Courage/Couragelessness:

Rethinking the Fear/Fearlessness Dialectic

Luke Barnesmoore & **R. Michael Fisher**[1]
USA-Canada

[*Sen. Ed.'s Note*: What happens to reading, writing, comprehension, when an anarchist-nomadic inquiry (Barnesmoore) and an exile positioning outside the 'Fear' Matrix (Fisher) combines... ? Well, the following is what happens... which is in many ways a bit like encountering a surrealist painting.... One best not expect anything too 'ordinary' for your left-brains to find comfort. This intense piece is really quite a trip 'beyond'].

Pre-Ramble: Superiority, an Abysmal Conflation of Metaphysical Reality

The net of problems of injustice in the world, past, present and in the oncoming future-present are characteristically rooted in the many and varied contextual manifestations of the superiority-supremacism form. In search of the metaphysical pathology hidden by the banal invisibility of Western thought (worldview/ideologies) for Western subjects, the authors critically recognize, conceptualize and unveil the superiority-supremacism form, the conflation of dualistic and nondualistic phenomena, and the all too common synthesis of superiority-supremacism and the conflation of dualistic/nondualistic phenomena that form an essential aspect of the Colonial Modernist Worldview (C.M. Worldview ; see Barnesmoore 2018) as a critique of Western knowledge and conceptions of human history manufactured therein.

Dualistic phenomena like 'light and dark' are conflated with non-dualistic phenomena like 'good and evil,' which ought to, preferably, be described as good and privation of the good. This conflation—when fused with supremacist logics that lead to valorization of one-side of natural dualities (light/male) as superior to the other side of natural dualities (dark/female)—manufactures a neurotic subjectivity that is deprived of its natural goodness, and tends to manufacture a near-totalizing paranoic-phallic lens (as if 'natural') [2] on reality—driven by mostly unconscious fear patterning (i.e., an unfilled liminal vacuum-void). 'Versus' (i.e., againstness) is transmitted from the metaphysical positioning of the Artificial-Domineering Worldview

---

[1] We acknowledge the valuable thoughts of Four Arrows (*aka* Dr. Don T. Jacobs) offered during the creation of this article in the early stages. Before Fisher was brought on as co-author, there is the original manuscript "Courage and Couragelessness" (Barnesmoore 2019). Prior FearTalks (video dialogues) of Barnesmoore & Fisher (2019, 2019a) are supplementary to many things in this article.

[2] From a matrixial critical theory view: "The language of representation [in A. D. Worldview], and especially the contemporary one that has armed the eye at the expense of the eye's other possibilities, is a paranoic language disguised as neutral [i.e., naturalized, normalized] and transparent. Armed with the [fear-based, unfilled liminal vacuum-void] phallic gaze we read what we see through the screen of paranoia [i.e., paranoic subjectivities] while we believe that there is no screen at all" (Ettinger 2009, p. 6).

(A.D. Worldview)—of which the C.M. Worldview is but the latest incarnation (Barnesmoore 2018, 2018a)—into our world *via* the hierarchical ways of knowing that emerge from this conflation.

Light becomes associated with Goodness, Darkness with Evil; so (too often) is masculinity associated with goodness and femininity associated with evil—this supremacist imbalance leads to and emerges from an ontological deep fear of ceasing to be—a fear that inspires a perverse desire (obsessive need) to disempower, devalue, conquer and colonize the natural order of motion, and qualities of change, difference and irregularity (e.g. the desire/need to conquer death) through hierarchical imposition of artificially unitary and regular order[1]—this desire for artificially unitary and regular order leads sustention to be known as superior to destruction and creation—it leads creation and destruction to be subdued to the purposes of sustention.

New contextually adapted iterations of the A.D. Worldview are manufactured to sustain the illusion of reform through the process of genocidal assimilation, and destruction is saved for those who try to step beyond the boundaries of the A.D. Worldview. The (mythic) twins have been sundered and dissociation prevails; the sands of time have been sequestered; Cain (Life-Light) kills Abel (Birth/Death-Darkness); Vishnu is caged, disfigured by the disconnection that arises from the hierarchically imposed solitude of the throne, perpetually attempting to manufacture an artificial replica (simulacra) of the Eternal in manifestation through perpetual obsessive domination of the natural order of difference and irregularity, perpetually fearing the return of Shiva because he has forgotten that Brahma emerges from her womb, the masculine archon perpetually fearing the feminine divine/goddesses, perpetually fearing the over-crowding brought on by Brahma when unbalanced by Shiva—Brahma and Shiva are in chains, brought into the light of day only when their force can be enslaved to Vishnu's perverse fear-based quest towards perpetual sustention in passing time and physical space arrest the creation-destruction dialectic. Vishnu's throne lies in the Natural History Museum, the physical embodiment of the C.M. Worldview's drive to sustention in passing time and physical space through domination of the natural order of creation-destruction. (Haraway 1989; Barnesmoore 2016)

At the heart of this conflation of dualistic phenomena with non-dualistic phenomena lies an insidious lack of metaphysical nuance in discerning between things like *goodness* that have a selfsubsistent existence—in and of themselves—and privations like *evil* that have no such basis within the Nothing-Infinite Eternal (NIE). With this conflation as context for critique, and serving as analytical lens, Barnesmoore argues that the *fear/fearlessness* dialectic, utilized as a core premise in Fisher's theorizing, could (though not necessarily) lead people to fall into this trap of assigning selfsubsistance to a privation (fear) and describing a reality that has selfsubsistance (fearlessness) as a privation. On the contrary, *fear* is a privation (the -lessness), an unfilled liminal vacuum-void. *Fearlessness* is, rather than a privation of fear, a state of *eternal courage(love/truth/trust/wonder/etc.)* that is fomented through healthy intimacy with the NIE. *Fear* ensues when a moment of shock and the liminal vacuum-void produced by the moment of shock goes unfilled—(the spirit of) fearlessness ensues when the liminal vacuum-void is effortlessly-stresslessly filled by the NIE (by what Four Arrows often describes as radical "fearless" faith/trust in the universe).

---

[1] See Fisher's A-ness (artificial-mechanical aesthetic pattern) in contradistinction to D-ness (natural-organic aesthetic pattern) research (Fisher 2012) and Barnesmoore (2018a) exploration of the relationship between the history of cities/agriculture and this desire to manufacture artificial unity and regularity through domination of the natural order of difference and irregularity.

In summary, Barnesmoore's argument leaves room for "natural fear"[1] with a poignant cautionary. The translation of this theorization of natural fear into concrete action in this world, wickedly complicated by the reality that the natural state of fear described by Barnesmoore's theorization, has been historically perverted by a worldview (A.D.) and associated system of hierarchical domination that—in their attempts to help the sprouts of our innate-instinctual virtue (e.g., eternal courage, fearlessness, directed towards protection of the sacred) 'grow' through pulling on them through traumatization *via* punishment and fear of punishment (and fear of fear itself; fear of fearlessness itself; fear of the eternal[2]). Such unhelpful helping growth as this severely governs people *en mass* through a weaponization of fear *via* artificially manufactured 'fear' and inevitably sustains the emptiness of liminal vacuum-voids *via* their ontological hierarchical-materialist assumptions concerning the nature of reality. A cancerous predatory capitalism, like all arrogant superiority-assumed ideologism, is predicated upon and foments this maintained (unnecessary) emptiness—as suffering. In this metaphysical pathology, Culture-story itself becomes the cause-and-effect of fear's perpetuation—the disease vector. The current diagnosis by many disciplines of a pervasive "culture of fear" is not without its perverse precedents in the deepest hidden curricula of the C.M. Worldview.

In this article, the authors, sometimes in agreement, sometimes not, nomadically explore the deeper recesses of Fear Studies' metaphysical foundations to set the stage for this discussion of *fear/fearlessness* v. *courage/couragelessness* and the seeming synthesis of 'fear/fearless-courage/trust/truth/love/ wonder/etc.' that has emerged from the liminal or vacuum-voids formed by the meeting of these two phrasings (in the space between the wings of the 'v'[3]).

In contradistinction to a mere normal and neutral "cultural" lens, the authors, both with strong political, ethical, activist and philosophical interests, call for and have taken on the topic of Conscious-Cultural Evolution (Ouspensky 1951; Geddes 1915; Mumford 1967; Mumford 1970; Barnesmoore 2016, 2017, 2018) as perhaps the only sane way to understand *human(ity) evolution* if we wish to create a just and sustainable social order. They both see *fear* as essential for understanding their projects of research and education and of understanding cultural evolution. Their collaboration involves a good deal of passion with one author, with a strong philosophical background, being fresh to this stream of intellectual engagement with fear (Barnesmoore) and one (Fisher) being a seasoned fearologist in this stream of intellectual engagement with fear. Both observe a general under theorization of fear in the social 'sciences' and humanities (e.g., Barnesmoore 2018c). This article takes off from a point of a Natural-Indigenous Worldview and the unity-difference, dual/nondual (Barnesmoore) and integral (Fisher) perspectives of the authors and develops a critical lens for observing ways we come to know fear in a culture whose hegemonic undercurrent is defined by the A.D. Worldview. They assert that fear in this undercurrent already undermines (i.e., taints) the very imaginaries, theories and methodologies in which we typically come to know fear, define it, and manage it.

---

[1] This is also an Indigenous perspective, as articulated by Four Arrows' philosophical interpretation where "Nature" is said to be our best ultimate teacher about fear and courage (Fisher, 2018a, p. 264)—because nature's fear is not twisted and/or constructed within the vacuum-voids of human "Culture."

[2] "Fear of the eternal" has been previously discussed, in relation to development of "law" *via* "hierarchical security" (Fisher & Barnesmoore 2018).

[3] Preferring a 'v' instead of 'vs.' (versus) signifier: the point where the two lines meet in the letter 'v' is the state of being that we are trying to describe with different words (fearlessness and eternal-courage/trust/truth/love/wonder/etc.)—our different words are the two lines—we are coming from different angles towards the same point, using different words to describe the same fearless state of being—the new phrasing, fearless-truth/love/trust/wonder/courage/etc., embodies the energy that is created by the friction that is created in the liminal space between the two wings of the 'v' (i.e., in the womb) as the two phrasings rub against each other.

INTRODUCTION

> Philosophy is a battle against the bewitchment of our intelligence by means of language.   -Ludwig Wittgenstein[1]

We must of course avoid naturalizing Wittgenstein's conception of the relationship between language and philosophy, which is surely contextual to the hierarchically domineering historical subjectivities (Foucault 1972) that have been manufactured by the MegaMachine (Mumford 1967, 1970) (e.g., A. D. Worldview and the hierarchical civilizations it spawns); but we live in a context where elite class actors seek to enslave life on earth through a synthesis of "bewitchment"[2] and "disenchantment"[3] (Herman 2008). Philosophy, in our contexts, can also be seen as a battle against the bewitchment *via* our fear (a bewitchment that ought to be contradicted by means of a mature and intelligent fearlessness) and the disenchantment of our world that divides us from the NIE that ought to fill the liminal vacuum-void that we associate with moments of shock. At least that's a potential reframing of Wittgenstein's cautionary that excites the imaginary by which we engage philosophy and, by which we share this article as (r)evolutionary project—a movement towards a guidance and awakening of the natural process of Conscious-Cultural Evolution (Geddes 1915; Ouspensky 1951; Barnesmoore 2016, 2017) whose potential is constrained and in some cases negated[4] by the A.D. Worldview that much of humanity has been enslaved to for the last several millennia (from Washington D.C. to London to Paris to Rome to Athens to Babylonian Egypt to Babylon the Great to Sumer to the Indus Valley to the Yellow Emperor's China and beyond into other such falling empires/ hierarchical civilizations).

