiment provided more strength and steadiness in my *being*.

I cannot comprehend *nothingness* as Sartre described it. I have only experienced consciousness or awareness that I am existing. My consciousness or my *being* seems clearly to be forever, so I can never be without awareness of my existence. My consciousness is not dependent on being conscious of the *being-in-itself*, as Sartre claims. Sartre claims that humans have the responsibility for creating the world continually; without humans as the creators, there would not be a world, according to Sartre. In my time experience, I was a part of this world, but I was moving through time. The world was already in existence for me to move through it. I only created or added to the environment of the world by the choices that I made.

We are not condemned to be free as Sartre claims. In my time experience, I felt the power of having the right to choose. Yes, it carried with it condemnation if I chose unwisely, but it also made living meaningful and joyous. Without freedom there is no personal life because one would only be the extension of someone or something else.
Sartre's description of the godless, spiritless human, from my perspective, was missing something because my experience of being did not resonate with Sartre's philosophy. My experience of present in the moment was very different from Sartre's. His description of a world that is created by humans, a sometimes noble, selfish, isolated, unhappy, frightening and without hope of eternal justice, is foreign to me. Sartre is right when he says that, for him, a human being lives in a hopeless world.

*Ludwig Binswanger and Medard Boss*

Sartre, Binswanger and Boss have concept that can be generally described as *thrownness*. Motivation for Binswanger and Boss is created by *thrownness*. The very act of going into the unknown continually creates in one the desire to prepare for the best possible outcome. The development of strategies to optimize *thrownness* to work for some meaningful advantage is foundational in Binswanger and Boss’s therapeutic work and to Sartre’s notion of authenticity.

Binswanger and Boss imbued existentialism with a morality to the effect that states that a human being has the responsibility to live according to the highest in human understanding (authenticity), not only for the present moment, but for all humans that follow afterward. Binswanger thought that the world-designs and related assumptions that had been worked out by one's ancestors could be found now in one's own Dasein. This concept meant that being authentic in one's own *thrownness* could not only make a difference in one's life now, but could also make a difference in future generations.

Constancy in Binswanger's work is also very important; he seems to understand that there has to be a powerful force to hold the fragments of lived moments in a meaningful whole while facing the overpowering Sudden. The *always-having-been* is
Binswanger’s construct for stabilizing the overpowering Sudden, to provide assurance in thrownness. For Binswanger, Dasein or consciousness is the glue that strings all the moments together in a meaningful whole. Binswanger's sense for continuity is very powerful and his description of the overpowering Sudden reaffirms my own feelings of experiencing the tenuousness of the present. Thrownness is not an easy thing to face, and without continuity as Binswanger explains, it would leave one isolated and beyond consolation. No ontological explanation is given about the nature or origins of always-having-been or the same of the overpowering Sudden.

Binswanger's suddenness describes so vividly the possibility of terror in Dasein because of the tentativeness of "thrownness." Binswanger describes the condition of always-having-been as that part of a person, which enabled one to subsume the conditionality of Dasein. Always-having-been is the foundational block for my view of thrownness. If we did not deeply understand that we have-always-been (pre-mortal existence), I believe the overpowering Sudden would consume us. My terminology is a deep knowing that we have always existed and that we will continue to exist and that is what keeps us from being over-whelmed in this tentative world.

For Binswanger, if constancy is strung together by consciousness and strengthened by authentic habits, then there is power in consciousness or Dasein to overcome the anxiety of thrownness. The absorbing nature of thrownness constitutes a tremendous load for consciousness to integrate. It is unrealistic to think that all this can take place in each human being beginning from scratch and have it work the first and thereafter. It in my view it would take so much more; it is beyond human comprehension. In my judgment, constancy and Binswanger's continuity as always-
having-been, which are similar terms, could not be created by humans but could only reside in an eternal nature. But how does Binswanger explain continuity? Binswanger offers no scientific explanation that I could find; continuity is an assumption that Binswanger believed is essential if thrownness is to turn to authenticity.

I believe that Binswanger and Boss were on the right track with the concept of world-designs and going into the next moment as a whole person, but thrownness is a lonely concept in existential explanations. As I was moving into the next moment as a whole person which meant I had all my past within me as well as hope of things for the future, so I never felt alone; God was always a part of my being. There was always a deep knowing of who I am with a deep sense of purpose in my living. In my consciousness, there was not a pure line of thought because there were deceptions, doubts, and fears about my failures in the past, successes in the present and also of my dreams of the future. The panorama of life was all moving fast, and I had to focus so a passing distraction would not divert me. Sometimes the distractions were a relief because they sidetracked me from the responsibility of living in that present moment. Choice was a blessing and a curse, and on that, Sartre, Binswanger and Boss would all agree.

In my time experience, we both endow and experience existence disclosing itself to our illuminated awareness. Professor Daniel N. Robinson, in a forum lecture at BYU, said that the most important thing that humans do is select what they want to attend to. Human beings have a tremendous amount of sensory stimuli available to them at any given moment and they must select which ones they want to give their attention to. The perceiving of an object or person is the simple part; more important, is how the individual mind interprets and lends meaning to the perception.
I agree with Binswanger and Boss that there is a moral connection between us and our ancestors and our posterity. We are all part of the human family as children of God and we are connected not only in this world but also in the pre-existence. In my time experience, I felt connected to others. I felt compassion and concern for their condition. I was not doing things that just served my own ends, because there was no joy in that. We are all in the same human condition.

Binswanger and Boss's work crystallized for me the act of being *thrown* as a motivational drive for future *thrownness*. They assume the concept of universal Care is to ensure a hope for a more positive future. In my experience, God and His love for us, was the constant force holding our existence together and providing the incentive to make a loving difference in the world.

*Carl Gustav Jung*

Jung was searching for the something beyond himself that provoked humans to be intentional framers of meaning, and to symbolize their existence. Jung listened and responded to his dreams and intuitive experiences to guide him along his investigative path. Jung was willing to go beyond the accepted scientific structures of his time to pursue further clarification. Jung developed a very complex theory, which included the collective unconscious to account for our a priori knowledge, and for inspiration that comes throughout life. Jung was one of a very few theorists to seriously investigate incidents of extra-sensory perception. Jung told his friend and associate Laurens van der Post that:

I was often amazed to the point of despair at the presumption of the organized knowledge and discipline of my day and their common attitude of all-
knowingness which I encountered everywhere among men in command of religious, scientific, and philosophic heights. I was enraged by their lack of just ordinary, natural, healthy curiosity in what they did not know and their instant dismissal as irrelevant, superstitious, or mystical rubbish of what seemed to me pointers towards increased knowledge and new areas for investigation (van der Post, 1975 p. 102).

Jung's libido or psychic energy is derived from the play of opposites. If the psyche is compelled to seek the opposite extreme and then balance this through the process of constancy, equalization, and entropy, then there is constant motion to come to balance over and over again. This oppositional process ensures constant motion. For Jung nothing in nature is static. This was near to what I experienced. I felt this constant motion in the present moment, but I did not clarify it in terms of opposites seeking homeostasis or equilibrium. I was so absorbed in the movement of everything. Nothing was static and simple. Everyone's thoughts were bouncing off me and my thoughts were responding to theirs, and then there were events that I was watching that I had no control over, but had an effect on my physical and emotional being. The idea that there was no opportunity for "pause" struck me poignantly. There is ever-constant movement. I knew that I was trying to come into a more balanced state. It was absolutely necessary that I find resolution because there was so much ahead of me that I would soon be facing. Sometimes the muddle that I created would distort the perception and then resolution was just an act of picking rather than weighing the alternatives. Although in my experience when everything was going so fast, I do not remember the oppositional dialogue. In everyday existence, I am keenly aware of this process.
Jung's concept of opposites was helpful in understanding my desire to slow and steady "thrownness." Jung believed that repression was a product of the psyche's oppositional behavior. For any intention, there was an immediate opposite intention. Potential energy is allocated for either intention or wish. If one chooses the good wish to help a friend instead of going to the movies, there is still free libido (psychic energy) from the desire to go to the movies which has potential for directing behavior later on (Rychlak, 1981). It stands to reason that if one tried to slow down existence in order to make it less complex, one could reduce the amount of aimless libido affecting the unconscious. In my experience, I felt that I could have more control of my life, if I stayed with the tried and true instead of venturing out into the unknown.

The concept of linear time cannot explain my time experience. My time experience lasted only a few seconds at the most. In those moments I did not have the sensation of time passing. It was as if time was not moving, although there was motion in every other respect. Time was more like a place. Everything was happening and there was time for everything and yet time did not pass. Urgency and yet calm, motion, yet timelessness. A concentration of layers of meanings, thoughts and feelings suspended in those quiet, active filled moments. And when it was over, I was different. I did not see life in the same way.

In my time experience, as I have mentioned before, I was feeling what others felt and, in that instant, I also knew what I felt in comparison. My moral values and my knowledge were all integrated as one. It was a condition of unity in all that I thought and did until a new moment opened up new uncertainties that needed to be resolved with my total being. My cognitive or rational abilities clarified and catalogued my experiential
memory, but it was my emotions that moved me to action. It was as Thomas Hume (1711-1776), the famous Scottish philosopher said that, “It is not reason that determines what we and do. It is our sentiments” (Gaarder, 1996, p. 279). For example, if someone offered me some chocolate that I knew was not healthy for me, but tasted good, I may alter my original resolve and eat it. My hope is that my moral values, my divine nature as a child of God will be the guiding force in choosing my direction, but often the pleasures of the temporal world weaken my resolve, and I choose chocolate instead.

