Sickness Unto Death aff page 2-13

After much self-reflection, We the aff have come to the realization that the resolution has an inherent predispose assumption of what mean to be a self. The ontological question of what it mean to be, needs to address first and foremost before we ask the federal government for any policies.

Thus the Advocacy statement:

We affirm the “Kierkegaardian self”, the need and action to relate ourselves toward the spiritual divinity of God by faith.(i.e. the acknowledgment and creation of the authentic spiritual selfhood), so that we can be release form the **indefinite detention** hold on us, which is imprisoning our being.

Clarification. The term being and the self is the same word. The agent is ourselves. There no budget or timeframe. We don’t defend any fiat but we defend it passage via Faith. We are not defending any religious institution.

Contention One: The Self

**Human being is spirit but isn’t necessarily a self.**

**Anti-Climacus 49** (Christian existentialism, The Sickness Unto Death)

Human being is spirit. But what is spirit? Spirit is the self. But what is the self? The self is a relation which relates itself to its own self, or it is that in the relation [which accounts for it] that the relation relates itself to its own self; the self is not the relation but [consists in the fact] that the relation relates itself to its own self. Man is a synthesis of the infinite and the finite, of the temporal and the eternal, of freedom and necessity, in short it is a synthesis. A synthesis is a relation between two factors. So regarded, man is not yet a self.

In the relation between two, the relation is the third term as a negative unity, and the two relate themselves to the relation, and in the relation to the relation; such a relation is that between soul and body, when man is regarded as soul. If on the contrary the relation relates itself to its own self, the relation is then the positive third term, and this is the self.

Such a relation which relates itself to its own self (that is to say, a self) must either have constituted itself or have been constituted by another.

\*ie, the self is a verb not a noun.

**It is the duty of all human being to self-relate itself towards God. The failure or refusal causes despair.**

**Smith 04** ( Dr Graham M,. Lecturer in Political Theory at the University of Leeds, Kierkegaard from the point of view of the political) http://his.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/haoli/119/29.pdf

Whilst the concern with selfhood links Kierkegaard to some of the wider currents of philosophical speculation we can identify three distinctive aspects of selfhood which help to differentiate Kierkegaard’s account from that of other thinkers. First, selfhood is not simply a matter for philosophical speculation.14 For Kierkegaard, selfhood must be understood (or more correctly apprehended) existentially. Second, selfhood must be understood as a religious category. That is to say, Kierkegaard situates his notion of the self as a spiritual entity in relation to God. Finally, Kierkegaard understands selfhood not to be a passive phenomenon or process, but a task. In Kierkegaard’s account, it is the task of every human being to actively attempt to become an individual self. In other words, it is the task of every human being to attempt to stand in correct relation with God. Such a relationship is characterised as faith. It is the failure of the self to relate in the correct way to God (and from this point to others) which is the manifestation of despair.

**Modern despairing politics is manifested by the rationality of the self-interested individual for the purpose of herding together in the crowd.**

**Smith 04** ( Dr Graham M,. Lecturer in Political Theory at the University of Leeds, Kierkegaard from the point of view of the political) http://his.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/haoli/119/29.pdf

In what follows we will re-construct Kierkegaard’s account of authentic community, and how this informs his criticisms of the politics and sociality of modernity. Specifically, we will see how Kierkegaard argues that modern politics is dominated not by individuals recognizing each other as spiritual equals before God, but by the instincts and rationality of ‘natural man’. Just as there is a correct form of selfhood of which despair is a misrelation, so too can we consider Kierkegaard to have a normative view of societal and political relations. Such a normative view would place these relations under the category of spirit: and to deviate from this category must therefore place relations in a condition of despair. Kierkegaard can be understood to contrast a genuine form of edifying community consisting of responsible individuals relating to each other as spiritual equals, to the despairing individuality of modern politics which manifests in the anonymous and levelling force of a self-interested ‘herd’ or ‘the Crowd’.