Amongst the traditional *status quo* and new scholarship on the study of fear, Fisher (e.g., 2010) has pursued a particular "*philosophy of fearlessness*" (Fisher 2018),[5] which is arguably unparalleled. It directly confronts and contradicts a largely fear-based Western (Enlightenment) philosophy/ worldview.[6] It also acknowledges that despite the inherited legacy of philosophical

---

[1] Cited in Brown (1958, p. 71). Brown also remarked on Cassirer's view of language as essentially "metaphorical" and a mode of "erotic expression" that succumbs to the domination of the reality-principle (p. 70)—the latter, linked to the Dominant worldview as discussed in this article. Any talk about "fear" ought to be metaphorical as well as literal in order to keep ourselves from becoming over-dosed with rationalism and its domination tendencies we may unconsciously bring into the investigation of fear *via* the Dominant worldview.

[2] Equally intertwined with 'bewitchment' is a mass hypnosis (see Four Arrows, 2016, Chapter 1; and Fisher, 2018, p. 2). Recently Four Arrows called it "hypnotic trance-logical self-protection 'programming'" (pers. comm., Feb. 6, 2019).

[3] See our citation of Herman (2008) p. 76 below for elucidation of his use of the term *disenchanted*.

[4] As Ouspensky (1951) notes, conscious evolution is dependent upon direction of will towards actualization of inner qualities like intuition, virtue, wisdom, love, etc. Because conscious evolution is dependent upon direction of will (and will not inevitably occur without such direction of will), our transition from bio-mechanical evolution to conscious-cultural evolution creates the potential for devolution if we fail to direct our will towards conscious-cultural evolution. The A.D. Worldview leads to hierarchical relationships that kill the sprouts that we direct our will toward to facilitate conscious-cultural evolution, and the C.M. incarnation of the A.D. Worldview denies the transpersonal reality of the *spiritual self* altogether and thus constrains our ability to direct will inwards towards conscious-cultural evolution.

[5] Which has recently been revised to a "fearlessness philosophy" (Fisher 2007a, 2017, 2018) and "fearlessness psychology" (Fisher 2019a); these we will not be covering in this article as they are distinct and require study themselves but their basis is primarily situated in alignment with Fisher's prior philosophy of fearlessness writings.

[6] Also called "Dominant" worldview (e.g., Four Arrows 2016) , "Mechanical" (Barnesmoore 2016) and "Artificial" worldview (e.g., Barnesmoore 2018) and form of evolution.

"Cartesian anxiety,"[1] we ought *not* overburden Fear Studies with *only* a construct and imaginary of fear which demonizes and makes fear *only* a problem, disease or evil to be delivered from through conquest, colonization (Warrior 1989) and/or some synthesis of elimination/ assimilation therein; this cautionary point helps us to avoid the insidious seductions of hierarchical dualism—that is, a fear-based rationalism ideology glued to the biomedical, psychological and dominating clinical approach to the topic—fear management; we'll return to this later in the article, but in short our object of critique is the unnatural way that fear is experienced and responded to by the subjectivities that emerge from hierarchical civilization rather than by fear itself. Simply, we take seriously the dictum: *Fear problems will not be solved by fear-based means.*

With the *Fear Problem* as a complex network (or 'Fear' Matrix[2]), according to Fisher, a Fisherian perspective, with its corrective set of assumptions, new referents and parameters (i.e., new paradigm and/or worldview) in understanding the nature and role of fear, offers a precarious ethical path with universal applications. Fisher calls this the "*path of fearlessness*"—a developmental (soul) path *from fear to fearlessness*.[3] With a dialectical philosophy in general, f*ear/fearlessness* is posited as a co-evolving contingent phenomena in Fisher's thesis[4] for understanding not only human behavior but the system dynamics of the Kosmos itself (Fisher 2019). At the same time, as Wittgenstein alluded, fear/fearlessness or any alternative to it, is language as metaphor and not merely a phenomena in the literal sense; yet, a relationship dynamic nonetheless valuable in that it provokes and represents both potency and limitation and is always pointing to mystery, inevitably, beyond our total knowing. An intelligent, intimate, ethical and existential fearlessness, in part, requires this humble, vulnerable uncertainty and sacred epistemology[5] that embraces non-neurotically unthought knowing and ludic experimental eroticism. Simply, this article may not be an easy read. We don't expect it to be understood on a first scan by those with whom we do not hold an intimate relationship.[6]

Both authors have acknowledged the pivotal role *fear* and its management (conscious or unconscious) plays in shaping human potentials for thought, feeling, behaviour, conception of being and the conscious-cultural *(d)evolution* of these potentials, and many other thinkers have also acknowledged this in the literatures from around the world (e.g., Eneyo 2018; Subba 2014). Both authors call for an intervention "for Conscious Evolution" (Barnesmoore, 2016a, p. 113) in

---

[1] E.g., on "Cartesian Anxiety" see Varela, Thompson & Rosch (1992), pp. 133-40. For further elaboration of how fear/anxiety insidiously taints methodology and science(s), see Devereux (1967), and Maslow (1966).

[2] The more encompassing formation prior to 'Fear' Matrix is *'Fear' Project:* "a complex term [coined by Fisher in the late 1980s] that refers to the dynamic defense mechanism of fear projection but on a metaphysical (ontological) level, with implications for everyday life; its opposition [is] Fearlessness Project" (Fisher & Subba 2016, p. 156). Fisher (2010) links this to Wilber's work re: the Atman Project etc. (e.g., Wilber 1980/82).

[3] See "Path of Fearlessness: Stages of the Soul's Journey" (Figure 2.1, in Fisher 2010, p. 48).

[4] This dialectic has also been conceptualized by Fisher for some time where Love/Fear are given focus and recently he has called for a trialectic constitution as the better way to go (Fisher 2017a). In this paper we'll not explicitly engage Fisher's trialectic Love-Fearlessness-Fear thesis.

[5] Barnesmoore (2016a) pursues this specifically as "virtue epistemology" (pp. 107-09).

[6] Obviously at one level we hold an intimate relationship with all that which is, but in this case we mean 'do not hold an intimate relationship' in more grounded spatiotemporal terms that could be stated as 'those who have not spent enough time talking with us/ reading our writings to understand the nuanced meanings that are implied by our use of language'.

contradistinction to the current Colonial-Modernist trends[1] (i.e., C. M. Worldview) of most societal formations, especially in Capitalist and Communist worlds that have been conquered and colonized by unsustainable economic theologies that are perhaps most aptly described by their slavish reduction of humans to labourers and of reality to 'the world[view] of total work' (Pieper 2009).

Barnesmoore (2016a) set the stage, in summary, for an overall project of interest which both authors foreground in their research on development and planning and on fear and fear management/education:

> [I]f the human is a discrete, biological individual, what is it therefore not?.... the Modernist definition of humanity as a discrete, biological entity (Foucault, *History of Sexuality VI*) negates the potential for Conscious Evolution in defining humans in a manner that eschews [fears] the 'invisible' dimension of self. If reality consists of passing time and physical space [as 'norm' consensual reality], then Infinite Substance [NIE] is necessarily relegated to the sphere of unreality (madness). Modernism, then, negates the potential for Conscious Evolution.... We must redefine humanity and reality in terms that are sensitive to Infinite Substance [NIE] and humanity's potential for Conscious Evolution if we are going to have the (r)evolution of theory ('world view', 'mind', [heart] consciousness) necessary for the development of social systems (for the planning of social order) that will socialize the public in a manner that expands potential for Consciousness Evolution (and thus social development and ethical outcomes like environmental justice). (p. 113)

Justice in human relations with each other and with the rest of nature is dependent upon the transcendence of the illusion of discrete individuality—a justice that is made possible through the "experiences of wholeness" (Cajete 1994) like "satori" (Cleary 1991) that emerge from the process of Conscious-Cultural Evolution (Barnesmoore 2018).

Arguably, the *self-fear-Other* (tripartite) system of relationality and the underlying myth of discrete biological individuality is of great interest here as a tripartite 'unit' of analysis—as the basic pattern by which *fear* is manufactured. Fear is not merely an object (fears)—that is, 'out there' (Blaser 2013) in the 'real world' and measurable in materialistic units or psychological units. The philosophical approach to fear demands something more than reductionism's pull (*via* positivism) to control and represent that which may be largely uncontrollable and unrepresentable in terms of capturing fear totally. It also requires something more than the post-positivist, post(most)modern reduction of reality to the difference and irregularity of passing time and physical space and dismissal of the potential for any form of healthy abstraction-generalization therein[2]. The literary sensibility and poetic, the aesthetic of our inquiry, the mystery, is not

---

[1] Beyond the scope of this article, we both also critique the trends of history and the build-up to where modernism then emerged as well as contemporary societies. The cultural evolution of worldviews is foundational in our work.

[2] We can generalize an underlying order of things in the structure of systems like capitalism, western law, western democracy, etc. without assuming that everything fits within that generalized order of things—humans are good, and though these systems serve to kill the sprouts of our goodness we remain capable of breaching their limits. Abstraction of form-order from the

something we ignore. This dimension may not be featured in this article *per se,* but there is always an underlining awareness to re-imagine *fear* throughout the process of inquiry—and, to remain as aware as possible that natural fear (i.e., an ethical fear of the privation of the eternal from manifestation through destruction of the sacred) may be lying in a proverbial (metaphoric) 'black box' like Nature's essence Herself—whereby, to force open the lid and probe and cut into the 'box' to find out *what fear is*, to define it (*via* imprisoning it), may be the very act of chasing fear away from our exposure.[1]

Respectful subtlety is surely required to know fear well. The contemporary writer Lia Purpura nicely captured this tacit quality in an essay exploring her life/memories and her exposure to media re: the uncaught "sniper" in her city, in the *space between*:

> Where is the fear this afternoon? Where did it go and why can't I locate it now?.... What is it that took this morning over, washed it with a morning past and by that breath, kept from it the fear....[2]

Redefining humanity through recourse to the 'invisible self' (Nicoll 1989), whose ontological status the C.M. Worldview denigrates, is compatible with the Fisherian project for a holistic-integral philosophy and psychology of fearlessness. Fisher argues that philosophy and psychology ought to be shaped by fearlessness (and thus, by fear) as much as they are disciplines to be utilized (as merely a 'neutral' tool) in studying fear/fearlessness. Fisher also argues there is no one single reductionistic definition of fear or fearlessness that all can agree upon. The complexity of defining is immense because of that a specialized *epistemology of fear* is called for in our post(most)modern times (Fisher & Subba 2016; Chapter Three). Barnesmoore thinks it is possible to develop an abstract definition of fear and fearlessness that is general enough to allow for the difference and irregularity of the order of manifestation (and thus multiple contextual definitions of fear to augment the abstract-general definition)—*fearless courage* (or *eternal-courage*) arises from intimacy with the NIE, and *fear* arises when the liminal vacuum-void that emerges from the shock of a perceived potential for the privation of the eternal (sacred) is not filled or is filled by an energy that lacks eternity.

---

environment of its many manifestations allows us to understand the essence of a form (the underlying order-form that exists beyond manifestation). We abstract a form-order from the grounds of its context of manifestation as water is evaporated from the ground to form a raincloud—this abstracted cloud (abstract-general understanding of form-order) can then fall down into the grounds of the form-order's manifestation in other contexts so that we can better understand these contextual manifestations. Like any practice, abstraction-generalization has no inherent value and derives its value from the worldview that enlivens the practice—our worldview allows for both unity and difference, and does not seek to dominate difference through abstraction-generalization.

[1] This awareness is part of a critical *epistemology of fear*. Fisher has drawn on the philosopher-mystic Jiddu Krishnamurti for many years and the insights he brought to the phenomenological problems of knowing fear. For example, "Our minds are not used to seeing the total nature of fear and what is implied in it" (Krishnamurti 1991, p. 71); "when there is fear, the observer is part of that fear" (Krishnamurti 1991, p. 56); "As you can observe in yourself, you want to get rid of fear. All life is an escape from fear" (Krishnamurti 1991, p. 28). We ask: Is life to be understood as an escape from fear? Or as a journey to become intimate with the NIE (wherein fearlessness ensues)? Are we running away from fear, or towards the eternal that fills the liminal vacuum-void caused by the moments of shock from which fear emerges if we are not intimate with the eternal?

[2] Purpura (2006), pp. 114, 118.