*Alfred Adler*

Adler invoked morality is his "Individual Psychology," which set him apart from the rest of the theorists. Adler’s psychology demanded more from its followers than mere intellectual knowledge. In order to be a teacher or therapist, one had to adopt the basic tenet of *social interest* and be a living example of "loving thy neighbor." The German word for *social interest* is Gemeinschaftgefuehl, which conveys more meaning; it embraces the idea of relatedness, which extends not only to one’s own community, but also to the world community and to the whole of life. It means that a human being belongs to a unity of existence and never stands alone in the universe. This higher order of living demanded by *social interest* was a difficult life change. Also, Individual Psychology was not burdened with psychological jargon or complex concepts. One did not have to become a doctor to practice it. The training was not difficult, but the execution of the therapy was more like an art form, than a specific technique. Each individual with his or her specific talents and abilities could incorporate Adler’s straightforward concepts into his or her unique personality. One of the most important aspects of the therapy was putting the client at ease and setting up an environment of
equality and cooperation. Adler was a genius at practicing his own theory and was a
tireless teacher and innovator throughout his life (Way, 1950).

Adler's optimism about the potentiality of human beings is epitomized in his work
with his "child guidance clinics" which he introduced into the Vienna public school
system. He not only worked with the children in the guidance clinics, but in the evening
he would have large meetings to council with both children and parents explaining his
therapies. This was not a money making concern for Adler, nor it was it generally
accepted by the medical community. Adler imbued his theories with sacrifice and service
for the welfare of others. Evolutionary principles support a hedonistic human being and
cannot account for this kind of behavior. Adler did impose his altruism in his view of
evolution, but his moral human being was not generally accepted. The prevailing current
view in psychology is that human beings act only in self-interest.

Adler chose a moral value of social interest as a foundational motivator in
Individual Psychology. I believe Adler understood that reason does not move one to
action, but emotional conviction does. Adler wanted to motivate people through virtue.
Adler pointed out that truth or reality is the "spiritual victory over egocentricity"
(Bottome, 1957, p. 22). Adler embraced this moral truth and distanced himself from the
scientific community because morality was not empirical and furthermore, his theories
were very simple. His medical peers complained that anyone could teach his principles
and felt that their professional careers were threatened by Adler's change of direction.
The object of his moral-directed therapy was to gain insight about his patient's style of
life and direct them towards caring for others and adapting their strategy to fit their style

Adler's law of movement stated that the foreseeing the direction of movement is
the major principle of the mind. And thus the anticipation and importance of this movement is very similar to “thrownness.” The mind and body acting as one are compelled to be goal-directed. I was a whole being moving into the time experience.

Adler recognized the importance for human beings to feel secure. Adler said, "All our striving are directed towards a position in which a feeling of security has been achieved, a feeling that all the difficulties of life have been overcome and that we have emerged finally, in relation to the whole situation around us, safe and victorious" (Adler. 1931, p. 27). In my time experience I was continually reminded that the temporal world was a fragile place and at any moment we could suffer or die. The tenuousness of this life was a powerful realization and was the major factor in the development of our strategies. Humankind strives continually toward being safe and secure.

Adler's concept of the prototype was what motivated human beings to act in a particular way. I felt that my spirit, the inner core of my being, was directing me in much the same way. The achievement of Adler's prototype or style of life depended also on the support and love of the family and community. Adler's theories were action oriented towards being involved by example and in direct behavior. In my experience I felt a deep sense of gratitude for those who had nurtured and helped me. Adler, more than the other theorists, struck a resonant chord in my being because he was so committed to his patients in improving their daily lives. The deep understanding of loving one another is what Adler seem to motivated by, and in my experience, the love of God and the desire to be like Him, was my strongest motivation.
Chapter 4

The Influence of the Doctrines of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on Perceptions of the Phenomenon of Time

The theorists reviewed for this thesis were helpful in clarifying certain aspects of the experience of time. But there are still some aspects of the problems entailed in thinking of time as a linear succession of moments that were not addressed. Some of these aspects I have arrived at because of the nature of my own experience of time mentioned earlier. Key to this experience and to understanding the phenomenon of time are certain core beliefs about the nature of God, the nature of human beings, and then the nature of the mortal experience itself. When one “takes on” the assumptions of the restored Gospel of Jesus Christ, the nature of our experience of time is altered in important ways. This is the topic of the next section of this thesis.

The basic tenets of the gospel as taught by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS), which are under discussion in this paper, are briefly mentioned here, to offer the reader some background information. The references used are from the standardized volumes of scripture from which are: the King James Version of the Holy Bible, The Book of Mormon, (B of M), The Doctrine and Covenants (D & C), and The Pearl of Great Price (P of G P). The words of modern day prophets and apostles are also considered scripture when spoken by the spirit and in the context of their authority. An example of modern scripture is, “The Family—A Proclamation To The World,” written by The First Presidency and Council of the Twelve Apostles of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
Following are some key beliefs that help understand the human experience of time:

1. "Man was also in the beginning with God. Intelligence, or the light of truth, was not created or made, neither indeed can be" (D & C 93:29; Abraham 3:22).

2. "All Human beings—male and female—are created in the image of God. Each is a beloved spirit son or daughter of heavenly parents and, as such, each has a divine nature and destiny. Gender is an essential characteristic of individual premortal, mortal, and eternal identity and purpose" (The Family—A Proclamation To The World, paragraph 2).

3. In The Premortal Realm, spirit sons and daughters knew and worshiped God their Eternal Father and accepted His plan by which His children could obtain a physical body and gain earthly experience to progress toward perfection and ultimately realize his or her divine destiny as an heir of eternal life. The divine plan of happiness enables family relationships to be perpetuated beyond the grave. Sacred ordinances and covenants available in holy temples make it possible for individuals to return to the presence of God and for families to be united eternally (Ephesians 3:14-15; Moses 4:1-4; Abraham 3:22-24; Mosiah 3:16-19).

4. Each human is endowed with the Light of Christ, which also rests in all of God’s creations. Through this entitlement we can know the difference between right and wrong (John 1:9; Moro 7:19). Through the power of the Holy Ghost we can receive a testimony of Jesus Christ and of the truth of all things if we have faith and seek the Lord with a broken heart and contrite spirit (Moroni 10:5).
5. There is opposition in all things. There is an active force for evil. In the War in Heaven, two thirds of the spirits chose God the Father’s Plan as explained by Jesus Christ. The third of the spirits that chose Lucifer’s plan are trying to destroy this world and all the inhabitants on it. These evil and unclean spirits are applying a force to destroy humans, but they have certain limitations in their power (2 Nephi 2:11-12; 2 Nephi 2:27-29; Rev. 12).

Every human spirit or intelligence is co-eternal with God, and was not created, but always existed as intelligence. Humankind was co-existent with God and was not created but always existed as intelligence. Always having existed as intelligence creates a unique relationship between God and humankind, both having a similar eternal pre-existence. This does not mean that humankind is equal to God, but only co-existent. This understanding is pivotal in recognizing our relationship to God and why God and humankind are so interconnected. It is God’s mission and purpose to assist humankind in inheriting all that He has. "For behold, this is my work and my glory—to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man" (Moses 1:39). And God, because of his benevolence instructed Christ to teach us, "that you may come unto the Father in my name, and in due time receive of his fulness" (D & C 93:19).

In addition to being co-existent with God, human beings know the difference between right and wrong because they have the Light of Christ. Moral understanding is not a mental process. It is a gift from God. Knowledge of the truth is not possible within the limitations of the physical reality of this world without the power of the
Holy Ghost, which also is the only means by which one can receive a testimony of Jesus Christ. Truth can only come from a perfect all-knowing God.

The opposition of good and evil is real and is experienced in the all those who follow Jesus Christ and all those who choose the devil. Opposition is essential so that humankind can be enticed by both good and evil so that we can choose which is right and which is wrong. Progression is only possible when humankind can either succeed or fail by their own deliberate choice.

_Thrownness in a Whole Connected Existence_

As I have mentioned previously, I never gave “time” much thought. Nobody I ever knew talked about it. Dr. Slife challenged his class to consider what the present moment means to each one of us. I recognized that I did have feelings about going into the uncertainty of the next moment. Because poetry more easily expresses my deep feelings, I wrote this poem to convey the urgency of the moment:

```
Wait!
I’m not ready!
It’s too fast
I’m not prepared
Enough
To go forth
Into
The unknown
Bare
Unrehearsed
And
Alone.
```

```
Wait
I’m not ready!
I need more
More of
What will
Keep me safe
Money
Position
Prestige
Power
Then I’ll
Go.
```

```
Wait!
I’m not ready!
Others are
Getting more
Which means
I’m getting
Less
I’ve got to
Stay
And get more
Then I’ll
Go
```

The ability of human beings to experience a whole connected life while facing the tentative present has not been adequately accounted for in the theorists work. They all
agree that human beings are motivated to seek meaning in their lives, and are goal-directed, but no reason is proffered to account for this behavior except to say that we have it. One of the major differences between the understanding of *thrownness* based on the teachings of the restored gospel and what the theorist offered is realizing that agency really begins in the pre-existence, and not at birth. This in turn, explains that we chose to accept this mortal existence, as a way to grow and develop, with the goal of potentially becoming like God himself. This choice involved considering two options: one proposed by Satan and one by God the Father through his Son Jesus Christ. In *The Pearl of Great Price*, an LDS volume of scripture:

"And I, the Lord God, spake unto Moses, saying: That Satan, whom thou hast commanded in the name of mine Only Begotten, is the same which was from the beginning, and came before me, saying—behold, here am I, send me, I will be thy son, and I will redeem all humans, that one soul shall not be lost, and surely I will do it; wherefore give me thine honor. But, behold, my Beloved Son, which was my Beloved and Chosen from the beginning, said unto me—Father, thy will be done, and the glory be thine forever. Wherefore, because that Satan rebelled against me, and sought to destroy the agency of man, which I the Lord God, had given him, and also, that I should give unto him mine own power; by the power of mine Only Begotten, I caused that he should be cast down; And he became Satan, yea, even the devil, the father of all lies, to deceive and blind men, and to lead them captive at his will, even as many as would not hearken unto my voice (Moses 4:1-4).
Satan sought to destroy the agency of humankind so they would serve and honor him for keeping them safe and secure. In an LDS perspective, agency is the only way human beings can personally progress. There are four principles that must be in force in order for agency to be actualized: 1. Laws must exist and be ordained by God, which can be obeyed or disobeyed: 2. Opposites must exist in order for a choice to be made—good and evil, right and wrong or any kind of oppositional force where choices can be made; 3. A knowledge of good and evil is necessary in order to know the difference between the opposites: 4. An ability to make choices (McConkie, 1966, p. 26). The prophet Nephi taught that personal agency is secured by the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ when he said:

And because that they are redeemed from the fall they have become free forever, knowing good from evil; to act for themselves and not to be acted upon, save it be by the punishment of the law at the great and last day, according to the commandments which God hath given. Wherefore, men are free according to the flesh; and all things are given them which are expedient unto man. And they are free to choose liberty and eternal life, through the great Mediator (Jesus Christ) of all men, or to choose captivity and death, according to the captivity and power of the devil; for he seeketh that all men might be miserable like unto himself. (2 Nephi 2: 26-27)

Agency, and knowing that we exercised agency in a pre-mortal sphere, are essential in understanding how the concept of thrownness can be just, even without our consent. Otherwise life becomes an absurd and meaningless existence, as Sartre claimed. Knowing humanity agreed to a plan, and accordingly to the terms and conditions of
mortality, raised existence out of mere existing, as Sartre purports, because it is essential to God's meaningful and purposeful plan. As a result, humans were made aware of the eternal significance of this mortal existence and they had the agency to choose or reject it. Likewise, because of the importance of agency, all humans are exposed to suffering the consequence of both good and bad choices of their fellow beings. This, it is explained, we knew since from before the world was, and we also possessed "essence" or a personal history even in the pre-mortal realm. So, human need not experience Sartre's nothingness, which is the void between themselves and the world that arises from the fact that we create ourselves (Osborne, 1992).

Agency is a fundamental constant in the continued life of human beings. Therefore, thrownness is not a random throw of the dice, but the result of a choice, where knowing something of the conditions of their state in mortal life were known beforehand. This does not mean that the essence of thrownness is eliminated in every moment, because we are continually making choices that are redirecting the flow of the present. They are also affected by others' choices and how they respond to them.

However, we are never thrown alone into the next moment. As spirit children of a Father in Heaven, we are part of a literal family of similar beings. "All human beings in the pre-existence were the spirit children of God our Father, an exalted, glorified, and perfected Man" (McConkie, 1966, p. 751). "The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's" (D & C 130:22). All men are literally connected as children to their heavenly parents and to their brothers and sisters. Thus, they are never alone; they always have the assurance that they belonged to the family of God. The Bible explains that they are also connected by the Light of Christ. Jesus Christ is "the true light that
lighteth every man that cometh into the world” (John 1:9). In The Doctrine and Covenants, another volume of LDS scripture, it further explains the concept of the Light of Christ in terms of the universe, laws of governance, and in all things:

Which light proceedeth forth from the presence of God to fill the immensity of space—The light which is in all things, which giveth life to all things, which is the law by which all things are governed, even the power of God who sitteth upon his throne, who is in the bosom of eternity, who is in the midst of all things (D & C 88:12-14).

Because the Light of Christ is in everything and is governable by God and gives life to all things, then it follows that God constantly maintains the universe using this Light. We do not just happen to exist or continue to exist without God's power. George Berkeley was right when he said that God's influence is a constant force in our existence. We are connected to all of His creations by this same Light so alienation is not inherent, as Sartre would claim. Rather it is created by humankind denying the power of God.

How is it possible to have continuity in our lives if we are constantly being thrown from moment to moment? Binswanger, in my view, has correctly seen that something must connect all discreet moments together in order to make a whole life. He reified abstraction, suddenness, always-having-been, etc., to explain the phenomenon of living in the present with a sense of continuity. However, Binswanger has not really explained this phenomenon or its origins.

A fascinating example of a disconnected life is that of Clive Waring, a distinguished musicologist and a choral master. He contracted viral encephalitis, which destroyed both sides of his hippocampus and left him in a world, which contained only a
few seconds of the present and no new memories. Clive's past memories are intact so can
still play the organ and lead music, but when it is over, he will never remember that it
happened. He lives in a hospital room with a deck of cards and a notebook, which
contains multiple notations of almost the same series of words. "Now I am completely
awake, for the first time in years" (Restak, 1988, p. 29). When he reads his entries, he
refuses to believe that he wrote them because he cannot remember having done it. His
wife says, "Clive's world now consists of a moment, with no past to anchor it and no
future to look ahead to. It's a blinkered moment" (Restak, 1988, p. 29). Clive has no
sense of the continuum of time; he cannot comprehend why he is stuck in the present
because he cannot hold on to enough words to get a clear explanation of his condition.

But that is not the whole story of Clive. He is angry. According to his wife, his
center, his soul is absolutely there as it always was. She claims that if he were not intact,
there would be no reason for Clive to be despairing and in so much anguish. If he only
had those few moments and they were never attached to another moment, and he felt he
just woke up, then why should he be filled with so much human passion? Clive embraces
his wife and loves her so deeply when he sees her. His wife says, "All he shows us is raw
human passion, straight from the heart of the mind" (Restak, 1988, p. 31). Humans are
not understood by simply understanding how their brains function. There is much more
to humans than billions of neurons firing. Clive is a man that is both body and spirit and
feels the pain of a lost life.

Clive's anger and passion can be understood in gospel terms better than in the
theorist's accounts. Human beings have an essential nature because of our pre-existent
life as members of God's family. The lack of continuity in Clive's existence, clarifies that
human beings are anchored in their past and in their hopes in the future which creates a connected whole life. The theorists offer no explanation on the individual level or the broad scale, for this connectedness or constancy of each moment nor of the past and the future. The gospel not only connects our temporal existence, but also connects the pre-existent state and Eternal life as well, which changes our understanding of the nature of our present existence.

Continuity can be explained in greater depth in the context of faith that God created us in his own image. Humans always existed in some form so creation from nothing is impossible. We have continuity because we have always existed in some form and because all of God’s creations have the Light of Christ which is a connecting force to God and to all of His creations. (D & C 93)

Consciousness has always existed in some form (D & C 93:29). Clive Waring knows that he is missing something. He is anxious, desperate, and frustrated because he must surely sense that his mode of living is not right. He does not know it cognitively because his brain cannot string thoughts together to make sense, but he is despairing. He loves his wife but he cannot miss her because she does not exist unless she is there. But why, then, should he respond so lovingly when he sees her? All of this would not make sense unless he is more than just his earthly existence. Because human beings have lived before, even though they have no recollection of it, no one on this earth is starting from scratch. The physical body may be new, but not consciousness, agency, and a history of lived understanding of God’s love for his children.

Faced by a new moment or suddenness, one who understands the doctrine of the pre-existence can remind oneself of his or herself of their origins and the sense of the
personal nature of God. Human beings thus can feel that they are not alone. It is easier
to not be afraid. "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things
not seen" (Hebrews 11:1).

The lack of wholeness and continuity of life that I sense in the thought and theory
of these scholars is very perplexing to me. It is difficult for them to argue for authenticity
or wholeness in their thinking and feeling without recognition of a power (God) that
makes wholeness and continuity possible.

In conclusion, continuity of time unfolds because God by virtue of the Light of
Christ is in all things and maintains all existence. Agency is a gift from God and is
necessary for all human beings to experience oppositional choices. Intentional and goal-
directed behavior exists because we have lived before in a pre-existent state and chosen
to experience mortality in order to become like God who is our creator. With faith in our
divine origin, assistance from the Light of Christ, and the Holy Ghost, we can make
knowledgeable choices in mortality.

Humankind Intentionality, Moral Nature, and Search for Meaning

Where the five theorists start with the assumption that humans are intentional and
goal seeking, the restored gospel of Jesus Christ explains how or why they are.
According to the doctrine of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, all human
life coexisted with God in the beginning before mortality (D & C 93:29). In the restored
gospel, there is a coherent account of the eternal nature of our intentional and goal
seeking nature. As human beings we were given the choice to come to earth; we came
because we wanted to prove ourselves to be like God. We came here with purpose and
intent and not just as a result of evolution or chance creation. We had some understanding of the purpose and organization of life.

One such purpose is to distinguish well from evil and to choose good. All human beings have access to the Light of Christ to aid them in accomplishing this purpose.

Without a view of internal spiritual intelligence along with physical beings, it is difficult to account for the source of what all the theorists reviewed have clearly recognized as our inherently purposive and goal-directed nature: our propensity to need and strive for meaning.

**Strategy**

As I experienced it, and in accordance with the description of *thrownness* in the existential literature, the very act of being *thrown* into the present moment creates a constant urgency to secure the positive outcomes in the next moment. Thus it would seem important to have a plan, a strategy, for the coming moments even though, according to the linear model of time, each moment comes so fast there is no time to step back and formulate a strategy by taking thought. Strategies must necessarily be formulated “on the move,” spontaneously, or in those moments when we can at least artificially step back and reflect on our selves and our world and plan. The better the strategy, it is supposed, the better the outcomes will be. This is one of the compelling motivations that drives humans to do something, anything, to make their lives happy, meaningful, secure, and to hopefully move towards spiritual and physical goals.