**Until we realign our relation towards God, modern politics is and all actions, projects, and plan texts with be mired in despair.**

**Smith 04** (Dr Graham M,. Lecturer in Political Theory at the University of Leeds, Kierkegaard from the point of view of the political) http://his.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/haoli/119/29.pdf

So, despair is the failure to achieve the correct form of relational selfhood, but the fact that humans are capable of despair is grounds for the hope of selfhood, and the indication that it is possible. For Kierkegaard this selfhood is a relation with God, a relation which is expressed as the freedom of becoming. This selfhood must be continuously reaffirmed and is threatened by the ever present possibility of despair.54 Additionally, this relational self must also constitute its relation to God with correct relations with others, and the starting point for this is to recognize the other as a neighbour.55 In doing so, Kierkegaard means that we must recognize the other as a spiritual self with the capacity to recognize and accept its relationship to God, and the realization of this in the socio-political sphere as the treating of others as spiritual ends and equals.56 Until this most basic and foundational of tasks is attended to, Kierkegaard believes all other projects will be mired in despair. It is the tragedy of modern politics that it is dominated by the concerns of natural man, who fails to recognize this.

Contention Two: The Crowd

**What is need is for the individual to transcend their understanding of themselves by relating their self to god, only then can an actual authentic community come forth.**

**Smith 04** ( Dr Graham M,. Lecturer in Political Theory at the University of Leeds, Kierkegaard from the point of view of the political) http://his.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/haoli/119/29.pdf

What then does Kierkegaard have in mind when he talks about community? For Kierkegaard community is certainly more than a simple association. Unsurprisingly, community does not amount to the sum of the relations of homo economicus pursuing narrow self interest or utility. Kierkegaard is looking for something more binding than the accident and temporality of these interests and desires. Nor does community amount to individuals simply subscribing to the same idea or procedure. Whilst individuals must share or relate to the same idea in order to form a community, the idea has to be both chosen and unchanging in order for the community to be stable. Thus, community does not exist simply because individuals subscribe to popular or widespread ideas (such as liberalism, democracy, ‘humanity’, ethical duty, or even ‘Christianity’).61 Community can only truly exist because of the nature of the ideas adhered to, and the nature of that adherence. For Kierkegaard, the only ‘idea’ which can achieve this is that of God, and individuals must relate to God in a spiritual way, and not simply reflectively or passionately. As a result, what is needed, in Kierkegaard’s view, is that individuals transcend an understanding of themselves as mere ‘natural men’ who limit their associations to utility or base it upon the dictates of an earthly or rational ethics. These lights will either lead the individual to empty categories such as the idea of ‘humanity’ and ‘equality’ which drains the spirituality of others and the individual’s responsibility towards the actual individuals that they encounter;62 or to the hidden self-love which characterize friendship and civic communities.63

**None spiritual community are doom to failure form being in despair.**

**Smith 04** ( Dr Graham M,. Lecturer in Political Theory at the University of Leeds, Kierkegaard from the point of view of the political) http://his.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/haoli/119/29.pdf

For Kierkegaard, then, in order for true community to exist individuals must first understand and embrace the spiritual task of selfhood. It is this task which enables the individual to understand the true relationship between their temporal and spiritual aspects and how to correctly relate these to God. Selfhood free of any misrelation provides the model for an individual’s understanding and relationship with all others.64 Just as the individual must come to understand that they are both temporal and spiritual, and that they stand before God, so too must they recognize that all others share these characteristics, and the characteristic of being a ‘single individual’. Thus it is selfhood which provides the dynamics for a positive ethical religious basis in a community with others, the foundations of true individuality, and the only possible stable and unchanging foundation for them both: God. To base community on any other foundation is to base it merely in the temporal. Thus, individuals never succeed in overcoming their status as ‘natural men’ and do not truly become selves even if they achieve a rational morality. Such foundations for community are doomed to failure. They are subject to change, limit human enterprise and communion to the purely earthly, fail to recognize others as spiritual beings, and elevate the temporal to the status of the eternal. As such, they represent a form of misrelation with God: in other words, despair.

Contention Three: The Individual

**Even if we fall short of the ideal, we ought to take that inwardness set to turn ourselves to God, the truth.**

**Smith 04** ( Dr Graham M,. Lecturer in Political Theory at the University of Leeds, Kierkegaard from the point of view of the political) http://his.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/haoli/119/29.pdf

Thus, the responsible individual has a personal relationship with God and the truth. They recognize what they both should be, and are aware that they fall short of this ideal. They are therefore capable of forming a responsibility that is responsive to the needs of their spiritual equals or neighbors. The Christian must make a stand that Christianity exists, even if they fall short of the ideal. To make such a stand is not to please, side with, or be followed by the Crowd, but to act in accordance with inwardness.