A decolonial critical theory approach has to be utilized for Fear Studies, not merely a (so-called) 'value-neutral' approach (e.g., functionalism-pragmatism) (see Fisher, Subba, Kumar, 2018, p. 19). Everything regarding how to know fear is epistemically-politically-cosmically charged in our view. We both have asserted a general Foucauldian framework is useful: "power/ knowledge/fear" (Fisher) and "power/knowledge/worldview" (Barnesmoore) and the productive power that emerges therein as fundamental 'units' for analysis—the productive power of worldview articulates the potentials for knowing fear, and the way that we come to know fear/power and the knowledge produced therein binds us in distinct power relations. In the Roman Christian worldview we come to know fear as a tool the genocidal old white man God uses to make us good, and this knowledge of fear binds us to power relations rooted in the use of fear to hierarchically dominate others under the pretension that we are making 'the other' good through said domination. There are healthier alternatives to this Roman Christian (and Abrahamic traditional) way(s) and the stories of divine genocide of Indigenous peoples and mass murder of children from which this way(s) emerges.[1]

Other than Fisher, one of the first scholars to acknowledge the specific importance of a "philosophy of fearlessness" *per se* in the academy is Singh (1996) (who happens to be in engineering and not taking an Abrahamic path[2]). Singh, following an East-West synthesis,[3] conceives an integrated spiritual philosophy as part of a new consciousness movement (i.e., evolution of humanity) to enhance organizational life, planning, management and culture (Singh, 1996). Singh, in Barnesmoorean fashion with the emphasis on opening the mysterious pass to see from both the relative and eternal perspectives without either interfering with the other (see Cleary 1999, p. 108) speaks to the need for a humankind project[4] within human development mentalities and operations in general (i.e., to the intention for conscious-cultural evolution towards the "experiences of wholeness" (Cajete 1994) and transcendence of the illusion of discrete biological individuality, therein that make virtuous relationships with the rest of our relations possible:

> The human experience is vast, its potentials equally infinite. The past is truly endless and unfathomable, the future equally eternal.... It is this nothingness of the mind that is our only tool in the real world.... A modified philosophy and psychology are recommended for handling the organization—one that learns about the originless origins and acknowledges the breaths of higher planes of existence. The introduction of the metaphysical [i.e., 'invisible'] into the operations of societies and organizations is the only great leap forward [i.e., (r)evolution of Conscious Evolution]. The rest of management sciences—that of planning and coordinating, while necessary—fade in

---

[1] We are aware of a 'perennial philosophy' below in the esoteric mystical schools of thought within the Abrahamic traditions but we are referring here to the exoteric institutional forms.

[2] He does, however, seem to take a very similar Indo-Aryan path towards hierarchical civilization through conflation of duality/nonduality from a supremacist perspective...

[3] Singh relies heavily on the Hindu tradition and in particular the visionary integral yoga philosophy of Sri Aurobindo, and the western general systems theorists (e.g., Bertalanffy, Laszlo, etc.).

[4] We use "humankind" for convenience, we remain aware of all life/beings, the 'greater-than-human' as equally valued in this work. Fear, more or less, impacts all beings.

contrast with the benefits of cogitating to a different music and science altogether. Hence, the total self-development (TSD) of the individual in the next step for organizations, where organizations can reap the benefits of the full human potential. Total quality management (TQM) has paved the path [but was insufficient itself]...to begin to adopt the philosophy of fearlessness and transcendentalism through TSD. (Singh 1996, p. 50)

Exciting in vision to us as Singh's prophetic call is, his paper has no discussion or mention of "fearlessness" other than in the paper's abstract (strangely enough). He focuses on fear (cites Deming's principle of "elimination of fear" in Total Quality Management discourse), and prefers to talk about "courageous decisions" and "no fear,"[1] yet, without in depth nuance of fearlessness developmentally and thus, misses a fear/fearlessness dialectic as in Fisher's work. Equally, we see his model clearly lacks sensitivity to the issues of *privation-supremacism* that we address in this article below. Singh appears to posit privation as an opposite or polarity, as the *other side* of a dualism conception; rather than (as we prefer), as a privation of something that exists in and of itself (e.g., "fear void-vacuum" as labeled by Barnesmoore). He thus serves to naturalize artificially sustained privations like 'evil' (e.g., Singh (1996). He wrote, "willpower cannot exist without evil" etc., p. 51))—he thus serves to grant eternal reality to that (e.g., "evil") which is in truth a privation of eternal reality (e.g., Goodness). Typically, with best of intentions for progressive (if not spiritual) organizational and cultural evolution, Singh's discussion, like most discussion in the West (especially) is inadequate and fear remains mis- and under-theorized dialectically with fearlessness (which is likewise inadequately conceptualized or defined beyond the simplistic literal definition of "without fear" or some variant[2]).

At this point, no systematic critique of Fisher's fear/fearlessness dialectic, that he relies upon, has been developed. Herein, Barnesmoore argues for a foundational worldview critical review[3] in which a point of departure and *philosophy of courage/couragelessness (or fear/fearless courage)* that is both dual and nondual (both unitary and sensitive to difference and irregularity) is posited as a clearer and perhaps 'better' (i.e., less likely to be interpreted in a manner that grants eternal reality to a privation through attribution of duality to a nondual reality) framing for understanding fear and one's transition from *fear* to different forms of *courage*; and yet, it is intended as complementary to Fisher's project of Fear Studies and ideally solving the "Fear Problem" (e.g., Fisher 2006), with potential of aiding the global "Fearlessness Movement" (e.g., Fisher 2007)[4] that Fisher has studied and conceived historically.

We take the position generally that fear is under-theorized, across time, cultures and philosophies. hooks (2000) pronounced a similar sentiment, albeit, indirectly:

As we love, fear necessarily leaves....But we do fear and fear keeps us from trusting love. Cultures of domination rely on the cultivation of fear as a way to ensure

---

[1] E.g., Singh (1996), p. 53.

[2] A criticism we have of Deming's TQM view re: fear and "elimination of fear."

[3] Eneyo (2019) has mentioned, but not yet developed, an ontological critique on Fisher's philosophy of fearlessness (p. 45).

[4] For e.g., see http://fearlessnessmovement.ning.com

obedience. In our society [in the West at least] we make much about love and say little about fear [and, even less about fearlessness]. (pp. 93-94)

The concern we have is not merely quantitative shortage of talking about fear but more importantly a qualitative and epistemic concern (to avert epistemic violence). This article rotates on the pivotal critique of our dominant knowledge re: *fear* and concomitantly on fearlessness and love—and, courage. We're not out to prove the destructiveness of "dominant knowledge" forms *per se*, herein, as we've written lots about that elsewhere (though Barnesmoore is of course always out to destroy the dominant anything). Rather, we'll nomadically explore the path(s) that emerge, not always in straight logical linearity, as we wander in search of wonder while investigating the topic. Henceforth, we'll make sure we fall not into the *saying little about fear* as hooks reminds us, because such neglect (denial) furthers violence and oppression and is definitely not useful. That said, we also know there are times that being critical activists-philosophers ought to be 'balanced' and led by silence, by love, by walks in Nature, by listening to an owl at night, by playing on the beach, making art with children, and all kinds of arational experiences. Writing for a scholarly journal, unfortunately, tends to filter out the abject—denying often a good deal of our diverse inquiry modalities other than rational text—words—language. So too does the tyrannical discourse of "accessible writing" (Barnesmoore 2019a). We trust that this limitation is recognized for what it is, and that the study of fear is not ever totally reduced to that on the published page.

Essential to any good philosophy involving the relationships of fear/courage/fearlessness (fear/fearless courage) are the problematics of phenomenological inquiry and thinking critically through the experience of "fear" itself. Stepping inside his own experiences, Barnesmoore theorizes *fear* as the state of being which emerges from the liminal vacuum-void—created by moments of "shock-privation"[1] and the potential for the privation of manifestation's capacity to reflect the Nothing-Infinite Eternal (i.e., NIE and the sacred) that causes these moments of shock-privation—when the liminal-vacuum-void goes unfilled.[2] It sets up a potent metaphor and imaginary for investigating fear. Coarsely speaking, in this reading, fear is *not*—more than it is *not not* (i.e., a thing). Fear is 'nothing' or no-thing[3]—perhaps, fear in this sense is only discovered by traces (or ruins) of its having 'come and gone' already before we perceive, conceive and 'try'

---

[1] The moment of fear when the cry of a bird disturbs the tranquility of a dark night. The moment of shock when a tree snaps in the wind. The moment of death. All of these are reflections of the same form manifest in different environments—'as above, so below'. (Scott 1993)

[2] See Barnesmoore (2019a) for the extended conversation among Barnesmoore, Four Arrows and Fisher in/by which Barnesmoore's conception of fear in terms of a moment of shock and the liminal void-vacuum that emerges therein was developed.

[3] Be it love or fear, Krishnamurti (1991) advised "seeing what it is not; through negation [we] come to the positive" (p. 115). This negative (methodology) philosophical way is a counter to the hegemonic modern positive (positivism) philosophies of the day in which "fear" is so easily and habitually represented as a neurobiological phenomenon as if this was the *only* correct meaning and definition. This no-thing-ness quality emphasis of the negative (that is, perhaps, not even a quality) is potentially analogous in some ways to Buddhist thought and non-dual philosophy re: the relative world/reality (as *maya* or illusion) from the perspective of the Absolute Reality. Also one could make connections to the new quantum physics findings where if reality is examined in the super-micro dimensions, all is energy and 'things' disappear into waves, movements and dynamics of no-thing-ness *per se*—that is, where nouns as descriptors fail to reflect accurately physical science findings beyond Newtonian physics representations. Fisher notes that "The Nothing" is creatively conceptualized within a register of fear (ontologically) in the children's fantasy/drama 1984 movie *Never Ending Story* (written by Michael Ende, Directed by Wolfgang Petersen).

to manage it as a something. How can we use a thing like language to describe nothing? "The dao that can be spoken is not the eternal dao," says, Lao Zi (1997). *Dune's* sci-fi author Herbert (1965) enigmatically, perhaps, has articulated the trace of fear, the negative philosophical and theological idea of fear, in a famous dictum:

> I will face my fear. I will permit it to pass over me. I will turn to see fear's path. Where fear has gone, there will be *nothing*, only I will remain. [italics added for emphasis]

Fear is a Shadow?[1] Fear is a nothing/something—dialectically, and ontologically(?)—a some-thing to ponder. We'll return to some of this conundrum of teasing out theoretical meanings and their implications later in the article. We also do not want to force readers or ourselves prematurely down *only* one path or imaginary when it comes to fear and understanding fear ('fear'[2])—so, we hold and invite open-ended ontologically transparent inquiry all the way through this discussion. This is particularly important when we consider maladies like perpetual terror and depression that emerge from hierarchical civilization's weaponization of fear through artificially manufacturing liminal vacuum-voids and ensuring—through productive power—that these liminal vacuum-voids go unfilled and thus result in an artificial form of fear that is (seemingly) never transformed (by spirit) into fearlessness.

Fear-void-vacuum is metaphorically interesting, and some others have recognized this association as a way to understand fear (and hope) (e.g., Kubin 2015). We have not system-atically researched this association of terms and meanings for this inquiry, but that could be a useful trajectory for future research. *Fear* forms when the liminal *void-vacuum opens*; and, in our experience, that void either becomes filled with something that allows one to transition to a form of courage (or hope, or love) OR it remains unfilled and we become crippled in some way. Perhaps fear can also be filled with feelings like sadness or a sense of inadequacy that cause a transition to depression? If we were to try and provide an analytic definition we might argue that from *fear* there is the 'naturalistic' logic/dialectic of arising *courage* which *requires* fear, and equally arising *fearlessness* which requires spiritual transmutation of fear to fearless courage. Many others have made similar ontological claims: you can't have courage without fear.[3]

---

[1] Anyone familiar with the gnostic traditions, esoteric spiritual schools, etc. will recognize the association of "fear" and "shadow" (including, Carl Jung's Shadow conception)—for e.g., Sorensen (1996/2014), wrote, "fear is a shadow" (i.e., like an illusion, or *maya* in many nondual philosophy traditions in the East). The summary of all these is, more or less, that fear—like sin—is without substance, as the "science of mind" philosophies tend to view—not unlike, Barnesmoore's basic thesis of "fear void-vacuum." "The Savior said There is no sin, but it is you who make sin…" (Gospel of Mary Magdalene n.d.).