Partly because linear time is composed of infinitely small, fleeting moments, all things have a potential to quickly pass away. In addition, the physical world is replete with scarcity. There is only so much food, gold, jobs, and cars etc. Thus our experience
is that we live in a world of potential if not perpetual shortage. If we take an LDS view of the soul, however, our understanding and thus our experience shift. We can consider the possibility that our spiritual side experiences no scarcity, no competition, and no physical pain. We are, however, because of our dual nature caught in between two worlds. These two worlds, the temporal and spiritual, vie for our attention as we go into each new moment and develop strategies that will help us secure our different goals. Temporal goals are fueled by necessity for the needs of the body and other motives centered in the experience of the physical world. The spirit, we might suppose, affords an eternal perspective on truth and a foundation for desires of a more exalting nature—though thrownness is still part of our experience, the spiritual aspects of thrownness change the fundamental nature of the experience.

The five theorists reviewed in this thesis describe the development of strategies in both physical and spiritual senses. Sartre states that the main characteristic of being-for-itself is its activity that "consists of and is exhausted by its own intentional, meaning-conferring acts" (Olafson, 1967, p. 291). Being intentional, and capable of acting with meaning, implies at least the rudiments of intentions and plans to achieve them. Meaning and purpose separate acts of genuine creation from mere accidents. Sartre believed that "scarcity was the motor that sets man into the constant battle between who is object and who is subject. According to Sartre, humans could either be a subject or object in relating to another (Olafson, 1967). Therefore, in Sartre's world, there is an unrelenting competition and responsibility for freedom and yet in this environment, he regarded humans as capable of being creators, of being authentic, of finding truth, and of possessing the ability to illuminate every human realm with action and to transform
passivity into activity (Sartre, 1992). Sartre, like Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) founder of phenomenology, held that humans were always conscious of something. Therefore, we are always choosing or choosing not to choose, but there is always intention and, therefore, at least the essence of a plan.

Binswanger and Boss as existentialists share Sartre's views on the tenuousness nature of our lives. However, Binswanger claimed an a priori "world-design" that "endowed" us with an intentional capacity and a capability of goal seeking that ameliorated the effects of the tenuousness of thrownness. Boss wrote of Dasein as being disclosed by the illumination of Dasein itself. Adler, unlike the existentialists, did not focus on the tenuousness of life. He posited that the force created by directing action toward a goal accounted for motivation or movement in the psyche. But Adler commented that all of our strivings are directed towards finding security where we are safe and victorious which would indicate that life is tenuous (Adler, 1931).

In conclusion, the tentativeness of thrownness motivates human beings to develop a strategy that will secure the next moments with the best possible outcome. The passing of small moments of time and the obvious scarcity in the physical world sets up an environment of competition for available resources. The spirit dimension of human beings experiences no scarcity of resources because the spirit is indestructible and outside of linear time. An LDS perspective enjoins the spirit to overcome the physical body and seek after spiritual goals of love, sacrifice, justice and truth.

All of the theorists reviewed here recognized that we are intentional and goal-directed beings and, therefore, that we develop strategies for living. We also seek meaning. They explained these essential qualities as a product of evolution, but in their
personal teaching and later writings they sometimes alluded to a spiritual force in the form of God, or some sort of universal, caring, or I-thou relationship.

**Time as a Structure**

There are other conceptions of time besides linear time, and there are many examples of these in the scriptures. Linear time is a structure that divides existence into past present and future and explains one kind of time reality. Glenda Green, a Christian apologist (Green, 1999), writes about linear time as "humanity's self-made structure with no beingness. The process we commonly call time is just structure in action. It is structure's bid for survival" (Green, 1999, p. 103). The Atonement is an example where time in terms of past, present and future is not adequate. Those who lived before Christ's Atonement, experienced the fruits of the Atonement before it actually happened. The atonement from an LDS perspective, the most important event for all humankind, is timeless. And example of this kind of timelessness can be seen in my time experience. Although only a few seconds passed, in terms of the things that happened, it would take me hundreds and hundreds of seconds to exhaust the experience. And I could not do it sequentially, because it did not unfold one event after the other, but it was compressed as one whole thing.

The future likewise plays an immense role in our present because it is in the present that we anticipate what lies ahead in the future. Pulling the future into the present does not follow the linear time paradigm because the future cannot exist in the present. Although we live our lives in the present moment, we live many of those moments by imagining "what would happen if." The future for the existentialists is considered the primary motivational concept for human beings (Rychlak, 1981). We strategize in the
present and project those strategies into the future as intentions. Clive Waring did not have a future in the present because he knew that he could not sustain his present, because he could not remember what he had decided to do. He even tried to write everything down so that he could create a present and, hopefully, a future. But instead, because he had no recollection of ever having thought those thoughts, he later read. They seemed not to be his words on the paper, and they had no meaning for him. He was frozen in those few moments of the present with no hope of a motivating future. Without actualizing our future in the present moments, there would be no anticipation, no looking forward, no hope for a better moment. There would be no need to strategize because there would be no expectation. There would only be a meaningless unfoldment of present moments. It would be Clive Waring's life.

The theorists agree that the future is a prime motivator and fills human beings with purpose and meaning. But when one dies, according to the theorists, there is no future; evolutionary theory for human beings ends with the last breath. If there is life after death as a belief in God would indicate, the theorists made no plans for it. In contrast an LDS perspective provides a future that is powerful and specific. It is the Plan of Salvation—the blueprint that explains the purpose of existence. According to the prophet Joseph Smith, "God himself, finding he was in the midst of spirits and glory, because he was more intelligent, saw proper to institute laws whereby the rest could have a privilege to advance like himself" (McConkie, 1966, p. 575). God's plan for this life is the gospel of Jesus Christ. "It comprises all of the laws, ordinances, and performances by conformity to which mortal man is empowered to gain eternal life in the kingdom of God" (McConkie, 1966, p. 576).
The present need never be without a future which means there can be continual expectation and hope for every tomorrow. The gospel provides a never ending future which is specific and connected to the pre-existence and mortality. We belonged to a spiritual family in the pre-existence which continued on in mortal existence. Our families in mortal existence can carry on into eternity. In the gospel members marry for "time and eternity." Death has no claim because life continues on in another dimension without pause. Every action in the present is meaningful because life is always continuing in some form. Therefore, hope is always with humanity.

Consciousness, Being or Dasein

Consciousness or being is the sum total of who we are at the moment of our thrownness. For the theorists, this temporal existence is the only history that human beings can formulate. The LDS perspective offers a premortal existence and specific goals for eternal life as part of consciousness. All humankind in this view has more content in their being than what the theorists claim. Our being or Dasein includes an eternal spirit, increased knowledge of God, our heavenly family, and our divine nature and potential. This means that we are weighted with obligation and expectation. Knowledge of this expanded conception of our human nature is both a blessing and a burden.

The blessing part is an expanded history of pre-existence and hope of eternal life that provides more information to make wiser decisions about our lives. The burden part is that we are obligated because our life on earth is made possible by God. There are innumerable manifestations of how human beings cope with "more content." I believe that one indication is the necessity to cope. Why would human beings feel obligated to
explain why they made a particular choice? It is evident that there is a justification process in effect which demands a reason. C. Terry Warner's (2001) theory on self-deception supports this process of justification. Our culture is riddled with opportunities for constant distraction. The cultural change wrought by the distraction that TV offers would have been incomprehensible sixty years ago. The weight of living each moment with the understanding of life's ultimate importance and responsibility can be oppressive. The obvious cure would be yielding one's heart to the inevitable truth (Warner, 2001).

As the apostle John declared, "And the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32).

From an LDS perspective, we have to make something of ourselves because God has given us the agency and the responsibility to become perfect, or as near perfect as we can in this mortal existence. This responsibility weighs heavily on us and I think we try to distract ourselves from facing this constant reality. There are many examples of our need for distraction: entertainment, relationships with others, even danger or fear. We also escape through overindulgence in drugs, drinking, work, sex, food and pleasure. However, the long term effects of distraction sometimes are painful, and in most cases, increase uncertainty about how well we are fulfilling our responsibilities because God cannot be erased.

Conclusion

An LDS perspective offers an in-depth view of humankind's existence from premortal, mortal, to eternal life, while the theorists, reviewed here, only begin and end with the small slice of mortality. An LDS perspective provides knowledge of the character and nature of God and Jesus Christ in the context of a family with all humankind. God offered humankind an informed choice between Lucifer's (devil) plan
of control where not one soul would be lost and God's plan of agency whereby Jesus
Christ would atone for all men who come unto Him. God's work and glory is to help
humankind be as He is. The origins and purposes of thrownness, intentionality, good and
evil, search for meaning, motivation and strategy and consciousness or being are
explained in terms of the revealed knowledge of God and His love for all humankind; the
theorists reviewed her have to merely assume the existence of the above qualities of
humankind from experience. There is no ontological explanation except through the
process of chance evolution.
God is Absent in the Theoretical Discourse on Time.

The scholarly world has concluded that the existence of God cannot be proven by rational or empirical methods; and therefore it is a waste of time and effort to hypothesize about God's existence. However, the position assumed regarding the existence of God will have consequences for any theory of behavior and any understanding of human nature. For example, if one decides that human beings are accidents of nature, certain attitudes follow about the reverence we ought to have toward human beings, including the human body. Any view of human beings as amoral is consistent with evolutionary views of human beings; however; a view of persons as divinely created is not consistent with this type of evolutionary amoral view. For example, an essentially hedonistic nature follows logically from an evolutionary paradigm. Adler tried to imbue evolution with final-cause purpose, and Jung created the idea of the collective unconscious to explain the primal need to nurture and love. Binswanger developed the "World Design" to respond to our goal-directedness, and Sartre consistently agreed that humans are always intentioned beings. And in spite of this tremendous work, theories developed without the idea of the existence of God have, in general, supported the concept that we are largely hedonistic. This is an example of how certain conclusions about us follow from certain theoretical assumptions (Slife & Williams, 1995).