**The formula for faith is this: in relating to yourself, you want to be yours self, but while grounded with the Divine. Thus, faith is the sum of 3 facts: self-reflection, acceptance, and relating your self-relation to God. To live in the spiritual poet-existence.**

**Anti-Climacus 49** (Christian existentialism, The Sickness Unto Death)

Although in this Second Part, and especially in this section, there is no place or occasion for psychological description, there here may be introduced, as the most dialectical borderline between despair and sin, what one might call a poet-existence in the direction of the religious, an existence which has something in common with the despair of resignation, only that the conception of God is involved. Such an existence (as is to be seen from the conjunction and position of the categories) will be the most eminent poet-existence. From a Christian standpoint such an existence (in spite of all aesthetic) is sin, it is the sin of poetizing instead of being, of standing in relation to the Good and the True through imagination instead of being that, or rather existentially striving to be it. The poet-existence here in question is distinguished from despair by the fact that it includes the conception of God or is before God; but it is prodigiously dialectical, and is in an impenetrable dialectical confusion as to how far it is conscious of being sin. Such a poet may have a very deep religious need, and the conception of God is included in his despair. He loves God above everything, God is for him the only comfort in his secret torment, and yet he loves the torment, he will not let it go. He would so gladly be himself before God, but not with respect to this fixed point where the self suffers, there despairingly he will not be himself; he hopes that eternity will remove it, and here in the temporal, however much he suffers under it, he cannot will to accept it, cannot humble himself under it in faith. And yet he continues to hold to God, and this is his only happiness, for him it would be the greatest horror to have to do without God, "it would be enough to drive one to despair"; and yet he permits himself commonly, but perhaps unconsciously, to poetize. God, making him a little bit other than He is, a little bit more like a loving father who all too much indulges the child’s "only wish." He who became unhappy in love, and therefore became a poet, blissfully extolls the happiness of love -- so he became a poet of religiousness, he understands obscurely that it is required of him to let this torment go, that is, to humble himself under it in faith and to accept it as belonging to the self -- for he would hold it aloof from him, and thereby precisely he holds it fast, although doubtless he thinks (and this, like every other word of despair, is correct in the opposite sense and therefore must be understood inversely) that this must mean separating himself from it as far as possible, letting it go as far as it is possible for a man to do so. But to accept it in faith that he cannot do, or rather in the last resort he will not, or here is where the self ends in obscurity. But like that poet’s description of love, so this poet’s description of the religious possesses an enchantment, a lyrical flight, such as no married man’s description has, nor that of his Reverence. What he says is not untrue, by no means, his representation reflects his happier, his better ego. With respect to the religious he is an unhappy lover, that is, he is not in a strict sense a believer, he has only the first prerequisite of faith, and with that an ardent longing for the religious. His collision is essentially this: is he the elect, is the thorn in the flesh the expression for the fact that he is to be employed as the extraordinary, is it before God quite as it should be with respect to the extraordinary figure he has become? or is the thorn in the flesh the experience he must humble himself under in order to attain the universal human? But enough of this. I can say with the emphasis of truth, "To whom am I talking?" Who will bother about such psychological investigations carried to the nth power? The Nüremburg Picture Books painted by priests are easily understood; one and all, they resemble, deceptively, people as they generally are, and, spiritually understood, nothing.

Contention Four: The Present

**The Crowd created this mass illusion of democracy, which in the present age become this tyranny that has turn our lives into Hell.**

**Smith 04** ( Dr Graham M,. Lecturer in Political Theory at the University of Leeds, Kierkegaard from the point of view of the political) http://his.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/haoli/119/29.pdf

Whilst for Kierkegaard there is a link between the inward and outward relations of a normative spiritual self, clearly modern politics, and especially mass democracy, fail to reflect this task of responsibility, truth and selfhood in any way. The characteristics of modern politics (as manifest in liberalism and democracy) is that it works against hierarchy, place, and purpose. Moreover, the Crowd also work against this realization: The Crowd stands for the many and is pitted against the individual. As such, the Crowd posits nothing over something. Mass democracy is the manifestation of this phenomena; a phenomena which contributes towards an age which is not devoid of passion and re-action, but which is devoid of meaningful reflection, action and responsibility.99 Mass democracy is the tool of the Crowd and enables it to tyrannies over the individual. In addition, whilst lacking responsibility, the anonymous mass is more powerful than any despot. Indeed, the Crowd represents a new form of tyranny.100 This form of tyranny is more insipid and debilitating than the more commonly recognized form, as from the Crowd there is no place to hide, nor is there a decisive point reached where the tyrant is seen to be defeated; or we are defeated by the tyrant.101 What is most diabolical about this new form of tyranny is that the Crowd destroys the character of the oppressed.102 Whereas with an individual tyrant it is possible to relate to an idea, there is no such possibility in a ‘people’s government’ as due to its very nature it is not clear who the ruler is, and what their principles are. As Kierkegaard ruefully warns:

A people’s government is the true picture of hell. For even if one could last out its torment, it would still be a relief if one got permission to be alone; but the torment is that ‘‘the others’’ tyrannies over one.103

**Without the religious center foundation toward god, all transformation of the self are doomed to failure.**

**Smith 04** ( Dr Graham M,. Lecturer in Political Theory at the University of Leeds, Kierkegaard from the point of view of the political) http://his.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/haoli/119/29.pdf

It is this equality that is striven for by the political programmes of the Present Age (even though they are mistaken about what ‘‘equality’’ means).115 However, in Kierkegaard’s view, these programmes are doomed to failure in the respect that they fail to provide adequate grounds for the transformation of self, and self-other relations. Indeed, they mistakenly focus on external relations to fulfil this task. For Kierkegaard this view fails to be informed by a notion of spirit, and treats men not as true individuals, but instead mistakes true individuality and equality for ‘replication’. For Kierkegaard, nowhere is this more true than in his own bourgeois Copenhagen.

Contention Five: The Politics

**Present age politics fails to heal humanity. It only create politics rooted in despair, which undermine the emergence of a true authentic community.**

**Smith 04** ( Dr Graham M,. Lecturer in Political Theory at the University of Leeds, Kierkegaard from the point of view of the political) http://his.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/haoli/119/29.pdf

Finally, we might reflect that Kierkegaard claimed that ‘In these times everything is politics’.126 It is a claim that points to the misunderstanding of the religious and the pathways to the religious in modern times. However, the statement itself dissolves the concept of the political before our very eyes. By pointing to the absence and misunderstanding about what it means to talk about and to be religious,

Kierkegaard is also alerting us to our misunderstanding concerning what it means to talk about and to be political. Whilst Kierkegaard can claim that everything is politics, he also reminds us that nothing is politics. That is to say, both the truly political and the truly religious are spirited away under the conditions of modernity: neither can exist as the foundations for both spheres have been lost along with the subject’s understanding of what is involved is becoming a ‘‘self’’. In short, for Kierkegaard, in modernity people fail to recognize what they are, and the seriousness of the task of selfhood itself. Without a proper understanding of self-there can be no possibility of politics.127 Politics can, at best, be an arena for reaching decision; but it cannot do more than that. Crucially, it does not achieve the truth, and it cannot forge the good citizen or ‘heal’ humanity. However, Kierkegaard’s concern is that liberal democracy even fails to reach adequate decision. For Kierkegaard, this is a double problem as not only does modern politics provide a bad form of reaching decision (which should be the pursuit of the individual), but it also acts to threaten any decision at all. The confusion of the Crowd, its inability to articulate or relate to the ideal, and its failure to understand the spiritual aspects of the human, lead not only to a bad politics, but also despair. In Kierkegaard’s thought the Crowd is an abstract power that not only diverts us from true selfhood and community, but also acts to undermine the conditions in which selfhood and a true community and politics could emerge.

Solvency

**The Kierkegaardian Self, a selfhood base on faith open up the sphere on modern politics to transform it into an authentic sociality in which we can engage with the other truly.**

**Smith 04** ( Dr Graham M,. Lecturer in Political Theory at the University of Leeds, Kierkegaard from the point of view of the political) http://his.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/haoli/119/29.pdf

So far we have outlined Kierkegaard’s account of selfhood and the condition of despair. Crucially, we have seen that this account of selfhood is one which recognizes that the human parts of the person (physical and psychical) have to be related with the spiritual. The individual achieves selfhood by relating in the correct way to God (faith). Failure to achieve selfhood, that is a misrelation to God, is characterized as despair (sin). Thus, Kierkegaard maintains that the human being has both an animal nature and a divine nature. It is important to recognize that for Kierkegaard the animal nature of man is not something which has to be expunged.58 Indeed, this is an impossible task. The task of selfhood is the task of relating in the correct way to both the temporal and eternal, human and divine. However, Kierkegaard does not intend this self-realization to simply be an inward turn. Indeed, the individuation process that selfhood engenders necessarily brings the individual into relation with others.Kierkegaard is at pains to point out that inner transformation results in a change in the way in which the individual both views and acts towards others.59 Others must be viewed as spiritual equals. In making this move Kierkegaard lays the foundations for an account of an authentic sociality, and a critique of the basis of modern politics.