[2] 'Fear' (with ' marks) is a deconstruction method Fisher has played with for three decades for a similar purpose (e.g., Fisher 1995). Later, 'fear' became often associated with a late 20th century emergence of a "new species of fear" (e.g., McLaren 1995, p. 148) (see further explanation in Fisher 2003, p. 54).

[3] See discussion in Fisher (2010), p. 140. Also, e.g., "... you must understand that there is no courage without fear.... Courage must have fear ... in order to have a place" (Lawson 2012, p. 19). The defining of "fear" in these cases is left unproblematized, uncritical, and *status quo* (*aka*, in our view, it is left tainted from the start). Following a kind of reality school (nondual pragmatism), a perversion exists within this potentially, that requires great caution—analogously, e.g., what some have espoused that there is metaphysical (dialectical) harmony of opposites (or complementarity) as a universal esoteric principle, and so they go so far as to claim that birth needs death, healing requires a hurt and/or love requires fear, Heaven requires Hell, God needs Satan, Good needs Evil, etc. Often Daoist philosophy of Yin/Yang is brought to bear on this type of interpretation to rationalize it as true, yet the Daoist philosophy of Yin/Yang only applies to truly dualistic phenomena. This can be easily twisted and used in unethical (if not egoic) ways to naturalize/legitimize nondual phenomena like the privation of good. Just as health requires a disease (illness).

"Viewing good and evil in dualistic terms leads us to accept evil as an eternal constituent of reality, and this leads us to accept the necessity (naturalization) of evil...".

Fisher (2010) has examined this Western canon of "ontologically co-dependent" (p. 140) discourse on *fear/courage* and its problems and management. The 17ᵗʰ century philosopher Spinoza echoed this: "There is no hope without fear, and no fear without hope."[1] Barnesmoore would caution that, in interpreting Spinoza's statement, we should understand hope in terms of faith rather than belief—faith is rooted in experience, whereas belief is rooted in the purported experience of others—the fearless hope/courage emerges from faith, from experiential intimacy with the NIE.[2] Typically, such a discourse fails to problematize the very definition of "fear" (likely

---

But the universe of living things is designed, so it appears to us, to create health as intention not illness; to create a system not meant to hurt. This raises problematic teleological issues which we will address, in part, later in this article. What would a fearlessness philosophy posit on this ontological co-dependency positioning?

[1] Cited in Chang (2006), p. 303.

[2] Barnesmoore comments: Redemption, The Hope of Fools: "'There never was much hope'… 'Just a fool's hope, as I have been told.'" -Gandalf. We are but fools, both merry and grave, a band of vagabonds wandering through the blistering deserts that have been formed by the artificial light of Colonial Modernity (C. M. Worldview). To the naked eye the lands are parched and there is no hope that we will quench our thirst before the last drop of strength leaves our bones and we wither back into dust. Our feet bleed into the blistering earth, or once did before the many years of exile began to form cocoons of scar tissue that now serve as boots. We are often taken in by the great mirage; oases appear on the horizon only to be lost in the dry sands of time. Hope seems to be but the purview of arational madmen, and yet we continue our solemn procession. What is this fool's hope that we search for? Is there redemption for a land that has long since forgotten the natural fire of life and the waters of heart-mind? Have we simply succumbed to madness? Foucault notes a trend, opposed to the contemporary conception of madness as the negative space beyond truth and reason, wherein Madness (i.e., arationality, which is often mis-described as irrationality by the archons of rationalist society) and Truth are intimate. "Madness was… proclaimed nearer to happiness and truth than reason itself" and indeed literature often sees the fool bringing the truth of matter into light—"to lovers he speaks of love, he teaches the truth about life to the young, and the sad reality of things to the proud, the insolent, and those who bear false witness" (Foucault 2006, p. 13). What is this truth and joy that has been rumored to lie in madness? Is it the fool's hope? Given our 'norm' socialization in the dualistic dogma of Modernity (C. M. Worldview), it may be fruitful to engage this question from the perspective of the binary between fact-truth-reason and madness that has been established in our ('western') society. To begin, our society has lost the distinction between truth (which is without motion) and fact (which is truth, or a lack thereof in cases of absurdity, with motion). Reason is no longer founded upon the simplest and most universal 'things' as in Descartes, which is to say the Infinite Substance and its emanations as described by Spinoza, but instead upon facts (upon the sands of time). "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock [(the uncreated and its emanations)]: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house [(i.e. time, motion, etc.,)]; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of *it*." [*The Bible*, KJV] The modernist subject, in losing the distinction between Truth (upon which reason must be founded) and fact (which reason has come to be founded, is then (most ironically in the context of this article) the 'foolish' person who builds their house upon the sands of time (upon facts, the manifest world of motion). As a result, the Modernist Mind labels the one who builds their house upon the rock (upon the uncreated and its emanations, which is to say Truth) as the fool. Truth and reason have been relegated to the sphere of madness, and 'the rock' is the abode of fools. The relationship between the fool, happiness and Truth is thus to be found in the seeming madness of knowing reality beyond the veil of sensory perception. The wise fool is only a fool in the eyes of those who lack eyes with which to see and in the ears of those who lack ears with which to hear, and yet the redemption of the deaf and blind is only a fools hope. We continue our solemn procession through the desert *because* we are fools, and though the shackled eyes of the modern slave paranoic mind see us as naught but mad(wo)men, without the fools hope would have long since died. Take heart in the foolishness of our hope, for it is precisely that foolishness—the incommensurability of Truth-Love with the present state of our material circumstances—which allows for the potential to transcend the seemingly (from a material, sensory perspective) insurmountable odds of our present circumstances. Redemption may seem like a foolish thing to hope for

tainted from the start) and only a 'common' discursive structure and the meaning of terms like fear established therein is utilized in such claims—all very dubious from our perspective. This complex dynamic relationship will be somewhat clarified throughout this article, and it will challenge most all prior and traditional views of this relationship. This pivotal point of interest in the problem of defining fear and its related ontology is given attention in this critique as elaboration on Fisher's core work in this area. Some productive directives are brought to light *via* Barnesmoore's experiential exploration of his own experiences of fear and the transition to *eternal-courage* (see later), while some things are left to their innate mysteriousness.

Beyond the more general goal of exploring fear through autoethnographic reflections on and observation of the inner energetic processes that occur when the liminal vacuum-void is formed by a moment of shock, when we begin our transition from fear to wherever the energies that fill the liminal vacuum-void take us, one purpose of this article is to offer an alternative (and/or complementary) proposition to the language we use to describe the fear/fearlessness[1] dialectic (*a la* Fisher)—courage/couragelessness or fear/fearless courage(/truth/trust/love/wonder/etc.).

"Ecstatic Companion" by Barbara Bickel ©2003
Casting by Monica Brammer
digital photo (photoshopping) by R. Michael Fisher 2019

---

when considered from our sensory perspective, but that is what makes it possible. Fisher (2010) takes another (tactical) emancipatory view of "hope" which is better replaced by "fearlessness" (e.g., pp. 97, 178, 230, 240).

[1] Although Fisher and Four Arrows (e.g., see Fisher 2018) often capitalize Fear and Fearlessness as constructs for a variety of reasons, we'll not engage that strategy or complexity as it is not likely important to this inquiry.

From Barnesmoore's perspective, things are a bit backwards with the fear/fearlessness dialectic, and this backwardness is indicative of a more general phenomena of treating forms of *privation* as self-subsistent realities—which they are not. Courage/couragelessness ought to replace or augment fear/fearlessness because it is fear (experientially conceptualized as a void), not courage, that is the 'lessness'. The same can be said of good and evil—there is no such thing as evil, only good and its privation (*a la* Augustine/ Arendt).[1] This is not to say that there are no phenomena (e.g. light/dark) that should be understood in dualistic terms because both sides are rooted in the eternal (dark-nothing/ light-infinite), but to say that there is great danger in attributing duality to nondual phenomena (e.g., good/evil) where only one side has its root in the eternal and the other side has its root in privation of the eternal.

What is this danger of attributing duality to nondual phenomena? Barnesmoore knows a rather vile old man who once told him that good and evil form a balance, and that taking political action in this world is unnecessary and perhaps unwise because there is already harmonious balance between good and evil. This markedly evil narration of reality, and the disgustingly privileged political nihilism that emerges therein, are made possible by attribution of an eternal quality to evil and the subsequent notion that (like other dualities) good and evil should be balanced. When we grant eternity to a privation through attribution of duality to a nondual reality (i.e., when we view a nondual reality like good and its privation in dualistic terms that attribute eternity to the privation) we come to naturalize (violently) the privation and thus seek to balance privation of the eternal with the eternal (rather than seeking to purge the privation of the eternal from manifestation as we purge a sickness from the body). Viewing good and evil in dualistic terms leads us to accept evil as an eternal constituent of reality, and this leads us to accept the necessity (naturalization) of evil (particularly the better of two evils…) and thus to try and balance good with evil. Viewing good and evil in nondual terms (as good and privation of the good) allows us to see evil as unnecessary and thus draws us into attempting to purge evil from this world.

Fisher has engaged over the years both the benefits and the limitations of a "point of departure theory" (*a la* Four Arrows[2]) and a dual/nondual perspective (*a la* Barnesmoore).[3] Yet, Fisher has not considered until very recently the privation argumentation of Barnesmoore, Arendt and Augustine. This article is thus something of a first exploration along these 'crooked paths of natural genius' (cf. Blake 1793). On first glance Fisher ought to recognize the discursive backwards orientation and thus could re-write his formulation as *fearlessness/fear* to reflect the Barnesmoorean critique. This move however, is neither sufficient nor equivalent to courage/couragelessness or fear/fearless-courage/trust/truth/love/wonder as conceptualized by Barnesmoore.

We aim (above and below [Scott 1993]) to make critical distinctions between *courage* and *fearlessness* in a value-transparent, visible, non-domineering/anti-hegemonic (i.e., an ontolog-

---

[1] Barnesmoore would add that the artificial form of privation from which evil emerges is created by hierarchical domination—by attempts to pull on the sprouts of human nature to 'help them grow'.

[2] Four Arrows (2016), pp. 5-8.

[3] Fisher prefers a critical integral-holistic approach and yet embraces (in part) the nondual consciousness structure in his spectrum theory of fear (and fearlessness)—*via* his "fearless standpoint theory" (Fisher 2008).

ically transparent and thus non-violent manner (Barnesmoore 2018b). Achieving this aim requires a philosophical and cultural-historical-political critique that extends beyond merely dealing with the topic of fear/fearlessness within the framework established by the A.D. Worldview and the obfuscating narrations of presently recorded human history that emerge therein. Fisher, too, has always approached this larger critical context in his conceptualization of fear ('fear') and the trans-disciplinary study he calls *fearology*.[1] Barnesmoore's desire to provide an alternative to the fear/fearlessness dialectic is rooted in the potential discursive implications of describing a form of privation (be it *evil* or *fear*) with a term rather than as the privation of that which is deprived (i.e., evil should be 'privation of the good' and fear should be 'privation of eternal-courage', or at the very least fearlessness [which is surely not a privation[2]] should not be described in a fashion that could be interpreted as 'privation of fear').