In all fairness to the theorists reviewed here, the true concept of the character and nature of God had, according to an LDS perspective, has been lost (Smith & Galbraith, 1993). When Jesus Christ was upon the earth, his disciples knew him to be the literal
Son of God as testified by Simon Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matthew 16:16). But after Christ was crucified and was no longer on earth in the flesh, the memory of his true character and nature slowly eroded, until in 325 A.D. at the first Council of Nicaea it was declared to the world:

> We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things, both visible and invisible; and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Only begotten of the Father, that is to say, of the substance of the Father, God of God and Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things are made (Sheen, 1963, p. 318).

This meant that God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ were not separate, unique beings but they were identical in essence and were one in the same substance. The true nature of God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost had been lost by the casting of votes. In recent Christian teachings, which have not changed appreciably, "God has no form, body, parts, or passions, so that his divinity will not be lost" (Bennett, 1984). Therefore, the theorists did not have a true knowledge of the nature and attributes of God the Father or his Son Jesus Christ to make a choice founded on the whole truth. When I examined the concepts of God from most of the major Christian sects, the character and nature of God was consistently in error according to the revealed knowledge of the gospel of Jesus Christ. There was not one that believed that God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ were separate beings with bodies of flesh and bone (Bennett, 1984). This standard error has held true since the Nicene Creed. It took a hundred years to lose the knowledge of the true nature of God, according to an LDS perspective, and yet the untruth has been stable for the past 1700 years. This leads me to
believe that the character and nature of God is fundamental to all our thinking and the devil's most important lie is to destroy the knowledge of the true nature and power of God. Joseph Smith, the founder and prophet of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, said that, "There are but very few beings in the world who understand rightly the character of God" (Smith & Galbraith, 1993, p. 387). If we do not understand God's nature, then we would have difficulty understanding our own, because we are confined to our limited, imperfect perspective. God can only reveal our true nature through his teachings and through revelation.

Joseph Smith in 1820 changed all this misunderstanding about God when he testified that he saw and talked with God the Father and His Son, Jesus Christ (JSH 1:17,18). The true concept of God is necessary in order to have enough faith to meet the demands of mortal existence which includes thrownness and being. In the moments of thrownness, the unknown is all around, but if one's being is firmly grounded in God, then the knowledge of God will provide assurance that all is well. It follows that if our understanding of God is saturated with untruth, then our faith is diminished. The stronger one's faith, the more one can push forward confidently into the future and find happiness in this life no matter what the circumstances of one's existence.

From an LDS perspective, the character and nature of God is a part of one's being because God plants in our minds those ideas necessary for them to exercise faith in Him. "For without these ideas being planted in the minds of men it would be out of the power of any person or persons to exercise faith in God so as to obtain eternal life" (Lundwall, n. d. p. 41). When one is thrown into the next moment, being or consciousness is filled with the remembrance of God and one's mission here upon the earth.
From an LDS perspective, human beings learn about themselves through their relationship with God. Human beings understand love and justice, not as isolated ideas, but in the context of their relationship with God. In my time experience, I did not experience vague emotions of love and goodwill, but I felt God’s love for me and my love for Him and those primary feelings were the grounding for my emotional reasoning. Also the opposite occurs in the personage of Satan who wields his subtle influence of evil by confirming me in my weaknesses and justifying my excuses. In the Book of Mormon, the prophet Moroni explains the source of good and evil:

Wherefore, all things which are good cometh of God; and that which is evil cometh of the devil; for the devil is an enemy unto God, and fighteth against him continually, and inviteth and enticeth to sin, and to do that which is evil continually.

But behold, that which is of God inviteth and enticeth to do good continually; wherefore, every thing which inviteth and enticeth to do good, and to love God, and to serve him, is inspired of God (Moroni: 7:12,13).

Good and evil are not intellectual concepts that human beings just happen to invent and then respond to, but instead, they are connected to actual personages in a historical context.

One contrast between theoretical understandings of human nature grounded in evolutionary thinking and theories based on foundational assumptions that there is a creator God, is that in the former all human beings must trust in their own abilities because there are no supernatural powers to come to their aid in understanding or in action. Humans alone shape and make their own destinies because evolutionary
processes are regarded as essentially random, and if human action is the result of such processes, there is no real meaningful purpose to human life, except what we ourselves can create. Evolution offers no guarantees, no plan, and no designated outcome. Some scientifically minded thinkers have endowed the evolutionary process with intention (e.g., Adler) by agreeing that history has been a series of purposeful happenings that has brought us where we are today and will continue to move us forward and upward (Burke, 1985). This is a hopeful wish that has no basis in evolutionary theory itself.

The popularization of evolution-based thinking had brought us to a position where there is no universal law, no lasting truth because truth is relative. Faith is diluted and trust in God is tempered by science. This way of thinking has real implications for the way we understand life and experience the passing of time. It is the hallmark of the times to keep one's options open in the face of to the prevailing changes—expediency is the name of the game for a successful life. There are no hard and fast rules or enduring principles to guide one's life. However, no matter how successful strategies may be, we are still haunted by the question of whether there is some purpose to the universe. Roger Penrose, professor of mathematics at Oxford University, who was honored for his analytic description of the big bang, which forms the basis of all big bang cosmology, questions the premises of science. Penrose as quoted by Gerald Schroeder held that, "This balance of nature's laws is so perfect and so unlikely to have occurred by chance that he avers an intelligent creator must have chosen them" (Schroeder, 1997, p. 21).

Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, the 1937 Nobel prizewinner wrote, "According to present ideas, this change in the nucleic acid [which determines the nature of protein molecules formed in a cell] is accomplished through random variation . . . . Yet in my mind I have
never been able to accept fully the idea that the adaptation and the harmonious building of those complex biological systems, involving simultaneous changes in the thousands of genes, are the results of molecular accidents .... The probability that all of these genes should have changed together through random variation is practically zero.... I have always been seeking some higher organizing principle that is leading the living system toward improvement and adaptation. I know this is biological heresy .... I do not think that the extremely complex speech center of the human brain ... as created by random mutations that happened to improve the chances of survival of individuals .... I cannot accept the notion that this capacity arose through random alterations, relying on the survival of the fittest. I believe that some principle must have guided the development toward the kind of speech center that was needed (Szent-Gyorgyi, 1972, p. xxix-xxxi).

There are other scholars who do not believe that human behavior can be explained in terms of evolution. One of these is Anthony O’Hear, a respected professor of philosophy, who maintains that while evolutionary theory is useful in explaining the natural world, it falls short when applied to the human world. Evolutionary theory cannot account for human’s quest for knowledge, their moral sense, and their appreciation of beauty. O’Hear states, "We are prisoners neither of our genes nor of the ideas we encounter as we each make our personal and individual way through life" (O’Hear, 1997, p. vii). Some scientists are responding against the limited view of man that the evolutionary process engenders.

In summary, without God in the dialogue concerning being and thrownness, the evolutionary perspective on humankind basic nature is hedonistic. From an LDS perspective, an understanding of the true nature of God is necessary in order to have
enough faith to meet the demands of mortal existence which includes *thrownness* and *being*. An understanding of the character and nature of God is essential for human beings to know themselves. God planted in our consciousness that which will enable us to exercise faith in Him. Our *being* is filled with some vestige of remembrance of our premortal life. Evolutionary concepts offer no guarantees, no plan, and no designated outcome. Some scientists are questioning evolutionary explanations for humankind purpose and meaning.

*Faith in God makes a difference in thrownness, time, being, and intentionality.*

Under the aegis of evolutionary thinking, existentialist's *thrownness* condemns human beings to an essentially random and, thus, meaningless world. We are responsible, but unprepared, without consensual standards for judging and living every new moment we are hurled into. This is why, for Sartre, *being* was terrifying. Without God, *being* is indeed without hope, because we have no preparation, no real reasons for choice, and in the end, it is all over and then there is nothing. But faith in God, particularly in God as understood in LDS doctrine, avoids these. God has a plan. He is merciful and just. We are only responsible for what we know; and we are prepared for life because we have lived before. We are partly divine because we are the literal spiritual offspring of God. We chose to come here. Although we could not know all the moments in the *thrownness* that awaited us, we could know that they have a purpose and an end. God has prepared a place for humans in the "mansions of the Father." We can all have Eternal life, the greatest gift, because of the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which manifests God's ultimate adherence to the laws of justice and mercy in His Plan of
Salvation. Thus, there needs be no terror in life if we have faith in God, because, in the end, all will be judged with justice, mercy, and love abounding.

Knowing that we have always existed, having experienced a life before as intelligent beings, we can go into the next moment with uncertainty especially if we believe that we bring to this life traits and talents from an eternity before. In fact, it appears that, most of the time, we move effortlessly moment after moment. If we could not do this with ease, *thrownness* would severely challenge each passing moment. This seems to suggest that we possess a deeper understanding and knowledge, something permanent about life no matter how impermanent it appears to be. Jung's response to life's uncertainties was mentioned in his autobiography and reaffirms the need for something outside of human capability, "I exist on the foundation of something I do not know. In spite of all uncertainties, I feel a solidity underlying all existence and a continuity in my mode of *being*" (Jung, 1965, p. 358).

Without God, human beings are assured of the terror of *thrownness*. The powerful *Suddenness* that Binswanger described is stabilized by *always-having-been* which, in my view, is the power of God. There is purpose and intention because human beings chose their existence and because God has prepared a way whereby they can be like Him in the eternities.