**The selfhood base on God provides the ONLY foundation for a stable selfhood and community.**

**Smith 04** ( Dr Graham M,. Lecturer in Political Theory at the University of Leeds, Kierkegaard from the point of view of the political) http://his.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/haoli/119/29.pdf

For Kierkegaard, then, in order for true community to exist individuals must first understand and embrace the spiritual task of selfhood. It is this task which enables the individual to understand the true relationship between their temporal and spiritual aspects and how to correctly relate these to God. Selfhood free of any misrelation provides the model for an individual’s understanding and relationship with all others.64 Just as the individual must come to understand that they are both temporal and spiritual, and that they stand before God, so too must they recognize that all others share these characteristics, and the characteristic of being a ‘single individual’. Thus it is selfhood which provides the dynamics for a positive ethical religious basis in a community with others, the foundations of true individuality, and the only possible stable and unchanging foundation for them both: God. To base community on any other foundation is to base it merely in the temporal. Thus, individuals never succeed in overcoming their status as ‘natural men’ and do not truly become selves even if they achieve a rational morality.65 Such foundations for community are doomed to failure. They are subject to change, limit human enterprise and communion to the purely earthly, fail to recognize others as spiritual beings, and elevate the temporal to the status of the eternal. As such, they represent a form of misrelation with God: in other words, despair.

**Essence precedes politics.**

**Smith 04** ( Dr Graham M,. Lecturer in Political Theory at the University of Leeds, Kierkegaard from the point of view of the political) http://his.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/haoli/119/29.pdf

Finally, we might reflect that Kierkegaard claimed that ‘In these times everything is politics’.126 It is a claim that points to the misunderstanding of the religious and the pathways to the religious in modern times. However, the statement itself dissolves the concept of the political before our very eyes. By pointing to the absence and misunderstanding about what it means to talk about and to be religious,

Kierkegaard is also alerting us to our misunderstanding concerning what it means to talk about and to be political. Whilst Kierkegaard can claim that everything is politics, he also reminds us that nothing is politics. That is to say, both the truly political and the truly religious are spirited away under the conditions of modernity: neither can exist as the foundations for both spheres have been lost along with the subject’s understanding of what is involved is becoming a ‘‘self’’. In short, for Kierkegaard, in modernity people fail to recognize what they are, and the seriousness of the task of selfhood itself. Without a proper understanding of self-there can be no possibility of politics.127 Politics can, at best, be an arena for reaching decision; but it cannot do more than that. Crucially, it does not achieve the truth, and it cannot forge the good citizen or ‘heal’ humanity. However, Kierkegaard’s concern is that liberal democracy even fails to reach adequate decision. For Kierkegaard, this is a double problem as not only does modern politics provide a bad form of reaching decision (which should be the pursuit of the individual), but it also acts to threaten any decision at all. The confusion of the Crowd, its inability to articulate or relate to the ideal, and its failure to understand the spiritual aspects of the human, lead not only to a bad politics, but also despair. In Kierkegaard’s thought the Crowd is an abstract power that not only diverts us from true selfhood and community, but also acts to undermine the conditions in which selfhood and a true community and politics could emerge.

1AC Framework 1/1

**1)** Role of the Ballet**, Who best creates a methodology to fixing the despair, and must best acted upon fixing it, to become an authentic self.**

**Anti-Climacus 49** (Christian existentialism, The Sickness Unto Death)

This is the situation in despair. And however thoroughly it eludes the attention of the despairer, and however thoroughly the despairer may succeed (as in the case of that kind of despair which is characterized by unawareness of being in despair) in losing himself entirely, and losing himself in such a way that it is not noticed in the least -- eternity nevertheless will make it manifest that his situation was despair, and it will so nail him to himself that the torment nevertheless remains that he cannot get rid of himself, and it becomes manifest that he was deluded in thinking that he succeeded. And thus it is eternity must act, because to have a self, to be a self, is the greatest concession made to man, but at the same time it is eternity’s demand upon him.