According to Barnesmoore, Fisher (and Four Arrows) have done an excellent job engaging the problematics of the fear/fearlessness dialectic, thus, Barnesmoore's proposed alterative is not meant as an assault on their underlying philosophical work as much as an address to the sickly nature of normative consciousness in this world and some of the underlying shifts in worldview that are necessary for making just human relationships with the rest of reality possible. The shift is necessitated by a flaw in hegemonic consciousness rather than a flaw in the work of Four Arrows and Fisher. In this case, the shift is to describing privations as privations of that which they deprive rather than as realities in and of themselves. Barnesmoore's style leaves behind traditional use**s** of vague terms like *courage* itself and develops a unique ontologically transparent framework for use of such terms. Forms of courage are to be defined based on the energy that fills the liminal vacuum-void we associate with fear in the argumentation of this article, and when it is the eternal that fills the fear vacuum we transition to a form of eternal-courage that Barnesmoore takes as virtually synonymous with fearlessness (*a la* Four Arrows and Fisher). The courage that arises from anger must be differentiated from the courage that rises from being filled by the eternal. Obviously, as always, there is a bit of linguistic incoherence between what Barnesmoore means by courage and what Fisher means by courage, which will be sorted out (as much as such differences can and, or need to be sorted) below.

Fisher's Fear Management[3] Systems Theory, impressive in scope (sensitive to general unity) as it is in ferreting out the various forms in which the "spirit of fearlessness" manifests in the relative domain of reality called evolution and development (sensitive to the difference-irregularity of manifestation), Fisher has given "courage" (relatively) the least amount of attention (see Fisher 2010, pp. 136-42). Fisher (2010) notes how, too often, "courage and fearlessness are often conflated" in the literatures around the world and through time. He also admits:

---

[1] Example (Fisher 2001). "Fearology" is defined in Fisher & Subba (2016), p. 158.

[2] Fisher (2010) gives 15+ meanings of "fearlessness" from the diverse literatures, but also includes "fearlessness" in one of its meanings as a 'virtue of virtues' (see also Fisher 2018a, p. 1).

[3] "Management" is not a noun nor equivalent to "managerialism" (*a la* Foucault)—it is an inherent self-regulation process of evolution itself.

More than all the other seven ways of fearlessness,[1] *courage* has been studied and written about the most by far (in sacred or secular texts). From the earliest Western ancient philosophers like Aristotle and Aquinas, many have written extensively on this topic... I won't repeat or try to summarize here. This section will be brief. (p. 138)

It appears Fisher has been far less interested in analyzing the discourses and philosophies on courage in comparison to the discourses and philosophies on fear/fearlessness (or fearless). Barnesmoore sees a solution to this problem of conflating courage with fearlessness in developing a nuanced conception of the different forms of courage that emerge in relationship to the energy that fills the fear void-vacuum and thus allows us to transition from fear, including fearlessness (i.e. eternal-courage/trust/love/truth/ wonder /etc.). From this lacuna, this article is meant to conceptually and logically bring the different forms of *courage* to the foreground and more importantly to show the relationship of courage/couragelessness dialectic in relationship to the contextual critique that will support development of philosophies of fear/courage/fearlessness today and in the future.

Courage/couragelessness or fearless-courage/truth/love/trust/wonder/etc. may be more illustrative expressions of fear if we wish to highlight the nondual nature of phenomena like fear and evil. Fisher and Barnesmoore have published a dialogue on the value of the NIE construct and standpoint in terms of issues of fearism (philosophy) and hierarchical security in relation to new ideas about law and society (Fisher & Barnesmoore 2018, pp. 125-48). This article continues on that prior conversation and extends it into Barnesmoore's proposed alternative (and/or complement) to the fear/ fearlessness dialectic.

When Barnesmoore says 'eternal-courage', it should be remembered that the eternal has many synonyms. Eternal-trust could also describe the state of being he describes as eternal-courage. So too could eternal-love. Eternal-truth and, Fearless-courage/truth/love/ wonder/trust. They all lead back to the same intimacy with the NIE, to the same state of being. "The Tao that can be told is not the eternal Tao" (Lao Zi ,1997, p. 1, *trans*. Feng & English)—we can grasp at the state of being we are trying to describe though terms like fearlessness,[2] eternal-courage, eternal-truth, eternal-love, eternal-trust, but in the end the state of being that we are trying to describe cannot be named—this state of being is all of these things, and it is nothing, 0-1. Perhaps the term courage and its history is too laden with discursive violence for courage to be the appropriate replacement; but whether we select courage, trust, truth, love, wonder or any other of the qualities by which we try to name the nameless the point of this paper is to identify the dangers of granting eternity to privations.

---

[1] In Fisher (2010) he identifies: (1) no fear, (2) bravery and bravado, (4) courage(ous), (5) fear-less, (6) fearlessness, (7) fearless.

[2] Fisher remarks: such a Barnesmoorean view is commensurable with much of my own view of "fearlessness" (and that of many others) but only so far as it goes when using this "state of being" assessment/framing. When using a stage or levels developmental (ontogenetic) assessment/framing, then the Barnesmoorean view is less accurate. My own developmental emphasis and imaginary of fearlessness is not meant as a way "to name the nameless" (as in a nondual perspective re: the Absolute). Ideally, we ought to use, integrally, both state *and* stage framings (ontologies, epistemologies) to understand fear/fearlessness but that complicates things immensely, beyond the scope of this article. There is merit to pursue the Barnesmoorean critique regardless of my own views because it provides a useful cautionary in general with ontological work on fear (or 'fear').

> *"When I fear the universe, I fear myself. When I love and am in awe of the universe, I love and am in awe of myself. Imagine then, the power when I align with the universe."*
> Brown (2017, p. 11)

Distinctions: Courage and Fearlessness

[the Indigenous worldview:] A fearless trust in the universe[1] comes from a continual cultivation of courage and generosity….   -Four Arrows[2]

I make a distinction between courage and fearlessness in that courage is the phenomenon that causes one to engage that which is causing the fear but with right learning once this happens a degree of fearlessness that incorporates a trust in the cosmos can eliminate the need for courage.   –Four Arrows[3]

Barnesmoore is inspired to pursue thinking about courage/courageousness by both Fisher's work and Four Arrows' (*aka* Don Trent Jacobs) work on a theory of fear/courage/fearlessness (e.g., see Jacobs 1998; Fisher 2018; Four Arrows 2016). "Right learning," as Four Arrows mentions in the quote above, requires more articulation and is of great interest to Barnesmoore. Four Arrows' life/writing/teaching has positively motivated many students and others. His keen observations, and Indigenous perspective on fear/courage/fearlessness have led to powerfully insightful conversations. On one recent occasion he wrote to Barnesmoore,

The distinction between courage and fearlessness that I make is challenging. I do it only because I know many courageous people who burn out and no fearless ones. (personal communications, Four Arrows 2018)

Let's begin (partially) to parse this distinction between *courage* and *fearlessness* in a value-transparent, visible, non-domineering/anti-hegemonic manner. This is an approach, based on the Indigenous (natural) and, in certain contexts, dual/nondual worldview(s)—essential to acknowledging that the politics of knowledge/power/fear (*a la* Foucault)[4] that operates in dominant-domineering civilization is *not* inevitable (i.e., natural or necessary)—a point made also below in the problematization of defining *fear* in and of itself—rather, preferred in this article, fear is a natural moment of shock and ensuing liminal void-vacuum that signals the perceived[5]

---

[1] Recently, Four Arrows has equivalently suggested "trust in the spirits" or "trust in the righteousness of action" could be alternative expressions for the same basic phenomena (personal communications, Four Arrows 2018).

[2] Excerpt from Four Arrows (2016), p. 7.

[3] Excerpt from Four Arrows (2013), p. 262.

[4] *Knowledge/power/fear* is an analytical tool adopted from Fisher's work and a Foucauldian perspective.

[5] Perceived is quite important here as a racist might perceive the potential for privation of the eternal/sacred in seeing a person who is perceived as racially different from them and that perception might result in fear—this example allows us to see that the instinctual response of fear to the potential for privation of the eternal/sacred can lead us astray when we are dominated into ignorance—our instincts are the sprouts of our virtue, but they will lead us astray if we do not provide them with an environment that allows them to survive (hierarchically-culturally imposed ignorance of the sort that leads to racism is anathema to the survival of our instinctual sprouts of virtue as salt is anathema to the growth of plants in the soil and birth control is anathema to the growth of life in the womb).

potential for the eternal's privation from manifestation (i.e., the potential for what would in dominant discourse be described as evil and what would in this discourse be described as privation of the good). Meng Zi (2A6) argues that the innate-natural instinct to save a child (i.e. the sacred) from falling into a well (i.e., being destroyed) that we feel in the moment of shock when we see the child teetering on the precipice *is* the sprout of human virtue—that instinct to protect the sacred is the eternal, and it flows into the liminal void-vacuum that is formed by the moment of shock when we see the child—when the void is filled in this way we transition effortlessly (*wu-wei*) to fearless-courage/truth/ trust/wonder/love—then the sprouts of our goodness grow—as we deepen the grove through the virtuous actions that effortlessly emerge the liminal void-vacuum--formed by a moment of shock, and is filled by instinct, it becomes easier for instinct (i.e., the eternal) to flow in and the sprouts get the sunlight-water-earth they need to grow—instinct grows to intuition. Through great effort we become effortlessly virtuous—the climax of silence is motion/the climax of motion is silence (Cleary 1991).

Fear, like evil, is too often understood within the confines and not so subtle violence of the dualistic conceptions of privation that are so prevalent in the Colonial-Modernist World(view). Such dualistic conceptions of privation obsessively seek to naturalize the evil that arises from the hierarchical-domineering states of consciousness that are produced by hierarchical civilization and its Artificial-Domineering Worldview (i.e. by the MegaMachine [Mumford 1967; Mumford 1970]). Framing fear, like evil, as *privation* serves to denaturalize colonial violence, genocide, slavery, etc. According to Barnesmoore, this point is starkly missing from *Fear Law and Criminology* which at times very clearly falls into such naturalization of hierarchical oppression as a quality of 'human nature'[1]—the age old ploy of colonizing forces like the police and the nation state they serve is to excuse their oppressive behaviour through recourse to human nature arguments that seek to obfuscate the fact that hierarchical privations of the good arise from the privation of our goodly human nature that is caused by oppressive socialization within the MegaMachine [Mumford 1967, 1970], that is, hierarchical civilization (i.e., Fear's Empire,[2] as Fisher calls it; cf. the "Falling Empires" *a la* Bob Marley 1979).

As in Fisher's work, there has to be a critical and skeptical philosophical analysis when it comes to such powerful terms and phenomena like *fear* that ascribe self-subsistent reality to privation (creating naturalization of fear—for example, many authors unquestionably propagate "fear is natural" discourse(s) without critical reflection on what might distinguish natural and artificial forms of fear). The reasons for this skepticism, for this shift to a more nuanced definition, to the different forms of courage/trust/love/truth/wonder/etc. that arise from the differing energies that can fill the fear vacuum-void are many (e.g., see how courage is often an insidious hidden disguise of fear[3]). One major danger lies in the long trajectory of dominant dualism within

---

[1] E.g., see dialogue Fisher & Barnesmoore (2018), pp. 126, 129-30. Fisher would prefer "human condition" for this dynamic. See Michel Foucault Laughing Uproariously at Chomsky for Making Claims about 'Human Nature' to Substantiate His Views: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-0dM6j7pzQA

[2] Fisher has his own understanding of the nature of "Fear's Empire" but the term was originally used by Barber (2003).

[3] This is a case Fisher makes often in his writing, and specifically based on the pseudo-fearless (bravado) hype that is easily commodified in today's world (Fisher, 2015); he also draws upon Overstreet's analysis (1951/71, Chpt. 7 "Dangerous Disguises") of fear.

hierarchical philosophy, a dualism that is arguably (because it assimilates nondual realities like good and the privation of good into its domineering discursive structures), as Fisher agrees, colonizing (toxifying) of virtually everything and leads us to construct *fear* as fear-based itself.[1] This dualism is therefore questionable as to any acumen about depictions of reality, fear itself, and courage etc. that arises (or may) from fear experiencing. We are not positing a dualistic relationship between fear and courage—we are problematizing the attribution of duality to a nondual (natural) phenomenon that ought instead to be described in terms of privation (*a la* Barnesmoore). Much of the philosophy of fear(ism) schools of thought tend to ignore this concern and posit what Fisher calls a *fear-positivism*[2] (i.e., naturalizing of fear without often a deeply thought out ontological transparency and critical self-reflexivity).