َاThe Gospel Response to Linear Timeَا

Time is both temporal and spiritual because humans possess physical bodies and a spiritual essence which comprise the whole person. Elder Neal A. Maxwell of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints wrote of time, "Whereas the bird is at home in the air, we are clearly not at home in time—
because we belong to eternity. Time, as much as any one thing, whispers to us that we are strangers here" (Maxwell, 1997, p. 347). The scriptures are replete with examples of the different concepts of time. In the Book of Mormon, Alma says that, "Now whether there is more than one time appointed for men to rise it mattereth not; for all do not die at once, and this mattereth not; all is as one day with God, and time only is measured unto men" (Mosiah 40:8). God's time and man's time are different. The Doctrine and Covenants 76:100 declares, "The Lord hath redeemed his people; And Satan is bound and time is no longer." Time can be removed. "This life is the time for men to prepare to meet God" (Alma 34:32). Time is this verse does not mean past, present and future, but just time to meet God. Any departure from linear time is considered by psychology somewhat mystical, a sharp contrast to the cause and effect relationships designed to show us how we function in an empirical world. Jung was criticized for his theory of synchronicity because it deviated from the structure of linear time.

God is Love.

Because the theorists were tied to the evolutionary view of humankind, the motivating principle of love is replaced by one form or another of "survival of the fittest." Adler is the exception because he amended Darwinism and emphasized social interest above survival. Adler thought that the word "love" represented too many meanings, but he made it clear that the healing process between patient and doctor is derived from caring for one another in an attitude of cooperation. Adler approved of the religious values of his patients. Adler believed that the, "primal energy which was so effective in establishing regulative religious goals was none other than that of social interest" (Adler, 1998, p. 199). In general, Binswanger, Boss, and Jung also supported
the religious beliefs of their patients but they did not speculate theoretically on the topic of "love." It was not a motivating factor in their theories per se, but it was implied. The concept of love is relegated to a minor place, whereas, in the LDS perspective, it is central to everything.

God is a God of love. One cannot describe God and leave love out because "God is love" (I John 4:8). In The New Testament, the apostle John wrote, "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 1:16). To understand our nature, we learn by God's loving example. The theorists do mention love, but it is not central to their theories. Love is assumed to be important especially in Alder's work, but is not discussed at length or even hypothesized. In the scriptures, love is primal; without it, nothing else really matters. In the New Testament, the apostle Paul clarified the importance of love, "Wherefore, my beloved brethren, if ye have not charity (love), ye are nothing, for charity never faileth. Wherefore, cleave unto charity, which is the greatest of all, for all things must fail—But charity is the pure love of Christ, and it endureth forever; and whoso is found possessed of it at the last day, it shall be well with him" (Moroni 7: 46-47). In the LDS perspective, love is the essence of all the meaningful things that we do.

The Problem of Evil is Not Discussed.

If God is absent from the foundational ideas upon which theory and explanation rest, then Satan, as God's antithesis, is also absent. But to be more precise, in the theories I have studied that profess to explain human behavior based on traditional secular understandings, God is sometimes mentioned but not taken seriously, while Satan, in particular and the problem of evil in general, are truly ignored. Just as evil is
rarely dealt with, the attributes of evil (or Satan) are rarely mentioned, or referred to in the literature. For example, Sissela Bok, when attempting to answer the question of lying and truth telling, turned to her training in philosophy as she explained:

(The) paucity of what I found was astonishing. The striking fact is that, though no moral choices are more common or more troubling than those, which have to do with deception in its many guises, they have received extraordinarily little contemporary analysis. The major works of moral philosophy of this century, so illuminating in other respects, are silent on this subject. The index to the eight-volume Encyclopedia of Philosophy contains not one reference to lying or to deception; much less an entire article devoted to such questions. Even if one looks back over the last few centuries, the little discussion, which is to be found, is brief and peremptory. And in works in other disciplines—in psychology, for example, or in political science—most often approach problems of deception in a merely descriptive or strategic manner (Bok, 1989, p. xix).

We also find many other contemporary examples of ignoring the problem of evil. In introductory psychology books, evil and lying are rarely mentioned. In John Updike's book, the Witches of Eastwick, one of the witches shyly says, "Evil is not a word we like to use. We prefer to say 'unfortunate' or 'lacking' or 'misguided' or 'disadvantaged'. We prefer to think of evil as the absence of good, a momentary relenting of its sunshine, a shadow, a weakening" (Poelman, 1997, p. 51). Albert Delbanco wrote a book about the deconstruction of the devil in America. Delbanco said, "The work of the devil is everywhere, but no one knows where to find him. We live in the most brutal century in
human history, but instead of stepping forward to take the credit, he has rendered himself invisible" (Delbanco, 1995, p. 9).

C. S. Lewis clarifies the different approaches the intellectual community might take toward Satan in The Screwtape Letters:

There are two equal and opposite errors into which our race can fall about the devils. One is to disbelieve in their existence. The other is to believe, and to feel an excessive and unhealthy interest in them...the safest road to Hell is the gradual one—the gentle slope, soft underfoot, without sudden turnings, without milestones, without signposts (Lewis, 1982, p. 56).

About the real contemporary salience of evil, Ann Osborn Poelman in her book, The Amulek Alternative says, "This is no abstract and impersonal battle, no remote, imaginary conflict. Although it is a cosmic struggle, this ongoing war is fought well within our view, inside the boundaries of our own lives, indeed, very close to home. Sometimes it is actually in the home" (Poelman, 1997, p. 55).

Sartre, Jung, Adler and Binswanger edit out from their theoretical works evil and the devil in a very subtle manner. Sartre discusses truth and his counterpart for truth, which is ignorance. Error is what happens when we fail at truth. Jung dispenses with the devil by putting humans in the devil's place. Jung's motivational theory posits that all energy is derived from opposition, but makes the opposition of forces of good and evil no important part of his formulation. Instead of God's opposite being the devil, God's opposite is humans. Jung does take on the question of evil, and asks the question the Gnostics asked, "Whence comes evil" (Jung, 1963, p. 332)? Jung puts evil in the context of the collective unconscious and the unfolding of the myth of the Creator-God who
unites the opposites within humans. Jung said, "the essence of the Christian message can then be understood as human’s creative confrontation with the opposites and their synthesis in the self, the wholeness of his personality" (Jung, 1963, p. 338). Jung's meaning of "myth" does not mean that it was simply contrived by humans, but only that it is recorded in the collective unconscious. Jung seems to be rearranging Christianity to make it more meaningful in his view. In this process, Satan's actual existence is set aside to be replaced by an oppositional concept to God.

Adler and Binswanger talk about God, or the spirit, but none of them discuss God as the creator of humans. Adler invoked a teleological evolution to account for social interest. Adler imbued evolution with god-like attributes to support his positive and powerful view of human potential. God and the devil are not mentioned in his theoretical foundation. Evolution took center stage and by this means, Adler transformed and ennobled human character to make social interest possible. According to his biographer, Bottome, Adler believed:

There was a law binding humans to the universe, moving always in the same direction, and towards a goal that could never be reached, but which never varied; and as humans obeyed this law and co-operated with it, he would develop in a direction that furthered universal welfare—but his co-operation with others was the price he must pay for this development. The egocentric goal must be broken up. Social interest was the only goal for humans; and every human being must be trained towards it in childhood, until it became as natural to him "as breathing or the upright gait (1957, p. 120).
Binswanger barely talks about the "I-thou" relationship and the devil is absent from his writings. Binswanger suggests that there must be an "I-thou" relationship, or a spirit, of humans, which explains the unexplainable in humans. When Binswanger's patients either succeeded or failed in psychoanalytic insight, Binswanger concluded that it was a deficiency of spirit that prohibited them from making the positive change.

Binswanger's criticism of Freud's theoretical position clarified his views on God, religion, and free will. Binswanger clearly differed with Freud regarding the role of religion. For Freud, religion was a form of adult dependency, while for Binswanger it was an acceptable adult pattern that could make life more meaningful. Binswanger's "world-designs" promoted a positive view of life. Freud, on the other hand, considered human instinctual impulses to be neither good nor bad; humans were basically hedonistic and all changes from evil into good drives could only happen under compulsion (Binswanger, 1967, p. 153). Freud struggled against Judeo-Christian's guilt-producing views of human beings. According to Freud, since human instinct is only natural and a product of evolution, there is no necessity for humanity to be redeemed by a god. Freud focused on simple hedonism, but a hedonism that must be controlled.

We are left with the question of why we would choose to do evil. Rationally, evil is an unwise choice in terms of cause and effect outcomes. History itself suggests that evil, as often as not, creates fear, distrust, uncertainty and insecurity, which in turn create social disorder of various types. The Twentieth Century, which has experienced greater carnage than previous centuries, has experienced the huge cost of the waste of lives and resources in waging wars. Again history has shown that the aggressors lost and so did everyone else in terms of life and property. We have also experienced wonderful gains in
the humane treatment of human beings, increased rights for women and children, and
tolerance of others. But the question remains: why do aggressors want to risk their lives
and the lives of their families and countrymen to get more land, more money and more
power? Greed is not rational, nor historically intelligent in the long course of events, but
in the short term and in the lives of some of the aggressors they can certainly make real
gains. But it is a lesson of history that in the end, greed and covetousness beget scarcity.
In this fragile world one should want to establish peace and cooperation as the best hope
for security from moment to moment.

The elimination for academic as well as from the common discourse, of the
powers of God and Satan, good and evil, leaves only ourselves to come up with solutions
for world peace and cooperation. In my view, historically, we are not up to the task. The
Twentieth Century, which should be our highest achievement so far, according to Georg
Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) a German philosopher, was, in fact, the worst in violent loss
of human life. Hegel's thesis, "the world spirit," defined as the accumulation of human
knowledge, would create a human history as human’s knowledge increased, that would
always be moving toward the highest human ideals. Dialectical reasoning, of thesis—
antithesis and synthesis—would bring humans to ultimate synthesis or the absolute idea.
But more importantly, humans would experience a consistent ongoing improvement in
every aspect of their lives (Osborne, 1992).