Delude: impose a misleading belief upon (someone); deceive; fool

**2)** Role of the ballet solvency**: As soon as the illusion is broken then it is clear that despair was lying underneath the whole time. Ignorance of despair is a negativity that you have to pass through to cure the despair.**

**Anti-Climacus 49** (Christian existentialism, The Sickness Unto Death)

Compared with the person who is conscious of his despair, the despairing individual who is ignorant of despair is simply negativity further away from the truth and deliverance. Despair itself is a negativity; ignorance of it, a new negativity. However, to reach the truth, one must go through every negativity, for the old legends about breaking certain magic spell is true: the piece has to be played through backwards or the spell is not broken. However, it is in only one sense, in purely dialectic sense, that the individual who is ignorant of his despair is further form the truth and deliverance than one who knows it and yet remains in despair, for in another sense, an ethical-dialectical sense the person who is conscious of his despair and remain in it is further form deliverance because his despair is more intensive. Yet ignorance is so far form breaking the despair or changing despair to nondespair that it can in fact be the most dangerous form of despair, To his own demoralization, the individual who is ignorance is in despair is in a way secured against becoming aware- that is, he is altogether secure in the power of despair.

**3)** Out Method is Key: **The only method to fix despair.**

**Anti-Climacus 49** (Christian existentialism, The Sickness Unto Death)

The forms of despair must be discoverable abstractly by reflecting upon the factors which compose the self as a synthesis. The self is composed of infinity and finiteness. But the synthesis is a relationship, and it is a relationship which, though it is derived, relates itself to itself, which means freedom. The self is freedom. But freedom is the dialectical element in the terms possibility and necessity.

Extra 1AC Framework READ ONLY IF YOU HAVE TIME IF NOT READ AT 2AC

**Rejection of to take the leap of faith toward the divine is cowardice, it destroy the potentiality of human.**

**Kierkegaard** (Soren, Danish Philosopher of existentialism, Dare to Decide)

Cowardice settles deep in our souls like the idle mists on stagnant waters. From it arise unhealthy vapors and deceiving phantoms. The thing that cowardice fears most is decision; for decision always scatters the mists, at least for a moment. Cowardice thus hides behind the thought it likes best of all: the crutch of time. Cowardice and time always find a reason for not hurrying, for saying, “Not today, but tomorrow”, whereas God in heaven and the eternal say: “Do it today. Now is the day of salvation.” The eternal refrain of decision is: “Today, today.” But cowardice holds back, holds us up. If only cowardice would appear in all its baseness, one could recognize it for what it is and fight it immediately.

**The continuation of relying on the State as a source to fix problem to restore human life and value is wrong. It can only be solved by the individual human spirit that embraces the Kierkegaardian self**

**Sea of Faith 84** (BBC documentary, "Sea of Faith" on Kierkegaard) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hQlhRaXO110

Why Kierkegaard did ended his life with such a savage assault on Christianity? He was attacking an illusion, the establish Church was supporting the rapid modernization of Danish Society, in the believe that the new liberal state would be a continuation of Christianity by other means. Kierkegaard says no, that is a fatal error. The modern state is secular through and through and a church marry to it that will end to it by losing sight of its own gospel. The problem of meaning and value is not going to be solved in future by the socialist order. We are not going to have God giving us as a birth right rather Christianity is force back to its original starting point in the individual heart and conscience. Marx’s of course agrees that man has come of age that the world is purely human and secular and we face a conscience crisis in value. But for Marx value is a function of our objective social relations. Change thought politically and the problem of restoring value to human life is solved. The divergences between Kierkegaard and Marx during the 1840’s remain fundament to us until this day. Some of us are instinctively political; to other it is equally obvious that the problem of finding a philosophy of life and a faith to live by today is in the end a religious problem. That could only be solved by within the individual human spirit. But those who think Kierkegaard is right have better count the costs. In order to save the traditional sense of life ultimate religious importance, he squeezes the whole traditional doctrine with it whole super natural and in deed cosmic conflict within the narrow compass of the human soul. This certainty had the effect of heightening subjectivity but at a price. The Kierkegaardian self-remain a theater of conflict all its life.