"Perhaps the term 'courage' and its history is too laden with discursive violence[3] to be reconstructed. But perhaps not... ".

We are curious what Moore & Gillette (1991) meant exactly by "Only a massive rebirth of courage in both men and women will rescue the world" (p. 4). They called for a more "mature masculine" on the planet. We are all for that. However, "massive" sounds like a quantity increase. That may seem logical and useful on first glance but philosophically it leaves out too much unasked about the qualitative shift in the kind of courage that may indeed 'rescue the world.' We return to Four Arrows' point. 'Burning out' seems key in terms of practicality behind our discussion herein. It would be great to have much less burning out amongst activists, for example. What is this seeming courage that can burn out, and why is it that fearlessness (*eternal-courage*) cannot burn out?

The fearlessness (with courage) described by Four Arrows above, arguably, rises from intimacy with the *Nothing-Infinite Eternal* (NIE) and is thus itself eternal and does not by necessity burn out—a (radical) "trust in the cosmos [sic. the eternal]" (Four Arrows). Arguably, forms of courage that burn out arise when the fear vacuum is filled with an energy like an accompanying anger that lacks eternity. When we are intimate with the eternal it fills the liminal void-vacuum formed by the moment of shock that Barnesmoore understands as fear and we transition to eternal-courage (i.e. fearlessness). Our society is riddled with forms of courage that burn out because the A.D. Worldview and its Colonial Modernist incarnation destroy our intimacy with the NIE. We end up fearing the eternal—concomitant with an operative predominating dualism.[4] A.D. Worldview and its thoughts, feelings, behaviours, conceptions of being, social structures, etc.— all of which it makes possible killing the sprouts[5] of virtue (i.e., the instincts by which the eternal effortlessly flows into our thoughts, feelings, behaviours and conceptions of being)[6] that exist in all of us, through pulling on them to help them grow (Meng Zi 2A2).[7] It does this through systems

---

[1] Fisher (2016).
[2] For e.g., see Fisher & Subba (2016), pp. 47, 95.
[3] Excerpt from Barnesmoore's e-mail to Fisher (pers. comm., Feb. 21/19).
[4] Fisher & Barnesmoore (2018).
[5] Our instinctual sprouts grow into intuitive flowers.
[6] See discussion on "Virtue Epistemology" (Daoist Virtue Epistemology) in Barnesmoore (2016), pp. 107-09.
[7] Meng Zi (2016).

of oppression that try to make us good through traumatization *via* punishment and fear of punishment. The Colonial Modernist incarnation of the A.D. Worldview (*sic.* Scientism) further divides us from the eternal by denying the reality of realities beyond passing time and physical space.

Four Arrows suggests that a good place to look for forms of courage that burn out is in the embedded nature and role of fear itself in courage, and a worldview that supports such a *lack* (void-vacuum)—that is, as found, more or less, in the typical forms of bravery, bravado, courage(ous)ness. Krishnamurti marked this irony of typical Western courage(ous) imaginary and activism in practical terms as a cautionary and guide in order to really understanding fear:

> It is not that you must be free from fear. The moment you try to free yourself from fear [by dualism; fear-based means, by privation of fear from say love], you create a resistance against fear. Resistance, in any form, does not end fear. What is needed, rather than running away or controlling or suppressing or any other resistance, is understanding fear; that means, watch it, learn about it, come directly into contact with it. We are to learn about fear, not how to escape from it, not how to resist it through courage [etc.]....[1]

Perhaps the term *courage* and its "Hero-Male" history[2] is too laden with discursive violence to be reconstructed. But perhaps not; who is to say what worth it is to put forth reconstructions based on the intimacy of courage with NIE. Barnesmoore's *eternal-courage* (cf. fearlessness) is a good potential and perhaps it is best seen as a 'gift' of Creation[3] rather than a gift of human will. Perhaps it is the platform for a moral corrective referent needed today.

We need not worry over being brave or courageous—enough. Ideally, we need not fear (i.e., mistrust) the moment of shock (fear)[4] or the liminal void-vacuum that emerges therein—indeed, we ought to focus our attention and connection in all such shock moments—as respecting:

> (a) Shiva's sacred (c)re(l)ationship with Brahman,
> (b) and embrace bliss in the rebirth that is possible through death,
> (c) and reject our subjugation to Vishnu, and the A. D. Worldview
> (d) and learn from fear in the liminal, as in any good 'teaching moment' (as it is)
> (e) the ever-present (always already) guidance-system of NIE and Natural-Indigenous
>   Worldview(s) that arises from the order of nature—a reflection of the NIE—when

---

[1] Cited in Chang (2006), p. 304.

[2] Problems of typical courage, aligned with the Military/Sports/Industrial Complex and symbolic Hero-Male (especially in the West) have been discussed in relationship to Four Arrows' life and work, see Fisher (2018a), p. 107.

[3] Fisher refers to this as part of the South East Asian historical legacy of *abhaya dāna* (gift of fearlessness) tradition in Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism (e.g., Fisher, 2010, pp. 174-75).

[4] Fisher often teachings that we have an alternative: Rather than in the moment of shock paying attention only to the fear symptomatology of our body/mind systems, we re-identify a referential shift to paying attention to fearlessness. Thus, Fisher's dictum: *When fear arises, so then does fearlessness.* The outcome of such an arising dialectic is dependent on what one gives their attention to (cf. Jiddu Krishnamurti's philosophy).

untainted by the will-to-domination.

A good place to look for an alternative and corrective to the worldview that has infected our experience and understanding of fear is the NIE and Natural-Indigenous Worldview(s) that arise from the NIE and its reflection in the land-water-skies. For now, let's leave this topic and move to the problematics of defining *fear* and *fearlessness.*

Problematics of Conceptualizing Fear/Fearlessness

To begin, the central danger of defining fear (*a la* Fisher), from Barnesmoore's critical perspective, is reification (and normalization) of *privation* as a reality in and of itself. Although for most, *defining fear* is not a priority of interest and may seem overly complicated, abstract and academic, a critique often informally applied to Fisher's work, there is a necessity to attend to what Fisher (2018b) has raised about pitfalls in defining *fear*. He argued (Fisher 2018b, 9:00-9:10) that mere standard dictionary or encyclopedic definitions of *fear* attempt to be: (1) *value-neutral*, (2) *invisible* and, (3) *dominating/hegemonic*. Nearly all popular self-help books, mainstream professional textbooks, and most academic publishing re: handling and managing fear, more or less, start on that standard footing of the dictionary definition—e.g., "fear is a feeling or emotion" and/or "fear is natural" (conflated with "fear is normal")... etc.

This reductionistic neurobiological and individualistic psychologic framing of "fear" (as part of a Science and Biomedical hegemonic functionalism[1] model) is not what Fisher's fearology is in favor of, especially, when it dominates the discourses and knowledge/power/fear dynamics in an individual, group, community, society, or worldview as a whole. Fisher, with a critical eye for the hidden curriculum in the 'norm' and 'standard,' sees a decidedly *fear-based* dualism structuration underneath that current hegemony. He believes much of how fear is defined is fear-based (i.e., tainted) itself. This is not a good way to achieve accuracy about reality or fear and all that follows from fear experiencing and conceptualizations, theories and philosophies on fear. There's so much trouble defining and making meaning of fear. This article is very interested in such a problematic and its roots. Perhaps *privation* cannot be defined in and of itself and must be defined as privation of something which *is* in and of itself. We explore how perhaps Fisher's own framing of the fear/fearlessness dialectic may lead to exacerbation of the very problem of defining fear that he has been working to improve.

By value-neutral, Fisher (2018b) means that the common fear-definition(s) purports to describe rather than equally inscribe the diverse meanings of fear from multiple perspectives; by invisible, Fisher means that the definition relies silently upon the discursive structure (cosmological + ontological + epistemological assumptions) of the Colonial-Modernist incarnation of the A. D. Worldview (Barnesmoore); by domineering/hegemonic, Fisher means a politically-motivated wielding power over human subjectivities through expanding and constraining potentials for knowing and responding to fear, while disguising this influence under the cover of normalizing

---

[1] In sociological theory, "functionalism" is a powerful way of thinking and valuing in complete opposition to "critical theory" traditions of analysis.

discourses of supposed value-neutrality and 'objective reality' (i.e., "scientific") that rise from the Colonial-Modernist incarnation of the A. D. Worldview and its reduction of reality (*via* dualism and functionalism) to passing time and physical space. By domineering, Barnesmoore implies the hierarchical imposition of an artificially unitary and regular order of things that destroys the natural order of things in its many, different, irregular manifestations.

It should be noted that the issue of dominating/hegemonic definitions of fear (definitions that strive to exert power over those who accept them as real, that seek to impose an artificially unitary and regular order of things upon our conceptions of fear in its many, different, irregular manifestations) should be understood as necessary (i.e., normalized or natural*ized*) outcroppings of the A.D. Worldview. The trouble starts in that A.D. worldview by its assumed and defended definition of [human] nature as evil—and, argues sociologically and theologically, that 'good order' must be manufactured through hierarchical domination of our natural evil order (through traumatization *via* punishment and fear of punishment).

Hierarchical domination produces and permits fearmongering methodologies and policies that rarely are 'seen through' and/or challenged in regard to their pathologies (Post[most]Modern and Marxist 'post[most]colonials' are just as susceptible to this banally invisible embodiment of a hierarchical order of things as people like neoliberal capitalists who ascribe to an overtly colonial-imperial outlook). Therefore the A. D. Worldview (in contrast to the Natural-Indigenous Worldview that arises from the eternal order of the NIE that forms our shared essence), constructs definitions which are made to masquerade as value-neutral and to thus exert invisible cosmological and ontological power over the individual, who typically accepts them because they rise from a worldview that is centered on domination—and, fear-based (distorted, mistrustful) perceptions, thinking and actions. Thus self-described 'postcolonial' practitioners of paradigms like 'therapeutic planning' (Cornell AAP 2007) continue to embody the abusive, colonial order of things (virtue through traumatization *via* punishment and fear of punishment) that emerges from the A.D. Worldview in their educational praxis, for example, as it pertains to relationships with graduate students. No healthy, sane and sustainable society can function only on this privation/fear-based worldview and its tainted conceptualization and mis-understanding of fear itself (i.e. fear/trauma as the progenitor of human virtue and 'efficiency'[1]).

---

[1] Reflections from Barnesmoore's doctoral Comprehensive Examinations (2018):

To start by letting of a bit of the 'steam' (stress...) that these examinations are intended to express, I want to note that I feel confident both Geddes and Mumford would have found this exercise rather repellant (Mumford in his late years more so than Geddes or early Mumford, but surely Geddes if such a structure were to have been imposed upon him)—that's why both of them eschewed formal academic training. What sort of organic, insurgent, nomadic process of inquiry into the nature of reality could emerge from a tightly bounded three-month period? In a single day of writing? Geddes and Mumford would likely have recalled William James' (1914) *The Energies of Men*, which Mumford (1944) argues may have been inspired by a meeting between James and Geddes. Mumford wrote, "Geddes was convinced that much of our education and much of our business enterprise was a deliberate stultification of man's real nature and his potential creativity. He pointed out that just as the brain itself contains a large number of dormant cells, apparently never called into use, so in our time a large part of the "energies of men" were never employed: the very narrowing of human functions in the specialized workday of both the factory drudge and the successful professional man depleted their effectiveness even for their narrow tasks. (It is very possible that William James's famous essay on "The Energies of Men" was written as a result of his meeting with Geddes in Edinburgh.) When Geddes considered his own extraordinary powers, he did not think of himself as a genius, but as a "normal man" fully awakened to all the possibilities of being alive" (Mumford 1944, p. ix). In *The Energies of Men*, James argues that humanity is endowed with abundant stores of natural energy that are called forth by need-crisis-fear (or meditative practice?) to form what is commonly known as 'a second wind'. Like capitalism, the initiatory, ritualistic endeavor that is comprehensive

How can we avoid such damaging pitfalls in defining fear (which can taint fearlessness)? First, we ought not purport to a value-neutral perspective. We need to clearly explicate the underlying, less visible, worldview (cosmology + ontology) that informs our definition (i.e., the worldview whose values are inscribed upon fear through the process of definition)—we must be ontologically transparent (Barnesmoore 2018b). As we can see, the first two issues identified by Fisher—purportedly value-free and invisible definitions—are both to be treated by clearly stating our worldview. But there is a deeper issue. It is the particular worldview (Colonial-Modernist incarnation of the A. D. Worldview) and the will-to-domination that emerges from the privation of human nature therein, from which domineering/hegemonic definitions of fear rise, that render these definitions as domineering/hegemonic. Definitions are rendered as value-neutral and thus as bearing an invisible discursive structure because the person rendering the definition as value-neutral seeks (consciously or not) to hierarchically dominate others by inculcating and converting others into their worldview bias. Be it because they are truly deluded to the point of believing that their perspective on truth is the *only* true objective perspective on truth or because they seek to manufacture subjectivities that cohere with a worldview and associated discursive structures that make the subject more easily governable (i.e. more easily enslaved), in the end such individuals manifest an inherently supremacist relationship with reality that makes such purportedly value-free definitions (and the invisible discursive structures born therein) possible. What does this mean? It means that a (r)evolution of worldview will be required before value-transparent and visible definitions of fear will become possible—a revolution of worldview must always precede a true revolution in praxis (Barnesmoore 2017, 2018).