Hegel's confidence in humankind is warranted on many fronts, but in terms of
world peace it, and other philosophies, have fallen short. In my view, humanity’s
scientific and technical knowledge has brought us to a more understandable and user-
friendly world, but the power of our weapons has not moved in a parallel course with our
human capacity to use them appropriately. Donald Polkinghorn, a theoretical psychologist and theologian at the University of Southern California, in his book *Methodology for the Human Sciences*, explains:

> Our solutions to problems of the physical universe have provided an understanding that has always allowed us to transform energy from one form to another and have enabled us to replace 'natural engines' (human being and animals) with constructed engines as the sources of mechanical work. Yet the problems of living and working together in our families, our businesses and our nations remain puzzles (Polkinghorn, 1983, p. 7).

Evil has a powerful hold on our world. Technology has made a wonderful contribution, in terms of the physical aspect of our world. Humankind has the scientific knowledge expertise to feed, clothe and shelter everyone in the world, but the peace-making abilities of cooperation, sacrifice and love are not sufficient for world peace.

According to LDS perspectives, evil is defined as disobeying the laws of God, and is the opposite of good, and is of the devil (McConkie, 1966). President Spencer W. Kimball described the devil as a "very personal, individual spirit being, but without a mortal body...Yes, the devil is decidedly a person. He is clever and trained. With thousands of years of experience behind him he has become superbly efficient and increasingly determined" (Kimball, 1969, p. 21). Humankind has made a concerted effort to erase belief in the devil's existence and to soften the effects of evil. The five theorists do not discuss evil in great depth in their theoretical work.
Evil Affects Thrownness Time, and Intentionality.

Why do men choose evil in the present moment? It cuts one off from tender and gentle feelings toward others. Evil destroys friendship, because the selfishness and self-centeredness inherent in evil. Friendship cannot survive selfishness. Without friends, an evil person might experience an increasing need to control and maintain power over his or her world in order to feel safe. Evil and oppressive people are forced almost to paranoia because they simply cannot assume that there will not be others who like they themselves are out to control and manipulate them. To be evil is fraught with terror. If a person believes that hedonism and the desire for selfish gain are just part of his or her fundamental nature as an evolved being, then there will be few naturally occurring brakes against evil and little escape from its consequences. Understanding the reality of a real, personal, active source of evil prepares us against evil’s deceitful guises. Some of the devil’s most powerful lies include: God does not exist, the devil is a myth, humans are not sons and daughters of God, humans are an accident of nature, humans must find happiness wherever they can find it, and there is no divine order in the universe.

If we believe that doing evil is the result of human nature, we might well expect less of ourselves. Belief in a determined nature lessens our sense of agency, and heightens our sense of thrownness. Thrownness is all the more terrifying because our sense of agency, by which we might overcome some of the more terrifying aspects of thrownness—the effects of evil—is diminished. If we are aware of a source of evil outside ourselves and of our own powers of agency, some of the most dismal effects of thrownness can be overcome.
Faith is Not Mentioned.

None of the five theorists reviewed have used the word "faith" nor discussed its impact on our natures or our behaviors. This is understandable since faith, by most understandings of its essential nature, is religious. Since God is absent in their theoretical work, it follows that faith is absent also. We are, however, in the present analysis drawn to what the five theorists use to replace the concept of faith in their work.

*Intention replaces Faith in the Theorist's Work.*

Faith is replaced by the concept of intentionality and goal-seeking aspect of our humanity. In all these theories, there has to be something that motivates humans to action. The theorists do not attempt to develop an explanation of how intentionality was created in humans, but they all observe that we have it; and therefore, intentionality must, by the light of their own theorizing, be a product of the evolutionary process. The restored gospel can offer a reasonable explanation of our understanding that we have always existed as intelligence, and will exist as intelligent beings eternally. The essence of intentionality is intelligence. The fundamental manifestation of intelligence is intentionality, the capacity to have, and act for the sake of intentions.

*Faith Cannot be Replaced Nor is it Equivalent to Anything Else.*

According to the words of the prophet Joseph Smith, faith is, "the principle of action in all intelligent human beings" (Lundwall, n. d., p. 7). Although the theorists studied did not use the word faith or deal with all that it implies, they did recognize that
there has to be "something" to motivate humans to action; they referred to it as intention and goal-directedness. The question remains as to which concept, faith or intentionality, is the fundamental one; and which is a derivative—a mere label. I argue that faith is the fundamental reality. In the Book of Mormon, Moroni said, "And Christ hath said: If ye will have faith in me ye shall have power to do whatsoever thing is expedient in me. And he (Christ) hath said: Repent all ye ends of the earth, and come unto me, and be baptized in my name, and have faith in me, that ye may be saved" (Moroni 7: 33-34). Such hope is a manifestation of the capacity of intelligent beings to evaluate, to understand and compare, to reflect and to desire. Intentionality is certainly part of this intelligent action, but faith is the essence of all action.

If it is true that faith is at the heart of all motivation, then it must be true that all men have faith in some way, or to some degree. According to LDS doctrine, "(Humans) were also in the beginning with God. Intelligence, or the light of truth, was not created or made, neither indeed can be" (D & C 93:29). The knowledge of our beginnings, though not accessible in specific memory, may, nevertheless, be a part of experiential being. There might well be a type of deep knowing in all of us that constitutes the faith that Joseph Smith referred to as the "moving cause of all action . . . [and] exertion." From this I would suggest that all people have a foundation of faith simply because we are who we are as eternal, intelligent beings. It is then the quantity and quality of our faith that makes us who we are, and distinguishes us by our intentions and goal orientations. It is also the quality of our faith that accounts for our unique power and capacity to respond effectively to thrownness and the on-rush or lived experience. According to this doctrine,
human beings are without a foundation of faith in this world or else there would be "no existence."

The conflict with Cain and Abel helps clarify this basic faith in God that all men have been endowed with. Cain knows who God is and he understands in part that the devil is an enemy to God. "And Cain loved Satan more than God" (Moses 5:18). Cain knew who God was, but he chose Satan's plan. When Cain murdered Abel for gain he, "gloried in that which he had done, saying: I am free; surely the flocks of my brother falleth into my hand" (Moses 5:33). Cain is overjoyed that he has improved his lot and severed his connection with God. When God curses Cain, Cain does not question God's authority to do so, but offers a feeble excuse, "Satan tempted me because of my brother's flocks. And I was wroth also; for his offering thou didst accept and not mine; my punishment is greater that I can bear" (Moses 5:38). From Cain's response, one can see that Cain knows that Satan cannot save him; there is no plea for help from Satan, because Cain has certain level of faith to know that God is more powerful than Satan. Cain has knowledge and faith in the power of God and in the end surrenders to God. This clarification about Cain's level of faith is a foundational point in understanding that all human beings born on this earth have to have some level of faith in God in order to be moved to action (Mark 16: 16) (Lundwall, n. d.).

In conclusion, intention is a derivative of faith. Human beings cannot have intentions or goal-seeking behavior unless they believe that what they intend will make a difference to their existence. All the theorists recognized that human beings were intentional and since no ontology was given, it was an assumed characteristic. Faith in God is the foundation for all intention and goal-seeking action. This foundation of faith
means that we know in our experiential memory of our pre-existent life and that we have lived in a universe of divine law. In the case of Cain, he understood that he had agency to choose the devil over God and that God is more powerful than the devil. 

**Repentance is Not Mentioned.**

The concept of repentance carries religious connotations of seeking forgiveness from God, so it is not surprising that it is passed over in nearly all psychological theories, including the ones reviewed here. The term "repentance" is not mentioned, but the principle of admitting that one has made a mistake and should rectify the mistake is talked about in the theorists' work. For example, Adler had a patient who had a fear that he might have syphilis; and therefore, in consequence of that reality, should not marry. The patient had visited several doctors who diagnosed him as having no sign of syphilis. Then, he came to Dr Adler who after hearing the patient's previous history and completing the examination told the young man that he had syphilis and should break off his engagement. The young man said, in effect, that Adler was out of line since the other doctors reported he was healthy. Adler had recognized that this patient was intelligent and would soon realize Adler's intention. Sure enough, the patient came back and worked with Adler on his fear of marriage. Adler said that he could have worked on getting rid of the syphilis alibi but, "It would not have been enough to cure his symptom and release him of that particular alibi, since he would only have produced another, but by waking up his courage and by giving him faith in his own manhood, a cure was not difficult with so intelligent a fellow" (Bottome, 1957, p. 98).

In this example, one can see the obvious mistakes of the young man and why it is plain common sense to admit the error, and how that process brought a change in the
man's life. Adler expressed pragmatic, caring concern, and the young man responded by admitting his error and resolved to go on with his plans and marry. It appears legitimate to claim that a kind of repentance did take place in this case, but there was no mention of moral law or sin. Repentance, in its most general sense, is so common and such a natural process that we no longer seem to need a name for it. Just as faith seems to pervade all we do, as suggested above, so too, by other names, repentance is equally pervasive in the lives and acts of human beings. Remorse, and getting one's life right, are ubiquities in human behavior and rely on an understanding of what is expected of us as children of God. Psychological theories could profit from giving this part of life more attention.

Repentance Affects Thrownness, Time, and Consciousness.