Herman's (2008) reflections on the contemporary state of academic geography illustrates the ways in which the banal invisibility of worldview foments ontological violence (Blasser 2013) in the university:

> The overall assumptions of modern rationality remain largely intact, and even geographers [and planners] doing 'postcolonial' studies remain largely unwilling to step out of their epistemological frameworks for a moment and consider different ways of understanding the world… The colonial mentality holds: the modern worldview is 'real' even if it is socially constructed; other worldviews are not. Thus the

---

examinations seeks to create an artificial sense of need-crisis-fear so as to artificially draw forth my 'second winds'. I am meant to feel as though I am fighting for my survival so that my natural stores of energy—designed for functions ranging from the physical function of fighting off illness to the spiritual function of attaining elevated states of consciousness—can be drawn forth into this exercise. Fear of punishment if I fail these exams (i.e., fear of hierarchical domination) is to call forth my natural stores of abundant energy. Comprehensive examinations, then, are an expression of the form of the Artificial, Domineering Worldview (A.D. Worldview) (Four Arrows and Narvaez 2016; Barnesmoore 2018) —they seek to 'help' the sprouts of my intellectual development grow by pulling on them as the simple farmer from Song sought to help the sprouts in his field grow by pulling on them and only succeeded in killing the sprouts (Meng Zi 2016, 2A2). It is thus that I wrote the following words on the first day of this ritual of order through hierarchical domination: I'm feeling a bit tense. That's the design. Oh the unhealthy nonsense of the University, the absurd assumptions about human nature that say pressure, stress, competition, hierarchical domination (in the form of grading) and other such artificial means of manufacturing 'need' and 'urgency' are necessary to make me work hard, the actual barrier to creative expression this paradigm forms—but here I sit, fingers playing the music of the English language across my keyboard, trying to simply ignore the absurdity of the disciplinary structure known as 'comps' (there is a certain sense of dread that flitters across many eyes when this term is raised) so that I can focus my attention on the research that I will be conducting in this artificially limited timeslot. I'm not feeling tense anymore... These systems of domination are much less effective when we know how they are trying to manipulate us. My feet are buried in the sacred gardens: "The old that is strong does not wither, Deep roots are not reached by the frost" (Tolkien 1954).

critical turn has yet to decolonize the discipline truly and still leaves us in a disenchanted world without inherent values. (Herman 2008, p. 76)

**Getting Things Backwards, Critiquing the Dialectic:
Fear is the Privation, Not Fearlessness**

We now have some critical contextual grounds and reference points for pursuing a potentially commensurable alternative to the Fisherian fear/fearlessness dialectic. And, just as fear has been problematized, so must we also problematize the dialectic Fisher offers to guide Fear Studies overall.

This article locates *eternal-courage(/truth/love/trust/wonder/etc.)*, which arises from the intimacy with the NIE that is deprived when we enter the fear void-vacuum, on the mainstage in the pursuit of building of a philosophical foundation for individual and collective attainment of the fearlessness (eternal-courage) that doesn't by necessity 'burn out'. Perhaps there is a 'new way' being forged, but Barnesmoore's intention was simply to propose a linguistic shift (as cautionary) in the way that we describe the underlying framework that has been developed by Fisher and Four Arrows.

Four Arrows recently wrote to Barnesmoore, suggesting the corrective of courage/ couragelessness is not the best way to go—a basic *fear/courage* dialectic makes most sense:

> From my vantage point, fear is the focus requiring respectful attention, not courage.... Courage without fear for its focus is not much to talk about. So courage and couragelessness would not rise to the importance of fear/courage [or fear/ fearlessness, as in Fisher's dialectic focus]. (personal communication, Four Arrows 2018)

Barnesmoore, however, is not seeking to displace fear (couragelessness) as the focus of analysis—he is proposing that we shift the language we use (from fear to couragelessness/ trustlessness/truthlessness) to connote his experience of fear as privation rather than as something in and of itself. Fundamentally, to understand the Barnesmoorean critique here one has to grasp the notion of "eternal" as context (i.e., NIE) for everything. And, that when he posits "eternal-courage" as the reality of existence in essence, he could as well be positing the importance equally of eternal-trust, eternal-love, eternal-truth. They all lead back to the same intimacy with the NIE, a point made earlier but which deserves repetition.

Since Four Arrows' earliest explorations of fear/courage, he has typically stood upon the philosophical and pragmatic grounds of a conviction to promote "becoming a connoisseur of Fear"[1] and that is his focus not courage *per se*.[2] Fisher has promoted this similarly, if not more

---

[1] E.g., see Jacobs (1998), p. 156; see also Fisher (2018), for e.g., pp. 60-61, 142-43, 179-80.
[2] However, "courage(ous)" has been critical to Four Arrows' life and work as well; see for e.g., Fisher (2018a), Part III, Part IV.

implicitly, but he has focused on fearlessness *per se* not courage. Barnesmoore is not *per se* interested in shifting the focus away from fear towards courage but in shifting our ontology away from viewing fear as a thing in and of itself—in stead we ought to conceive fear as a *privation* (e.g., fear is the 'lessness'). Perhaps the dialectic of courage/couragelessness and the *ontology of fear* implied therein is more useful and accurate to the situation of attempting to solve the Fear Problem and extend a vision of Fear Studies and the Fearlessness Movement.

Indeed, upon further reflection Four Arrows wrote to Barnesmoore saying:

> … after my second read I decided that I agree that from a linguistic perspective referring to what I call "fearlessness" as "Fearless Courage" or fearless courageousness, may be a more accurate way to phrase the kind of letting go of the "need" to sustain courage to the[n] "trust in the universe" and the fearless, stressless continued commitment to action to which I refer. (Four Arrows pers. comm., 2019)

Fearless-courage/truth/love/trust/wonder/etc. is indeed stressless in that it is effortless in the sense of Daoism's 'effortless action' (*wu-wei*[1]). (Lao Zi, 2011; Zhuang Zi, 1968; Zhuang Zi, 2004;

---

[1] Zhuang Zi's stories of Cook Ting and Khing the Carver provide beautiful illustrations of 'effortless action' (wu-wei), which seems to be synonymous with fearless-courage as described by Four Arrows in this final cited personal communication: "Cook Ting was cutting up an ox for Lord Wen-hui. As every touch of his hand, every heave of his shoulder, every move of his feet, every thrust of his knee — zip! zoop! He slithered the knife along with a zing, and all was in perfect rhythm, as though he were performing the dance of the Mulberry Grove or keeping time to the Ching-shou music. 'Ah, this is marvelous!' said Lord Wen-hui. 'Imagine skill reaching such heights!' Cook Ting laid down his knife and replied, 'What I care about is the Way, which goes beyond skill. When I first began cutting up oxen, all I could see was the ox itself. After three years I no longer saw the whole ox. And now — now I go at it by spirit and don't look with my eyes. Perception and understanding have come to a stop and spirit moves where it wants. I go along with the natural makeup, strike in the big hollows, guide the knife through the big openings, and following things as they are. So I never touch the smallest ligament or tendon, much less a main joint.' 'A good cook changes his knife once a year — because he cuts. A mediocre cook changes his knife once a month — because he hacks. I've had this knife of mine for nineteen years and I've cut up thousands of oxen with it, and yet the blade is as good as though it had just come from the grindstone. There are spaces between the joints, and the blade of the knife has really no thickness. If you insert what has no thickness into such spaces, then there's plenty of room — more than enough for the blade to play about it. That's why after nineteen years the blade of my knife is still as good as when it first came from the grindstone.' 'However, whenever I come to a complicated place, I size up the difficulties, tell myself to watch out and be careful, keep my eyes on what I'm doing, work very slowly, and move the knife with the greatest subtlety, until — flop! the whole thing comes apart like a clod of earth crumbling to the ground. I stand there holding the knife and look all around me, completely satisfied and reluctant to move on, and then I wipe off the knife and put it away.' 'Excellent!' said Lord Wen-hui. 'I have heard the words of Cook Ting and learned how to care for life!'" (Zhuang Zi 1968, pp. 50-51).

"Khing, the master carver, made a bell stand
Of precious wood.
When it was finished,
All who saw it were astounded.
They said it must be
The work of spirits.
The Prince of Lu said to the master carver:
'What is your secret?'

Khing replied: 'I am only a workman:
I have no secret. There is only this:
When I began to think about the work you
Commanded

Cleary 1991, 1999). Perhaps the notion of fearless-courage/trust/love/truth/wonder/etc. that has emerged from the friction between the fear/fearlessness and courage/couragelessness dialectics and the dialogues facilitated by this friction, as well as the *ontology of fear* implied by the term 'fearless-courage/truth/love/trust/wonder/etc.' that emerged from this friction, is more useful and accurate to the situation of attempting to solve the Fear Problem and extend a vision of 'Fear' Studies and the Fearlessness Movement (*a la* Fisher).

Fisher has brought in another complementary point to support the Barnesmoorean cautionary. The ethical imperative of Sardello (1999) when studying and teaching about fear, is that "in writing about fear [we ought]... to avoid generating more fear by doing so" (p. xvi). Fisher has supported this general Sardelloian cautionary because it is one major way to undermine the very dynamic of the "culture of fear" (Fisher 2010, p. xxvii)—and the cycle of fear/violence. By re-constructing the fear/fearlessness dialectic of Fisher, Barnesmoore's courage/couragelessness brings with its ontological (and linguistic) corrective a movement to write less about fear—or at least, to less put the word *fear* all over. Couragelessness (sic. timidity) is maybe the better way to talk and write about fear in order to meet the criteria of Sardello's ethic. However, this raises other issues like maybe we should only really focus on love/lovelessness?

I guarded my spirit, did not expend it
On trifles, that were not to the point.
I fasted in order to set
My heart at rest.
After three days fasting,
I had forgotten gain and success.
After five days
I had forgotten praise or criticism.
After seven days I had forgotten my body
With all its limbs.'

'By this time all thought of your Highness
And of the court had faded away.
All that might distract me from the work
Had vanished.
I was collected in the single thought
Of the bell stand.'

'Then I went to the forest
To see the trees in their own natural state.
When the right tree appeared before my eyes,
The bell stand also appeared in it, clearly, beyond doubt.
All I had to do was to put forth my hand and begin.
If I had not met this particular tree
There would have been No bell stand at all.
What happened?
My own collected thought
Encountered the hidden potential in the wood;
From this live encounter came the work
Which you ascribe to the spirits.'

(Zhuang Zi 2004, pp. 127-128)

At times, Barnesmoore uses courage/trust/love/wonder or any other of the qualities which maintain intimacy with NIE—and, which are homologous to eternal-courage. Maybe this latter entanglement is best, as some would say for simplicity, kept to "love" as the answer to the world's problems—as the answer to "fear." However, the ontological transparency and critique in this article is to let go of simplified reification of virtues and qualities thereof in the absolute sense because trying to name the nameless has been warned about from the ancient sages onward in the history of philosophy. For purposes of this inquiry we'll leave this larger discussion for another time and place.

References

Barber, B. (2003). *Fear's empire: War, terrorism, and democracy*. NY: W. W. Norton & Co.

Barnesmoore, L. R. (2019). Courage and couragelessness. Available from
http://ubc.academia.edu/Barnesmoore.

Barnesmoore, L. R. (2019a). The Tyranny of 'Accessible Writing' Discourses. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Barnesmoore 2019b, "Theorizing Fear as Liminal Void Vacuum." Vancouver: University of British Columbia. https://www.academia.edu/38316846/Theorizing_Fear_as_Liminal_Void_Vacuum

Barnesmoore, L. R. (2018). "Cyclical Return: Worldview", Vancouver: Unviersity of British Columbia.

Barnesmoore, L. R. (2018a). Comprehensive Examinations Concerning the Nature of Reality? Good Luck Examining That! Urban Planning, Human Nature Relations, Anarchism and Worldview. Vancouver: University of British Columbia. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/37341984/Comprehensive_Examinations_Concerning_the_Nature_of_Reality_Good_Luck_Examining_That_Urban_Planning_Human-Mature_Relations_Anarchism_and_Worldview

Barnesmoore, L. R. (2018b) Conducting ontologically transparent research. Vancouver, BC: The University of British Columbia. Available from http://www.academia.edu/38093824/Conducting_Ontologically_Transparent_Research

Barnesmoore, L. R. (2018c). Notes: On the under theorization of fear. Unpublished (pers. comm., Nov. 5).

Barnesmoore, L. R. (2017). Conscious evolution, social development and environmental justice. *Environment & Social Psychology 2(*1): 11-25.

Barnesmoore, L. R. (2016). Nomadic Explorations V2.1: Genesis, Eden and the Grail in Modernity. MA thesis, Department of Geography, University of British Columbia.

Barnesmoore, L. (2016a). Conscious vs mechanical evolution: Transcending biocentrist social ontologies. *Environment and Social Psychology*, *1*(2), 104-14.

Barnesmoore, L., & Fisher, R. M. (2019). FearTalk 2: Luke Barnesmoore & R. Michael Fisher. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MYEQJzdkjjA

Barnesmoore, L., & Fisher, R. M. (2019a). FearTalk 3: Luke Barnesmoore & R. Michael Fisher. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yI3Gjn10t38

Blake, W. (1793). *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*. Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Blake_Archive

Blaser, M. (2013). Ontological Conflicts and the Stories of Peoples in Spite of Europe: Toward a Conversation on Political Ontology. *Current Anthropology*, *54*(5), 547-68.

Brown, A. M. (2017). *Emergent strategy: Shaping change, changing worlds*. Chico, CA: AK Press.

Brown, N. O. (1958). *Life against death: The psychoanalytical meaning of history*. NY: Vintage.

Cajete 1994, *Look to the Mountain*: *An Ecology of Indigenous Education*, Durango, CO: Kivaki Press.

Cleary, T. (1991). *The Secret of the Golden Flower*, San Francisco: Harper One.

Cornell AAP (2007). Leonie Sandercock: Where Strangers Become Neighbours: a Canadian Defense of Multiculturalism. Retrieved from https://aap.cornell.edu/news-events/leonie-sandercock-where-strangers-become-neighbours-canadian-defense-multiculturalism

Devereux, G. (1967). *From anxiety to method in the behavioral sciences*. Paris: Mouton & Co.

Eneyo, M. (2019). *Philosophy of unity: Love as an ultimate unifier*. Australia: Xlibris.

Eneyo, M. (2018). *Philosophy of fear: A move to overcoming negative fear*. Australia: Xlibris.

Ettinger, B. L. (2009). Fragilization and resistance. *Studies in the Maternal 1*(2). Retrieved from http://www.mamsie.bbk.ac.uk

Fisher, R. M. (2019). Dynamic Kosmos identity: Holonic architecture. Unpublished paper.

Fisher, R. M. (2019a). A new psychology: Fearlessness psychology. Retrieved from https://fearlessnessmovement.ning.com/blog/a-new-psychology-fearlessness-psychology

Fisher, R. M. (2018). How can we study and manage fear better. Unpublished paper.

Fisher, R. M. (2018a). *Fearless engagement of Four Arrows: The true story of an Indigenous-based social transformer*. NY: Peter Lang.

Fisher, R. M. (2018b). Developing a critical literacy on fear. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9CXUkaFSdMA

Fisher, R. M. (2017). Conceptualizing critically: Fearlessness philosophy. Retrieved from https://fearlessnessmovement.ning.com/blog/conceptualizing-critically-fearlessness-philosophy

Fisher, R. M. (2017a). Radical love—is it radical enough? *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 8*(1), 261-81.

Fisher, R. M. (2016). Ideological underpinnings of colonial domination in understanding fear itself. Technical Paper No. 60. Carbondale, IL: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.

Fisher, R. M. (2015). Educative criteria for using the terms "fearlessness" and "fearless." Technical Paper No. 55. Carbondale, IL: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.

Fisher, R. M. (2012). Erich Fromm and universal humane experience: Application in the aesthetic domain for art educators. Technical Paper No. 39. Carbondale, IL: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.

Fisher, R. M. (2010). *The world's fearlessness teachings: A critical integral approach to fear management/education for the 21ˢᵗ century*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Fisher, R. M. (2008). Fearless standpoint theory: Origins of FMS-9 in Ken Wilber's work. Technical Paper No. 31. Carbondale, IL: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.

Fisher, R. M. (2007). History of the Fearlessness Movement: An introduction. Technical Paper No. 22. Vancouver, BC: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.

Fisher, R. M. (2007a). Conceptualizing a fearlessness philosophy: Existential philosophy and a genealogy of Fear Management System-5. Technical Paper No. 23. Vancouver, BC: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.

Fisher, R. M. (2006). Invoking 'Fear' Studies. *The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 22*(4), 39-71.

Fisher, R. M. (2003). Fearless leadership in and out of the 'Fear' Matrix. Unpublished dissertation. Vancouver, BC: The University of British Columbia.

Fisher, R. M. (2001). Fearology: Biography of an idea. Technical Paper No. 12. Vancouver, BC: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.

Fisher, R. M. (1995/2012). An introduction to defining 'fear': A spectrum approach. Technical Paper No. 1. Calgary, AB: In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute.

Fisher, R. M., & Barnesmoore, L. (2018). Hierarchical security: Problem of fear of the eternal (Appendix 3). In R. M. Fisher, D. Subba & B. Maria Kumar, *Fear, law and criminology: Critical issues applying the philosophy of fearism* (pp. 125-48). Australia: Xlibris.

Fisher, R. M., Subba, D., & Kumar, B. M. (2018). *Fear, law and criminology: Critical issues in applying the philosophy of fearism*. Australia: Xlibris.

Fisher, R. M., & Subba, D. (2016). *Philosophy of fearism: A first East-West dialogue*. Australia: Xlibris. https://www3.nd.edu/~dnarvaez/documents/FourArrowsDarciaNarvaez2016ReclaimingIndigenousworldview.pdf

Four Arrows (aka Jacobs, D. T.) (2017). *Point of departure: Returning to a more authentic worldview for education and survival*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Four Arrows (aka Jacobs, D. T.) (2013). From fear to fearlessness (religion/psychology and spirituality). In Four Arrows (Ed.), *Teaching truly: A curriculum to Indigenize mainstream education* (pp. 237-40). NY: Peter Lang.

Four Arrows & Narvaez, D. (2016). Reclaiming our indigenous worldview: A more authentic baseline for social/ecological justice work in education. In N. McCrary & W. Ross (Eds.), *Working for social justice inside and outside the classroom: A community of teachers, researchers, and activists* (pp. 91-112). In J. Miller & L.D. Burns, Eds.), *Social justice across contexts in education*. NY: Peter Lang.

Foucault, M. (2006). *History of Madness*, Jean Kafka (ed.), Murphy and Kafka (trans.), Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1972). The archaeology of knowledge & the discourse on language. (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Gospel of Mary Magdalene (n.d.), http://gnosis.org/library/marygosp.htm

Haraway, D. (1998). *Primate Visions*. New York: Routledge.

Herman, R. (2008). Reflections on the Importance of Indigenous Geography. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal 32*(3): 73-88.

Herbert, F. (1965). *Dune*. Philadelphia, PA: Chilton.

hooks, b. (2000). *All about love*. NY: William Morrow & Co.

Jacobs, D. T. (1998). *Primal awareness: A true story of survival, transformation, and awakening with the Rarámuri shamans of Mexico*. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions.

James, W. (1914). *The Energies of Men*. New York: Moffat, Yard & Co.

Krishnamurti, J. (1991). *Beyond violence*. London: Victor Gollanz [originally published in 1973].

Kubin, J. (2015). Remember John Lennon: Fear fills the vacuum left by disappearing hope. Retrieved from https://www.commdiginews.com/life/remember-john-lennon-fear-fills-the-vacuum-left-by-disappearing-hope-53447/

Lao Zi 1997, *Tao Te Ching*, trans. Feng and English, New York: Vintage

Lawson, D. (2012). *Christian agnostic: The doubt Jesus requires his followers to have*. AuthorHouse.

Marley, B. (1979). Babylon System. *Survival*, Tuff Gong Studios, Universal-Island Records Ltd.

Maslow, A. (1966). *The psychology of science: A reconnaissance*. NY: Harper & Row.

McLaren, P. (with Gutierrez, K.) (1995). Pedagogies of dissent and transformation: A dialogue with Kris Gutierrez. In P. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy and predatory culture: Oppositional politics in a postmodern era* (pp. 145-69). NY: Routledge.

Meng Zi (2016). *Mencius: A teaching translation* [Trans. Robert Eno]. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press. Retrieved from http://www.indiana.edu/~p374/Mengzi.pdf

Moore, R., & Gillette, D. (1991). *King, warrior, magician, lover: Rediscovering the archetypes of the mature masculine*. New York: HarperCollins.

Mumford, L. (1970). *The Myth of the Machine: The Pentagon of Power*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc.

Mumford, L. (1967). *The Myth of the Machine: Technics and Human Development*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.

Mumford, L. (1944). "Introduction", in Philip Boardman, *Patrick Geddes, Maker of the Future*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Nicoll, M. (1989). *Living time*. Utrecht: Eureka Editions.

Overstreet, B. W. (1951/71). *Understanding fear in ourselves and others*. NY: Harper & Row.

Pieper, J. (2009). Leisure: The Basis of Culture. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press.

Purpura, L. (2006). The space between. *Ecotone, 2*(1), 114-18.

Sardello, R. (1999). *Freeing the soul from fear*. NY: Putnam Penguin.

Scott, Sir. W. (1993). *Hermetica: The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings which Contain Religious or Philosophic Teachings Ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.

Sorensen, S. (1996/2014). *Unlimited visibility: Lessons and processes to improve your 'I' sight*. Camarillo, CA: DeVorrs.

Subba, D. (2014). *Philosophy of fearism: Life is conducted, directed and controlled by the fear*. Australia: Xlibris.

Tolkien, J. R. R. (1954). *The Fellowship of the Ring*. NY: Allen & Unwin.

Varela, F. J., Thompson, E. & Rosch, E. (1992). *The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, pp. 133-40.

Warrior, R. (1989). Canaanites, cowboys and Indians: Deliverance, conquest and liberation theology today. *Christianity and Crisis 49*, 261-265.

Wilber, K. (1980/82). *The Atman Project: A transpersonal view of human development*. Wheaton, IL: A Quest Book/The Theosophical Publishing House.

****