Many psychologists assume that one can be scarred forever by experiences in the past and can never really be free of them; this reiterates the unfairness of thrownness and the negative effects of the effects of acts done by unjust people can have on others. By its very nature, repentance constitutes a change of the direction of one's life. This power to change, in spite of circumstances, is power over thrownness. Repentance is also a change in the meaning we create in our lives. Such power over meaning is a direct challenge to the overwhelming pressure of thrownness. Thrownness is no longer hopelessness, and because we can genuinely change the direction and thrust of life there is time to do all that is needed. Alma taught, "And we see that death comes upon humans . . . which is the temporal death; nevertheless there was a space granted unto man in which he might repent; therefore this life became a probationary state; a time to prepare to meet God; a time to prepare for that endless state which has been spoken of by us, which is after the resurrection of the dead" (Alma 12:24). Being or Dasein is always, at
least at its foundation, hopeful. This is so because we can transform our lives, or have them transformed, through the principles of repentance and forgiveness, leaving our past behind, changing its consequences and thus our **thrownness**, and pressing forward "with steadfastness in Christ, having a perfect brightness of hope and a love of God and of all men" (2 Nephi 31:20). This is only possible because Jesus Christ atoned for our sins; thus creating an earth where repentance and forgiveness are possible and a perfect brightness of hope is within our reach.
Chapter 6

Conclusion

Time Theory Limitations in Developing a Theory about Humankind

Living in the present moment is formidable. It takes tremendous effort to make the choices required in each moment for the best possible outcome. Strategies are developed to make throwness more reasonable and secure. The five theorists, whose work is reviewed in this thesis, all described and explored the different strategies that human beings create to meet the challenges of living. They came up with some remarkable insights and clarification about human strategy and were devoted to clarifying this issue. There were similarities in their theories, but also many differences. However, they all had one thing in common from the perspective of the doctrine of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, in that their theories were all incomplete in describing and accounting for the lives, actions and feelings of human beings. Most assuredly, they had some valuable insights and truth in their theories, but in terms of the whole picture they all fell short. The reason is not because they were not gifted and talented enough, but because the task was impossible. They did not have access to the understanding of the origins, and, thus, the nature of human beings.

The linear time paradigm that permeates psychological theory is also not adequate to account for the multi-dimensional process of throwness. Simultaneity and spiritual time are necessary to account for the complexities of moving through the structure of time. During my time experience, which lasted only a few seconds, I received insights and revelatory understanding that would have been impossible to achieve through the
processes of linear time. In general, the behavioral sciences have ignored temporal phenomena such as these, in favor of the predictable linear time paradigm.

The primary difference between the theories offered by contemporary psychology, with which the five theorists reviewed share many characteristics, and a perspective based on LDS teachings, is that human beings are not the creators of themselves, nor are they products of a simple natural process. In an LDS perspective, we have divine origins. We are limited, by the nature of our mortal existence, to live in a world where we only know a part of the larger picture. In the Bible, the apostle Paul wrote, "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things. For now we see through a glass darkly; but then shall I know even as also I am known" (I Corinthians 13: 9-12).

Our temporal existence is only a shadow of what we are in reality. We see only a small part, we hear only a limited range of frequencies, and our sense of smell, relative to many animals is underdeveloped. We "see through a glass darkly," sensing only a part, limited also by the range of our genetics, environment, and lived experience.

The theorists were limited by the nature of their environment and personal experience. The therapists/theorists were talented in viewing human beings from different perspectives. They could transcend their particular human limitations and enlarge their view by stepping outside of their own experience to see it from their patients' vantage points. Sartre, in contrast, was a wonderful observer, but in my view, he did not transcend his peculiar view of the world. From an LDS perspective, human beings are not limited to what can be accomplished through mere human transcendence,
but rather, they can communicate and receive inspiration and revelation from God. No longer is humankind confined to earthly knowledge, but the heavens can be opened and God can share all that He has. God, being perfect and all knowing, can see the whole of existence. He experiences pure truth, which can free human beings of their restricted view (D & C 93). The prophet Joseph Smith further clarifies our dependence on God in understanding our own natures when he declares, "If men do not comprehend the character and nature of God, they do not comprehend themselves" (Smith & Galbraith, 1993, 387-8). We not only limit ourselves by not considering God, but we, according to the prophet, cannot know others or ourselves.

The problem of connecting all the moments to make a whole life is mentioned by Sartre and Binswanger, but no ontology is offered. Continuity of life is simply assumed as a product of evolution because human beings are able to sense a whole-integrated life while only living in the slice of the present. Evolutionary theory, it seems, has become a sort of theoretical dumping ground for all human unknowns, because if something exists and cannot be explained, then it has to be a product of evolution. In all fairness, religion can function as a type of dumping ground. As a result, scientific inquiry is put on hold because evolutionary theory, religion, or whatever else can fill in the gaps.

However, continuity is difficult to explain without a creator and an ontology that allows for the eternal intelligence of human beings. More is required than just connecting the moments of the present, one must account for a larger, more meaningful cosmic order. The restored gospel of Jesus Christ offers such ontology of order and purpose. Part of this order is the Light of Christ that is in all of God's creations and the Holy Ghost which, among other things, is the Comforter, Testator, Revelator, and the
Messenger of the Father and the Son. But in truth, we do not know the whole picture of how God establishes order and constancy in the universe, but we do have faith in His perfection which, in my view, is more reasonable than faith in random, chance creation.

The last limitation considered is that, whatever the choice one makes about the origin of humankind, the consequences of that choice will be inherent in one's theories. If God does exist, then denying His existence would be an incorrect description of reality. The assumptions of random creation would be in error and all the implications grounded in that assumption would, likewise, be faulty (Slife & Williams, 1995). Thus the path towards truth is diverted for it is impossible to get the whole truth when the foundation is incomplete. If human beings were limited in their knowledge about the existence of God and could not make a responsible choice, then the consequence would be simply being on the wrong path. But if humankind had enough knowledge and faith to know of God's existence, then to deny God, would put humankind in a state of deception, creating a multitude of attempts to justify the non-existence of God. These defensive measures are limiting and destructive (Warner, 2001). In the LDS perspective, "that which is from the beginning is plainly manifest unto them,...And every spirit that receiveth not the light is under condemnation" (D & C 93:31-2). One of these attempts is the alteration of the true character and nature of God. Sartre made an insightful observation about deception when he wrote, "We would have to know the truth very exactly in order to conceal it (from ourselves) more carefully" (Warner, 1986, p. 39).

Faith is Universal.

My study of the works of the theorists reviewed here left me amazed at their persistence and their dedication to unraveling the mysteries of human thought and
behavior. The consistency of their devotion and tenacity must have a source akin to faith. Yet in their theories, there is little mention of God, and in the case of Sartre, God is denied altogether. If faith is the "moving cause of all action," then these theorists were moved by some level of faith in God (Lundwall, n. d.). I believe that this is why the theorists were so driven, because they are children of God and have existed forever as intelligences. The theorists have a type of faith in God, even though they do not name it as such, nor attribute it properly, they have lived and known God far longer than their mortal existence.

Clues exist that lead to the theorists' having understood human life well enough to see the human phenomena that lead others to God. They saw and attempted to account for the fact that there is order in the universe. For example, Binswanger's description of the always-having-been is his attempt to name the phenomenon that connects all the moments together to make a whole life and a feeling of security. This is a wonderful description of how something holds the events, experiences, and the moments of this world together. Jung, in his autobiography, recognized this order when he wrote about a "solidarity underlying all existence and a continuity in my mode of being", which suggests something similar to Binswanger's always-having-been (Jung, 1963, p. 358).

Sartre revealed his belief in something beyond explanation when he discussed humanity's passion for meaning and our disillusionment when meaning was absent. He called this absence of meaning being alienated from the world, which in turn created "despair, boredom, nausea, and absurdity" (Gaarder, 1996, p. 457). Why does a lack of meaning create this absurdity? Why does it matter? The most important thing we know, according to Sartre, is that we exist. So why does meaning have to be a part of our
existence? There must be, in every person, some sense that life "ought" to mean something. Sartre's personal life was an example of this need to understand human existence. He was a prolific writer of novels, plays, biographies, philosophical works and a political theory. He never gave up his search and he never explained why he and the rest of humans are so driven to find meaning.

Adler was a tireless seeker of truth and understanding of humans. His war experiences convinced him that the only philosophy that would save humans was "loving thy neighbor as thyself." This seems to have prompted a change from a complicated mechanistic view of the mind, to an intense interest in the moral core of humans because he understood how destructive humans could be, and that survival of human civilization depended on loving one another. Adler's moral position demonstrated that he had faith in the deep spiritual meaning and values that motivated humans. His life's work was devoted to the goal of the establishment of social interest, which indicated that he understood that a moral nature pervades all of a person's choices. Adler's Law of movement was similar to thrownness, so in essence, he was saying that in that moment, what human's value, would guide all their choices.

All the theorists exemplified intentional, meaning seeking and goal-directed qualities. They made outstanding contributors in their field of interest. In my understanding, they had to have sufficient faith to believe that what they offered was important and worth doing and would make a difference in the world.

Implications of my Time Experience

In conclusion, I am convinced that the moments in the present are where the drama of life is played out. The past only has the power that the present chooses to give
it. Likewise, future expectations are also chosen in the present. The tenuousness of the present creates a continuum from fantastic opportunity to terrifying burden. Each moment the drama is replayed. There is no opportunity to stop the play and get off the stage, unless there are no more moments. Human beings are compelled to respond to each moment, which they do depending on the level of faith in God and their desire to follow Him. This reenactment of faith each moment that we live, reminds us of our fragile mortality, and, I believe, inspires us to seek for more spiritual assurance that comes from loving and knowing God and the hope of eternal life through the atonement of Jesus Christ. The forces of evil combine to destroy our faith in God. Satan comforts and persuades humankind to seek the pleasures and things of this world. Every moment the opportunity to choose God or Satan is played out, therefore, every moment is crucial.
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